



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)  
January 2013**

**Psychology A**

**PSYA3**

**(Specification 2180)**

**Unit 3: Topics in Psychology**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

---

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 students' 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: [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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.

## PSYA3: Topics in Psychology

### Topic: Biological Rhythms and Sleep

#### Question 01

#### AO1 = 8 marks      Outline of explanations for insomnia and/or narcolepsy

There are several explanations available for insomnia and narcolepsy, eg genetics and neurotransmitters such as hypocretin for narcolepsy, while in relation to insomnia there is no requirement for students to distinguish between primary and secondary insomnia, although it would be legitimate for students to present them as two sleep disorders. Otherwise material related to insomnia should be assessed as covering one disorder, eg hyperarousal, genetics, predisposing psychological and medical conditions.

Students often outline symptoms of disorders. However the question is on explanations, and description of symptoms may receive credit only if explicitly linked to explanations, eg the symptoms of narcolepsy reflecting a rapid transition into REM sleep.

Students are required to present at least two explanations and those discussing only one explanation of one sleep disorder are showing partial performance on AO1 and AO2/AO3. Such answers can receive a maximum of 6 marks for AO1 and 10 marks for AO2/AO3.

#### AO1 Mark Bands

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Sound</b> Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed. A good range of relevant material has been selected. There is substantial evidence of breadth and depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b> Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed. A range of relevant material has been selected. There is evidence of breadth and/or depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent. <i>Partial performance is Sound (max 6 marks)</i></p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b> Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial. A restricted range of material has been presented. Organisation and structure of the answer are basic. <i>Partial performance is Reasonable</i></p>
<p><b>2 - 1 mark Rudimentary</b> Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate. The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant. Lacks organisation and structure. <i>Partial performance is Basic</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 16 marks**

**Evaluation of explanations for sleep disorders**

The main source of AO2/AO3 credit is likely to be evidence from research studies eg twin studies of genetic involvement, scanning for abnormalities of brain function, non-human animal research into narcolepsy. For insomnia, studies on arousal, personality factors, and predisposing conditions would be directly relevant. The focus should be on the relevance of findings for particular explanations. Methodological evaluation of studies may receive credit if explicitly linked to the discussion of explanations.

Commentary might include reference to the interaction of different factors, eg the possible involvement of genetic mechanisms in hypocretin abnormalities in narcolepsy, the role of physiological arousal and environmental factors in insomnia. Implications for treatment would also provide relevant AO2/AO3 for explanations.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include biological reductionism. Sleep disorders have been explained using abnormalities of brain function or genetics. Students may point out that this approach may neglect the influence of psychological and sociocultural variables. However, effective elaboration might include the point that the evidence for biological factors in eg narcolepsy is overwhelming, and so the reductionist approach is not always inappropriate. They may also discuss the use of non-human animals in research and the nature/nurture debate, but cultural and gender issues and biases are unlikely to be relevant. Less likely but creditworthy would be discussion of applications of explanations to therapies.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

**16 - 13 marks Effective**

Commentary/evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**12 - 9 marks Reasonable**

Commentary/evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.  
*Partial performance is Effective (max 10 marks)*

**8 - 5 marks Basic**

Commentary/evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.  
*Partial performance is Reasonable*

**4 - 1 marks Rudimentary**

Commentary/evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.  
*Partial performance is Basic*

**0 marks**

No creditworthy material is presented.

## Topic: Perception

### Question 02

**AO1 = 4 marks**

#### **Outline of findings of cross-cultural research into perceptual development**

The emphasis of the question is on findings and lengthy description of methods cannot receive credit. It can be difficult to distinguish between findings and conclusions and so students may receive credit for commenting on the relevance of findings, eg for the nature-nurture debate. Examiners should also be sensitive to the time constraints on this question (about 5 minutes).

There is a range of cross-cultural studies of perceptual development, some looking at the interpretation of ambiguous pictures, some studying perspective and others looking at susceptibility to visual illusions. The study must be relevant to cross-cultural research into perceptual development. Examiners should be careful to check unfamiliar studies for accuracy.

#### **AO1 Mark Bands**

<b>4 marks Sound</b> Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>3 marks Reasonable</b> Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed. Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.
<b>2 marks Basic</b> Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial. Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.
<b>1 mark Rudimentary</b> Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and/or inaccurate. Lacks organisation and structure.
<b>0 marks</b> No creditworthy material.

### Question 03

#### AO1 = 4 marks      **Outline of one theory of perceptual organisation**

The two theories on the Specification are Gregory's top-down theory and Gibson's bottom-up theory. Given the time available detailed descriptions are not required for the top band. However key features should be outlined eg optic array, invariants and affordances for Gibson's theory, hypothesis testing and top down influences such as motivation and stored knowledge for Gregory.

Theories of face recognition are not creditworthy, unless explicitly justified as theories of one aspect of perceptual organisation.

#### AO1 Mark Bands

<b>4 marks Sound</b> Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>3 marks Reasonable</b> Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed. Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.
<b>2 marks Basic</b> Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial. Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.
<b>1 mark Rudimentary</b> Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and/or inaccurate. Lacks organisation and structure.
<b>0 marks</b> No creditworthy material.

#### AO2/AO3 = 16 marks      **Evaluation of one theory of perceptual organisation**

A key feature of theories of perceptual organization is how they well account for perceptual phenomena such as constancies, perception of novel objects, or the effects of context on perception, eg in ambiguous figures. Students may use this approach as a source of AO2/AO3 marks, which will depend on the clarity of the description and the link with the target theory. Findings of research studies would also be an effective source of AO2/AO3 credit, although again this will depend on the clarity of the link made between the findings and the theory. Note that cross-cultural studies could be credit worthy if linked to theory.

The alternative theory may be used legitimately to evaluate the target theory, eg in terms of a more convincing explanation of perceptual phenomena. However the focus of the answer should be on the target theory.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include the nature-nurture debate. Gregory's theory has a key role for experience and learning in perception, while Gibson's is very much on the biological 'nature' side of the debate. Whichever one is presented this would be a key debate to highlight. Students may also refer to biological reductionism, especially in the case of Gibson.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

<p><b>16 - 13 marks Effective</b> Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p><b>12 - 9 marks Reasonable</b> Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p><b>8 - 5 marks Basic</b> Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p><b>4 - 1 marks Rudimentary</b> Evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No creditworthy material is presented.</p>



**Topic: Relationships**

**Question 04**

**AO1 = 4 marks                      Outline of one theory of the formation of romantic relationships**

The most popular theories are likely to be reinforcement/affect (reward/need satisfaction), filter theory and social exchange theory. Given the time constraints of this question a full description is not necessary for marks in the top band, although key features should be outlined, eg the importance of conditioning in reinforcement/affect, or the role of comparison levels in social exchange approaches. In addition the explicit focus must be on the formation of romantic relationships rather than, for instance, maintenance. This is particularly important for social exchange and other ‘economic’ approaches.

Other theories may be outlined, such as Murstein’s matching hypothesis or explanations based on evolutionary theory. These may receive marks across the scale as long as the explicit focus is on the formation of romantic relationships.

**AO1 Mark Bands**

<p><b>4 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>3 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.</p>
<p><b>2 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and/or inaccurate.                  Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 8 marks                      Evaluation of one theory of the formation of romantic relationships**

Assessment of AO2/AO3 should be made in the context of the time constraints of this question part.

A key source of AO2/AO3 would be the findings of research studies and their support (or not) for a given theory. Some of these studies can be evaluated in terms of ecological validity (can relationships be studied in the laboratory?) and whether they are actually focused on the formation of romantic relationships. For instance, some studies seem more concerned with ‘liking’ more than with romantic relationships. Methodological evaluation of studies may receive credit if explicitly linked to the discussion of theories. Further commentary might include the issue of understudied relationships and whether theories can be applied to eg gay and lesbian relationships.

If evaluation is restricted to findings of studies on liking as opposed to romantic relationships, students can receive a maximum of 2 marks unless explicitly shaped towards the question.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include cultural bias and cultural specificity. 'Economic' theories may be more applicable to Westernised individualised societies, while psychological theories in general may not apply to cultures where arranged marriages are the norm. Students may also refer to the ethical aspects of research in socially-sensitive areas, or to reductionism in relation to, eg reinforcement/affect theory. The free will/determinism debate is also relevant to this area.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

### AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Effective</b> Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b> Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b> Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p><b>2 - 1 marks Rudimentary</b> Evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

**Question 05**

**AO1 = 4 marks**

**Outline of research into the influence of childhood on adult relationships**

‘Research’ includes both theories and studies, and this provides two routes to AO1 and AO2/AO3 credit. If the focus is on theories/explanations then outline of theories becomes AO1 and studies are likely to provide a source of AO2/AO3 material. If the focus of this question part is on research studies then the outline of these becomes AO1, while AO2/AO3 might then include implications of findings for theories/explanations. Examiners should be alert to these possibilities, and also to combinations of these routes. The mark scheme for this question should be interpreted in the light of whichever route is used.

The work on early attachment styles and their links to adult relationships (eg Hazan & Shaver’s research studies, Bowlby’s ‘internal working model’), and their influence on adult relationships, is likely to be popular. Some answers may become diverted into lengthy description of Ainsworth and her categorisation of attachment styles in young children using the ‘strange situation’. Answers where this forms the bulk of the essay are unlikely to move beyond Rudimentary. Note that ‘adolescence’ is acceptable as part of childhood.

Assessment should bear in mind the time constraints of this question part. Examiners should also be alert to the use of unexpected but legitimate material, eg research into the effects of early abuse on later relationships

**AO1 Mark Bands**

<p><b>4 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent</p>
<p><b>3 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.</p>
<p><b>2 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and/or inaccurate.                  Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 8 marks**

**Evaluation of research into the influence of childhood on adult relationships**

There are a number of cross-sectional and longitudinal research studies relevant to this area and the findings of these may provide an effective source of AO2/AO3 marks if the AO1 material presented consists of theories/explanations. Findings would need to be discussed in the context of the question, eg whether they support or contradict an influence of childhood on adult relationships. If studies have been presented as AO1 material, then methodological evaluation, eg focusing on the problem of using questionnaires (demand characteristics, self-presentation, etc), identifying cause and effect, inconsistent findings, etc, would be another rich source of AO2/AO3 marks. Implications of such evaluation for the reliability/validity of findings would provide additional AO2/3 credit, as would the implications of findings for theories/explanations.

Commentary may also include the complex nature and range of relationships that adults may have, the consistency, or not, of attachment styles over time, and gender and cultural aspects of research in this area.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include the free will/determinism debate. Attachment theory implies that our adult relationships are 'set' by early experience. However there is evidence that attachment styles change over time, and adult relationships are complex and will involve far more than attachment styles. The general implications of findings, eg in relation to child rearing practices and later relationships, would be another important issue.

Examiners should bear in mind the time constraints of this question part.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

**8 - 7 marks Effective**

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**6 - 5 marks Reasonable**

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

**4 - 3 marks Basic**

Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

**2 - 1 marks Rudimentary**

Evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

**0 marks**

No creditworthy material is presented.

## Topic: Aggression

### Question 06

**AO1 = 8 marks**      **Outline of evolutionary explanations of human aggression, including infidelity and/or jealousy**

Evolutionary explanations of human aggression focus on specific areas where aggression is thought to be adaptive. These include acquiring and protecting resources such as food, territory and mates, and status within the group, especially in males. High status then leads to greater access to resources in general and to mates in particular. AO1 detail for marks above Basic should include the evolutionary context, ie the need to ensure survival of one's genes.

There is a requirement for students to consider the relationship between human aggression and infidelity and/or jealousy. This can make up the entire answer or alternatively form part of a more general essay on explanations of human aggression. Aggression in relation to infidelity and/or jealousy is usually linked to male mate-retention strategies in response to imagined or actual sexual infidelity. There are a range of mate-retention strategies several of which do not involve aggression of any sort. For credit to be earned students must retain a clear focus on human aggression. Again the evolutionary context would be necessary for marks above Basic; this could include reference to potential cuckoldry and the evolutionary drive for men to invest resources only in their own offspring. Outlines of non-aggressive strategies (eg surveillance) might earn AO2/AO3 credit if used as relevant commentary on aggression in relation to infidelity/jealousy.

Answers that do not consider infidelity and/or jealousy can earn a maximum of 6 marks for AO1 and 10 marks for AO2/AO3.

#### AO1 Mark Bands

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Sound</b>                      Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                      A good range of relevant material has been selected.                      There is substantial evidence of breadth and depth.                      Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b>                      Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                      A range of relevant material has been selected.                      There is evidence of breadth and/or depth.                      Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.                      Answer does not refer to infidelity and/or jealousy. Maximum 6 marks.</p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b>                      Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                      A restricted range of material has been presented.                      Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>2 - 1 mark Rudimentary</b>                      Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate.                      The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant.                      Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                      no creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 16 marks**

**Commentary/evaluation on evolutionary explanations of human aggression, including infidelity and/or jealousy**

A range of research studies would provide highly effective AO2/AO3 material for this question. Studies on criminal aggression (perpetrated mainly by young poor males) can be linked to the relationship between status and aggression (eg Daley & Wilson). Studies on tribes such as the Ache or Kung San provide some support for the relationship between aggression in males and access to resources such as food and mates. Further important points of evaluation/commentary include the use of different types of aggression, which can interact with gender differences in aggressive behaviour.

Research studies have also supported gender differences in attitudes to infidelity, with males being more upset by sexual infidelity and females by emotional infidelity. However there must be clear relevance to human aggression for AO2/AO3 marks to be awarded.

Methodological evaluation of studies may earn marks, but only if the relevance of the evaluation for explanations is explicit and sensible. For instance, given an evolutionary perspective, studies on non-human animals (especially primates) cannot be dismissed out of hand, as they often are.

Alternative explanations of human aggression, such as social psychological or biological (genetics, neurotransmitters) approaches, may earn marks if used effectively as evaluation of evolutionary explanations.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include free will and determinism. The idea that human aggression is driven by our evolutionary past is highly deterministic. However, when students have provided research support for this view then it cannot simply be dismissed, and effective debate would be expected to consider the validity of the determinist view. Students may also refer to reductionism, and gender and cultural issues. Applications of explanations/findings to relationship therapy and to an understanding of contemporary relationships would also be a relevant issue in this area.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

**16 - 13 marks Effective**

Commentary/evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**12 - 9 marks Reasonable**

Commentary/evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning. Answer does not refer to infidelity and/or jealousy. Maximum 10 marks.

**8 - 5 marks Basic**

Commentary/evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

**4 - 1 marks Rudimentary**

Commentary/evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

**0 marks**

No creditworthy material is presented.

## **Topic: Eating Behaviour**

### **Question 07**

**AO1 = 8 marks**                      **Description of research into factors influencing attitudes to food and/or eating behaviour**

Research includes both theory and studies, and examiners should be alert to these two approaches to the question. However it is likely that students will outline factors as AO1 material and then evaluate their contribution to attitudes to food and/or eating behaviour as AO2 material. Factors given as examples in the Specification are cultural influences, mood and health concerns, and the quote in the question guides students to these. However, although students may focus on these examiners should be alert to additional relevant material.

'Attitudes' include emotional, cognitive and behavioural components and attitudes to food can be shaped by individual concerns or social/cultural influences that can affect eating behaviour. Although from different parts of the specification, factors such as biological (neural and hormonal) mechanisms and eating disorders can also influence attitudes to food and/or eating behaviour. Therefore such material would be creditworthy.

An answer simply listing factors influencing attitudes to food is unlikely to move beyond Basic for AO1. To move up the mark bands there needs to be some elaboration of depth/detail eg an outline of the possible role of serotonin in mood effects on our attitudes to food, or accurate and specific examples of health concerns in relation to diet.

Students are required to describe 'factors' and answers covering only, eg mood are showing partial performance and may earn a maximum of 6 marks for AO1 and 10 marks for AO2/AO3.



**AO1 Mark Bands**

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  A good range of relevant material has been selected.                  There is substantial evidence of breadth and depth.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  A range of relevant material has been selected.                  There is evidence of breadth and/or depth.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.  <i>Partial performance is Sound (maximum 6 marks)</i></p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  A restricted range of material has been presented.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.  <i>Partial performance is Reasonable</i></p>
<p><b>2 - 1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate.                  The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant.                  Lacks organisation and structure.  <i>Partial performance is Basic</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 16 marks                      Evaluation of research into factors influencing attitudes to food and eating behaviour**

Research studies are likely to provide the main source of AO2/AO3 marks. There are research findings relevant to each of the factors mentioned in the Specification and in the quote (cultural influences, mood, health concerns), confirming their significance in influencing attitudes to food and eating behaviour. Methodological evaluation of studies may earn AO2/AO3 credit if discussed in the context of the influence of factors on attitudes to food and eating behaviour.

Comparison with alternative approaches such as the biological would be another effective source of AO2/AO3 marks. Alternatively, commentary might include the complex nature of the control of eating behaviour, with attitudes interacting with biological control systems.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include the nature-nurture debate. Eating behaviour is influenced by a complex mix of biological mechanisms and psychological/social/cultural influences. Attitudes usually reflect the nurture side of the equation. Students may also refer to free will/determinism and gender issues, while cultural issues are embedded in the question.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

**16 - 13 marks Effective**

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**12 - 9 marks Reasonable**

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

*Partial performance is Effective (maximum 10 marks)*

**8 - 5 marks Basic**

Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

*Partial performance is Reasonable*

**4 - 1 marks Rudimentary**

Evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

*Partial performance is Basic*

**0 marks**

No creditworthy material is presented.

**Topic: Gender**

**Question 08**

**AO1 = 8 marks                      Description of the biosocial approach to gender development**

The broad form of the biosocial approach sees gender development as representing an interaction between biological and social/cultural factors. Biological factors include genes (XX or XY) and the organising effects of prenatal hormones such as testosterone. Social/cultural factors include early socialisation based on cultural attitudes to gender stereotyping (masculinity and femininity); these can involve labelling (boy or girl) by parents and peers.

Narrower views of the biosocial approach focus more closely on factors such as the baby/parent interaction, eg with the biologically determined temperament of the baby eliciting particular forms of interaction with the parent. These would vary with the baby’s temperament and in theory may lead to different long term outcomes in relation to gender development. Either approach is acceptable.

Gender dysphoria is included in this part of the Specification. There are a variety of explanations for gender dysphoria, including attachment problems, parental influence, psychoanalytic approaches, and biological factors (sex hormones, genetics). It can be used to illustrate and discuss the biosocial approach to gender development and can earn marks across the scale if used in this way. However the biosocial approach itself must be clearly described and used as a framework for the discussion of gender dysphoria for credit to be earned as either AO1 illustration or AO2/AO3 evaluation.

The key will be an emphasis on the interaction between biological and social/cultural factors. Answers that present outlines of biological and social/cultural factors without mentioning their interaction will be limited to a maximum AO1 mark of two.

Note that some research, such as Eagly & Woods, may qualify as either AO1 or AO2/AO3 evaluation.

**AO1 Mark Bands**

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  A good range of relevant material has been selected.                  There is substantial evidence of breadth and depth.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  A range of relevant material has been selected.                  There is evidence of breadth and/or depth.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.</p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  A restricted range of material has been presented.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>2 - 1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate.                  The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant.                  Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 16 marks**

**Evaluation of the biosocial approach to gender development**

The most effective route to AO2/AO3 marks is likely to be reference to the many research studies in the textbooks, including work with human participants (eg Bruce Reimer, CAH syndrome, influence of parents and peers on gender development) and with non-human animals (eg effects of manipulating prenatal levels of sex hormones on later sex-typed behaviours). To move up the bands findings should be accurately interpreted as supporting or contradicting the biosocial model rather than simply *demonstrating* biological or social/cultural influences. Methodological evaluation of research studies may earn AO2/AO3 credit if discussed in the context of the biosocial approach.

Commentary might include reference to the value of the biosocial model in combining biological and social/cultural influences. Issues, debates and approaches in this area include the nature-nurture debate. If evidence supports the biosocial model then we have a combination of nature (biological) and nurture (social/culture). Other IDA that would be relevant include free will/determinism in relation to gender, socially-sensitive research and cultural aspects of gender development.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

<p><b>16 - 13 marks Effective</b>                  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation.                  The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.                  Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.                  Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p><b>12 - 9 marks Reasonable</b>                  Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.                  The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.                  Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.                  Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p><b>8 - 5 marks Basic</b>                  Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding.                  The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.                  Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.                  Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p><b>4 - 1 marks Rudimentary</b>                  Evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding.                  The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

## Topic: Intelligence and Learning

### Question 09

**AO1 = 8 marks**

**Outline of one or more information processing theories of intelligence**

Information theories of intelligence emphasise different forms of cognitive processing that underlie different types of intelligence. Examples given on the Specification are Sternberg and Gardner, and it is probable that students will outline one or both of these. Sternberg's triarchic theory is presented slightly differently in different texts and examiners should be careful to check the accuracy of the material presented. For example, his three 'sub-theories' that refer to three different types of intelligence have been labelled componential, contextual and experiential, or alternatively analytic, practical and creative intelligences. Each of these can be divided into further components, but this level of detail is not required for marks across the scale.

Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences is more straightforward in that it proposes eight (or nine, depending on the source) independent forms of intelligence based on different information processing modules in the brain. Students would not be required to list all the types of intelligence, but for the top band they would be expected to outline three or four as examples.

Examiners should be sensitive to depth-breadth trade-offs in answers that cover more than one theory.

Students may introduce alternative information processing theories of intelligence and examiners should ensure that they are familiar with any material that is presented. Material on psychometric theories is not relevant to this question and cannot earn marks.

#### AO1 Mark Bands

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  A good range of relevant material has been selected.                  There is substantial evidence of breadth and depth.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  A range of relevant material has been selected.                  There is evidence of breadth and/or depth.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.</p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  A restricted range of material has been presented.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>2 - 1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate.                  The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant.                  Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>

**AO2/AO3 = 16 marks**

**Evaluation of one or more information theories of intelligence**

AO2/AO3 credit may be earned either by generic evaluation of the information processing approach and/or by evaluation of specific theories. The approach in general provides a more complex and dynamic picture of intelligence than psychometric theories. On the other hand this makes it difficult to test as many of the concepts are not precisely defined and theories can look unsystematic and incoherent.

Sternberg's triarchic theory divides intelligence into areas that make intuitive sense (analytic, creative, practical) and can be used in applied settings such as the classroom. However, because it lacks detail, it cannot easily explain observations such as the loss of particular abilities after brain damage, or the existence of people highly gifted in specific areas.

Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences again looks plausible. It can explain why brain damage can selectively impair specific abilities, and why individuals can show exceptional talents in specific intelligences. It also provides a framework for assessing children in the classroom. However there is also confusion between 'intelligence' and talents or straightforward abilities, while there are potentially a number of other talents/abilities that might qualify as an 'intelligence' in Gardner's terms.

Note that if research studies are used as AO2/AO3 material, methodological evaluation can only earn credit if the implications for the reliability/validity of findings, and hence for the theory, are explicit.

The psychometric approach may earn AO2/AO3 credit if used as part of sustained and effective evaluation of information processing theories.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include cultural issues. An advantage of information processing theories over the psychometric approach is that they can easily accommodate the idea that different intelligences or abilities are vital for adaptation to different environments or cultures. Students may also refer to applications of theories to, eg education, the nature-nurture debate and ethical aspects of trying to define intelligence.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

<p><b>16 - 13 marks Effective</b> Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p><b>12 - 9 marks Reasonable</b> Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p><b>8 - 5 marks Basic</b> Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p><b>4 - 1 marks Rudimentary</b> Evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

## Topic: Cognition and Development

### Question 10

#### AO1 = 4 marks      Description of the development of a child's sense of self

Students may take various approaches to this question part. They may present a developmental approach that outlines stages in the development of the sense of self as separate from other people. Marks awarded will depend upon the accuracy and detail of the stages presented. Age ranges should be appropriate for the stage of development described, but as different books tend to give slightly different age ranges some allowance can be made.

It is more likely that answers will focus on the development of Theory of Mind in children. It can be a hard concept to describe, but can be effectively illustrated by the sorts of false belief paradigms used to test for it, eg the Sally-Anne task. Description of such studies may therefore earn AO1 marks if they are not used as effective AO2/AO3. The focus of the question is on development of the sense of self, and answers that do not address this aspect can earn a maximum of 2 marks for AO1. For instance, Theory of Mind tasks use the understanding of others as a test for the development of the sense of self. Therefore AO1 and AO2/AO3 marks awarded will depend upon how well the answer is 'shaped' to the development of the sense of self, rather than to the understanding of others.

Similarly, students may refer to Selman's theory of the development of perspective taking. This is specifically linked to the development of the understanding of others and cannot earn credit unless explicitly made relevant to the development of the sense of self.

#### AO1 Mark Bands

<p><b>4 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>3 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.</p>
<p><b>2 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and/or inaccurate. Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>



**AO2/AO3 = 8 marks**

**Commentary/evaluation on the child’s development of a sense of self**

Research evidence should provide effective AO2/AO3 material whichever approach is taken to the question, as there are many studies investigating the development of the self. These include studies of the stages in development of the self, and more specific studies on, eg theory of mind. Implications of findings should be clear, and a consideration of inconsistent findings would be an effective source of AO2/AO3. Methodological evaluation, such as interpretations of the ‘mirror’ paradigm, the complicating role of language and problems of working with small children, would be relevant as long as the implications for the reliability/validity of findings are clear. Note that the question refers to the ‘child’, and studies on non-human animals may only earn credit if findings are explicitly discussed in relation to the child’s development of a sense of self.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include the nature-nurture debate. Development of the sense of self probably involves innate tendencies as well as a crucial role for social interaction. Other issues that can be made relevant include cultural and gender differences, and applications of findings to social development and education.

**AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

<p><b>8 - 7 marks Effective</b>                  Commentary/evaluation demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.                  Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.                  Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p><b>6 - 5 marks Reasonable</b>                  Commentary/evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.                  Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.                  Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p><b>4 - 3 marks Basic</b>                  Commentary/evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.                  Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p><b>2 - 1 marks Rudimentary</b>                  Commentary/evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.                  If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

## Question 11

### **AO1 = 4 marks      Outline of applications of one or more theories of cognitive development to education**

Theories of cognitive development in the Specification are Piaget and Vygotsky. There is no requirement for students to cover both. AO1 marks can be awarded for outlines of applications of theories to education. For Piaget this might be stage-specific learning, 'readiness', discovery learning or the concepts of assimilation and accommodation. For Vygotsky, key ideas include the zone of proximal development, scaffolding, the role of language, and collaborative learning. Examiners should be sensitive to depth-breadth trade-offs in answers covering both, and also to the marks available for this question part.

Other theories of cognitive development, such as Bruner's, would also be relevant to this question.

#### **AO1 Mark Bands**

<p><b>4 marks Sound</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>3 marks Reasonable</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.</p>
<p><b>2 marks Basic</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.                  Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.</p>
<p><b>1 mark Rudimentary</b>                  Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and/or inaccurate.                  Lacks organisation and structure.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No creditworthy material.</p>

### **AO2/AO3 = 8 marks      Commentary on applications of one or more theories of cognitive development to education**

There are a number of routes to AO2/AO3 credit. Research studies have investigated the effectiveness of, eg scaffolding or stage specific learning ('readiness'). Note that methodological evaluation of such studies can only earn credit if explicitly linked to discussion of application of theories. General points include the role of the teacher and the significance of individual differences between children. Observations on the overall significance of Piaget and/or Vygotsky to education may also earn marks.

Further relevant commentary might include some direct comparison of Piaget and/or Vygotsky's theories in relation to education, although this is not essential for marks in the top band. Alternative theories, such as Bruner, may earn AO2/AO3 credit if used either as part of effective commentary on Piaget and/or Vygotsky, or discussed in their own right.

Note that students are not required to evaluate their chosen theory (ies) beyond their applications to education. Classic studies (naughty teddy, three mountains, etc) will not earn AO2/AO3 credit unless the implications of findings are directly linked to the discussion of applications to education.

Issues, debates and approaches in this area include cultural and historical issues, with Vygotsky's views in particular shaped by the socio-political environment he was working in. Issues such as free will and reductionism are unlikely to be relevant.

AO2/AO3 material should first be placed in the appropriate band according to the descriptors. However, not all the criteria need be satisfied for an answer to be placed in a particular band. Weak performance in one area may be compensated for by strong performance in others. In order to access the top band, issues and debates and/or approaches need to be addressed effectively.

#### **AO2/AO3 Mark Bands – Best Fit**

##### **8 - 7 marks Effective**

Commentary demonstrates sound analysis, understanding and interpretation. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

##### **6 - 5 marks Reasonable**

Commentary demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

##### **4 - 3 marks Basic**

Commentary demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

##### **2 - 1 marks Rudimentary**

Commentary is rudimentary, demonstrating a very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled and inaccurate. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

##### **0 marks**

No creditworthy material is presented.