

Version 1.2



**General Certificate of Education**

**Psychology**  
*Specification A*

**Unit 3 PSYA3 Topics in Psychology**

**Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards**  
**This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)**

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009 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.

### UNIT 3 TOPICS IN PSYCHOLOGY

**AO1** - knowledge and understanding of psychology (as a science) and of how science works (9 marks)

**AO2** - Application of knowledge and understanding of psychology and of how science works: analysis and evaluation of knowledge and processes; application of scientific knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations, including issues; assessment of the validity, reliability and credibility of scientific information (12 marks)

**AO3** - How science works - Psychology; candidates should be able to describe ethical, safe and skilful practical techniques and processes; know how to make, record and communicate reliable and valid observations and measurements; analyse, interpret, explain and evaluate methodology, results and impact of their own and others' investigative activities (4 marks)

In Unit 3, candidates are also required to demonstrate their understanding of the major approaches in psychology through their study of individual topics; also to develop an appreciation of issues and debates as relevant to each topic: for example, gender/cultural bias, the role of animals in research, ethical issues, nature/nurture, free will and determinism, and reductionism.

An initial suggestion was to mention explicit issues/debates/approaches in questions. Trying this made it apparent that this could be extremely artificial and would lead to quite complex marking criteria. It seems more appropriate and workable to incorporate such material in the combined AO2/AO3 mark schemes, and make it clear to candidates that reaching the higher bands would depend upon reasonably effective reference to such material. The AO3 marks are likely to be accessed through methodological analysis and evaluation of studies.

---

## BIOLOGICAL RHYTHMS AND SLEEP

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

<b>01</b>	Discuss the role of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers in the sleep/waking cycle and at least <b>one</b> other biological rhythm. <i>(25 marks)</i>
-----------	---

**AO1 = 9 marks** Description of the role of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers in the sleep/waking cycle and at least one other biological rhythm

A general description of the role of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers in the sleep/waking cycle and at least one other biological rhythm would earn AO1 marks. However, description of biological rhythms per se is not creditworthy, but may earn marks if used explicitly to illustrate the underlying control of biological rhythms. Description of the brain mechanisms underlying endogenous pacemakers and/or the interaction with zeitgebers (eg light) would be directly relevant to the question.

Candidates are likely to base their answers on the very many studies on the roles of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers in controlling biological rhythms. These range from a variety of isolation studies in humans, work with pheromones and the menstrual cycle, to invasive work with the supra-chiasmatic nucleus in non-human animals. Many of these would be relevant to the sleep/waking cycle, while others involve rhythms such as the menstrual cycle and hibernation. The key to AO1 marks will be the accuracy with which candidates describe the studies and their understanding of how the results relate to the role of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers in biological rhythms.

Candidates are required to refer to the sleep/waking cycle and at least one other biological rhythm. If only one is covered, there is a maximum mark of 4 for AO1.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<p><b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>7-5 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.</p>
<p><b>2-1 marks 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 and evaluation on the roles of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers and evaluation or interpretation of research into endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers

Although description of relevant studies would be AO1 material, *commentary* on their significance for the roles of endogenous pacemakers and exogenous zeitgebers in the sleep/waking cycle and one other biological rhythm would qualify for AO2 / AO3 marks. Interpretation of results and methodological criticisms of studies would affect the degree of support they provide, or lack of support, and would qualify for AO2 / AO3 marks.

Candidates may introduce material on the disruption of biological rhythms, such as jet lag and seasonal affective disorders. To earn credit, such material must be explicitly shaped to the question. More relevant would be general commentary on the relative roles of pacemakers and zeitgebers, for example the increasing significance of electric lighting during the last 100 years and effects on the sleep/waking cycle.

Issues, debates and approaches that are relevant to this area include use of non-human animals, ethical issues in research, reductionism, determinism, and the biological approach. For AO2/AO3 marks above **Basic**, there must be reference to issues, debates and approaches.

Candidates who refer to only one biological rhythm can receive a maximum of 8 marks for AO2/AO3.

---

**AO2/3 Mark bands****16-13 marks Effective**

Commentary and evaluation demonstrate sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. 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 and evaluation demonstrate 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. There is evidence of synopticity. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

**8-5 marks Basic**

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

**4-1 marks Rudimentary**

Commentary and evaluation are rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. 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.

## PERCEPTION

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

<b>02</b>	Describe and evaluate Gibson's bottom up/direct theory of perception.	<b>(25 marks)</b>
-----------	---	-------------------

**AO1 = 9 marks**    Description of the main features of Gibson's theory

Key features of Gibson's theory 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 alone cannot take the answer out of Band 2.

Description of stand-alone studies not used effectively as AO2 / AO3 may earn some AO1 marks in so far as it enhances the description through *illustration* of aspects of the theory.



**AO1 Mark bands**

<b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>7-5 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.
<b>4-3 marks Basic</b>	Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial. A restricted range of material has been presented.
<b>2-1 marks 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	No creditworthy material.

**AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks** Analysis and evaluation of Gibson's theory and methodological evaluation of studies used to support or challenge Gibson's theory

As mentioned above, research studies should provide the main source of AO2 / AO3 material. Alternatively, the general explanatory power of the theory in explaining (or not) phenomena such as visual illusions would be an effective way of accessing AO2 / AO3 marks. Alternative theories, such as Gregory's, may be introduced as comparisons with Gibson, but must be used explicitly as evaluative material to earn AO2 / AO3 marks.

AO2 / AO3 marks would be earned through methodological analysis of research studies. Issues, debates and approaches relevant to this area could include the cognitive approach, reductionism, nature/nurture and determinism. Relevant reference to issues, debates and approaches would be necessary for AO2 / AO3 marks above **Basic**.

**A02/3 Mark bands**

<p><b>16-13 marks Effective</b>  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. 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. There is evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. There is some evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation are rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. 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>

## RELATIONSHIPS

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

<b>03</b>	Outline <b>one or more</b> theories relating to the formation and/or maintenance of relationships. (9 marks)
-----------	--

**AO1 = 9 marks** Outline of one or more theories of formation/maintenance of relationships

Social exchange, reward/need satisfaction and equity theory are likely to feature as central to this question, while *models* of established relationships (eg Thibaut & Kelly) would also be acceptable. As the stages of relationships naturally overlap, it is also possible for candidates to introduce other aspects of relationships (eg dissolution), but these must be made *explicitly* relevant to the question to receive credit. Interpersonal attraction can be distinguished from formation/maintenance of relationships. However, it is difficult to exclude interpersonal attraction as a component of relationship formation, but candidates must clearly place such material in the context of relationship formation rather than simply presenting studies on interpersonal attraction. They must also be able to present *factors* in interpersonal attraction (similarity, proximity etc) as part of a *model/theory* of attraction in order to receive credit.

There is also no requirement for the candidate to focus on romantic relationships; theories relating to, for example, friendship or understudied relationships could be relevant to this question.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<p><b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.</p>
<p><b>7-5 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 marks 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>

**04** Evaluate **one** of the theories outlined in Question 03 with particular emphasis on the nature of relationships in different cultures. (16 marks)

**AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks** Analysis and evaluation of one theory of formation and/or maintenance of relationships and interpretation and methodological evaluation of studies used to support or challenge the theory

Theories of formation and/or maintenance of relationships may be evaluated in various ways. Research studies can provide supporting or contradictory findings. Descriptions of relevant studies may only be credited if they are used effectively to evaluate an explanation. Evaluation of relevant studies is creditworthy and may take the form of methodological analysis and criticism, or perhaps pointing out that the focus of some research is limited to short-term relationships.

Candidates are required to consider cultural differences in relationship formation and/or maintenance when evaluating the theory. There is a range of material they may draw on, including individualistic versus collectivist societies, 'free' choice versus arranged marriages, the role of 'love', etc. If no reference to cultural differences is made, the maximum AO2/AO3 mark is 8.

More general commentary could include the effectiveness of the theory, assumptions underpinning the theory, or the approach it represents. Alternative theories/explanations may be introduced as an effective way of evaluating the target theory, but can only receive credit if used explicitly in this way.

Issues and debates relevant to this area might include cross-cultural and sub-cultural biases and ethical issues. Relevant reference to issues and debates is necessary for AO2/AO3 marks above **Basic**.

**Note**

This question does not exclude material from, for instance, socio-biology or evolutionary psychology. However, such material must be *shaped* to formation/maintenance of relationships *and* represent a *theory* to earn marks.

**A02/3 Mark bands**

<p><b>16-13 marks Effective</b>  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. 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. There is evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. There is some evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. 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>

---

## AGGRESSION

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

**05** Outline and evaluate **one** social psychological and **one** biological explanation of human aggression. *25 marks*

**AO1 = 9 marks**      Outline of one social and one biological explanation of aggression

Social psychological explanations include social learning theory and deindividuation. There are a number of biological explanations, including hormonal (the role of eg testosterone), neurochemical (eg the involvement of neurotransmitters), genetic, and brain systems, (eg traditional and contemporary models involving the amygdala and frontal cortex). Only one explanation is required and if more than one is presented all should be marked and the best credited. However, examiners should be sensitive to overlaps, for instance between neurochemical and brain system approaches. Material need not limited to human aggression.

Biological and evolutionary explanations of aggression are clearly differentiated in the Specification. Evolutionary explanations are not therefore creditable in this question, unless they explicitly refer to purely biological aspects such as genetic mechanisms or brain systems.

If only one social psychological **or** one biological explanation is presented, there is a maximum mark of 4 for AO1.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>7-5 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.
<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 .
<b>2-1 marks 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	No creditworthy material.

**AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks** Analysis and evaluation of explanations of human aggression and methodological evaluation of studies used to support or challenge explanations of human aggression

Explanations can be most effectively evaluated through the use of research evidence from a variety of sources. For social learning theory, for instance, this could include Bandura and Zimbardo's studies. For the biological explanation, there are many studies, including human and non-human experimental work, case studies of intact, institutionalised or brain-damaged humans, and the historical use of psychosurgery for aggressive disorders. Methodological analysis of research evidence would earn credit.



Alternative explanations, such as evolutionary explanations, may be introduced and would an effective source of marks if used explicitly to evaluate social psychological and biological explanations. Further commentary could include the problems of defining aggression, different types of aggression (eg reactive and instrumental), gender differences and the interplay of biological, social, and cultural factors in aggression.

Issues, debates and approaches relevant to this question could include cultural and gender bias, the role of non-human animals in research, ethical issues, the nature-nurture debate and the cognitive and biological approaches. Relevant reference to issues, debates and approaches would be necessary for marks above **Basic**.

**AO2/3 Mark bands**

<p><b>16-13 marks Effective</b>                  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.                  The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.                  Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.                  There is substantial evidence of synopticity.                  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.                  There is evidence of synopticity.                  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>                  Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.                  The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.                  Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.                  There is some evidence of synopticity.                  Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>

**4-1 marks Rudimentary**

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity.

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.

## EATING BEHAVIOUR

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

<b>06</b>	Outline factors influencing attitudes to food and eating behaviour.	<i>(5 marks)</i>
-----------	---	------------------

**AO1 = 5 marks** Outline of factors influencing attitudes to food and eating behaviour

Factors influencing attitudes to food include parental and peer attitudes, learning experiences, cultural influences, mood and health concerns. Examiners should be sensitive to depth/breadth trade-offs, particularly given the marks available for this question part.

### AO1 mark bands (5 marks)

<b>5-4 marks</b>	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
<b>3-2 marks</b>	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline is weak and muddled.
<b>0 marks</b>	No creditworthy material.

<b>07</b>	Outline and evaluate <b>one or more</b> psychological explanations of <b>one</b> eating disorder.	<i>(20 marks)</i>
-----------	---	-------------------

**AO1 = 4 marks** Outline description of psychological explanation(s) of one eating disorder

Candidates are likely to focus on anorexia nervosa, given the breadth of material available. There is a range of psychological explanations associated with anorexia nervosa: these include social learning and imitation, operant and classical conditioning, cognitive abnormalities, personality characteristics, family dynamics (eg Minuchin), and more psychodynamic approaches (eg Bruch, Freud).

Variation is likely in the detail and accuracy of accounts, especially given the marks available for this question part. At the top end, answers should be reasonably thorough and accurate, while at the lower end, they will be weak and muddled.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<b>4 marks</b>	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
<b>3-2 marks</b>	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline is weak and muddled
<b>0 marks</b>	No creditworthy material

**AO2 / AO3 = 12 marks** Analysis and evaluation of psychological explanation(s) of one eating disorder and methodological evaluation of studies used to support or challenge psychological explanation of one eating disorder

A clear source of AO2 / AO3 would be research findings relevant to a particular explanation. Methodological evaluation and criticism of any studies quoted would qualify for marks. An alternative source of credit would be the success or otherwise of an explanation in accounting for distinctive features of the disorder, such as any gender bias, age of onset, or severe weight loss. Alternative explanations may be introduced and earn credit if used effectively to evaluate psychological explanations. General relevant commentary could also involve the multifactorial nature of eating disorders.

Issues, debates and approaches relevant to this question could include cultural bias, ethical issues, free will and determinism, and the psychodynamic, behavioural and cognitive approaches. To receive marks above **Basic**, candidates must make relevant reference to issues, debates and approaches.

**A02/3 Mark bands**

<p><b>16-13 marks Effective</b>  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. 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. There is evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. There is some evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. 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>

---

**GENDER**

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

**08** "As children branch out to social relationships with their peers, gender development continues in very powerful ways - in the games they play, the relationships they form, and how they react to each other's behaviours."

Discuss the **influence** of social context on gender development.

(25 marks)

**AO1 = 9 Marks** Description of how aspects of the social context influence gender development

AO1 credit can be earned by a description of factors and explanations related to the social context of gender development. The social context consists of parents and peers, and a description of how these may affect gender development would be directly relevant. Explanations include social learning theory, psychoanalytic theory and cognitive-developmental approaches. However, the *socially-relevant* aspects of explanations must be emphasised for them to earn AO1 credit. Some of these explanations also deal more with particular aspects of gender such as identity or role, but as the distinctions are subtle, candidates are not required to distinguish between them in their answers.

Other aspects of development, such as moral or cognitive, are unlikely to earn marks unless there is a specific focus on implications for gender development.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>7-5 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.
<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.
<b>2-1 marks 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	No creditworthy material.

**AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks** Commentary and evaluation of how the social context influences gender development and methodological evaluation of relevant research studies

One source of AO2 / AO3 material would be research studies related to the effect of various factors on gender development or providing evidence for or against particular explanations. Methodological evaluation and criticisms of such studies would be eligible for marks.

The success of explanations in accounting for general features of the relationship between social context and gender development, such as changes over time or the developmental trajectory, would also qualify for marks. Further AO2 / AO3 opportunities would include general commentary on the complexity of factors affecting gender development. Alternative explanations, such as biological approaches, would qualify for credit if used explicitly to evaluate the role of social context in gender development.

Issues, debates and approaches relevant to this question might include gender and cultural bias, ethical issues, nature/nurture, and behavioural, psychodynamic and cognitive approaches. Relevant reference to issues, debates and approaches is necessary for marks above **Basic**.

Answers on gender development that do not refer to the social context cannot receive marks above **Rudimentary**.

### **AO2/3 Mark bands**

#### **16-13 marks Effective**

Commentary and evaluation demonstrate sound analysis and understanding.

The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.

Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.

There is substantial evidence of synopticity.

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 and evaluation demonstrate 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. There is evidence of synopticity.

Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate

use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

#### **8-5 marks Basic**

Commentary and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.

The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.

Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.

There is some evidence of synopticity.

Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and



spelling are intrusive.

**4-1 marks Rudimentary**

Commentary and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate.

There is little or no evidence of synopticity.

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.

**INTELLIGENCE AND LEARNING****Total for this question: 25 marks****09** Describe **one** theory of intelligence. **(9 marks)****AO1 = 9 marks** Description of one theory of intelligence

There is a variety of theories of intelligence, including Spearman 'g', Thurstone's Group Factor theory, Guildford's Abilities, Sternberg's Triarchic model, and Gardner's multiple intelligences. There is also a great deal of contemporary interest in emotional intelligence (eg Goleman's model), and an aspect of intelligence theories from this area would be acceptable. Beyond a simple description of the theory, candidates may also refer to underlying aspects such as implications for nature/nurture, developmental aspects and usage. All of these would be relevant to the question.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>7-5 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.
<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.
<b>2-1 marks 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.
<b>0 marks</b>
No creditworthy material.

**10** Evaluate the role of genetic factors in intelligence test performance. (16 marks)

**AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks** Evaluation of the role of genetic factors in intelligence test performance and evaluation of the methodology of studies to investigate the role of genetics

There is a wide range of evidence on genetic factors in intelligence performance, especially MZ/DZ twin studies and adoption studies. Evidence on the contribution of environmental factors, such as enrichment studies, cannot earn marks unless used effectively as AO2 / AO3 material, ie to evaluate the genetic argument. Methodological criticisms of, for example, intelligence tests themselves, or of MZ/DZ twin studies, may earn marks.

General commentary could include the interaction of genetic and environmental factors, historical debates and controversies, and the multiple and complex nature of intelligence.

Issues and debates relevant to this question include gender and cultural bias, ethical issues and the nature/nurture debate. Relevant reference to issues and debates is required for marks beyond **Basic**.

---

**A02/3 Mark bands**

<p><b>16-13 marks Effective</b>  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. 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. There is evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. There is some evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. 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>

---

## COGNITION AND DEVELOPMENT

**Total for this question: 25 marks**

<b>11</b>	Describe and <b>evaluate</b> research studies into the development of perspective taking in children.	<b>(25 marks)</b>
-----------	---	-------------------

**AO1 = 9 marks** Description of research studies into the development of perspective taking

Perspective taking is the ability to imagine what other people are thinking and feeling. It is central to the development of the self-concept and the capacity to understand the thoughts and feelings of others. As such it is the basis of social communication, (eg empathising with others, understanding their intentions, etc). It is a broad area encompassing formal models such as Selman's stages of perspective taking and concepts such as Theory of Mind. There is therefore a wide variety of relevant studies that would qualify for AO1 marks. These could include specific tests of ToM, (eg first and second order false belief tasks) in relation to age, and many systematic studies of the developing child's awareness of the knowledge and intentions of others. Work on eg mirror neurons would also be creditworthy if shaped explicitly to the question. Answers will vary in accuracy and depth of detail, and examiners should be sensitive to depth/breadth trade-offs. Models of perspective taking, such as Selman's or Theory of Mind approaches, would not be eligible for AO1 marks, but may allow access to AO2 credit.

**AO1 Mark bands**

<b>9-8 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/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
<b>7-5 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.
<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.
<b>2-1 marks 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	No creditworthy material.

**AO2 = 12 marks** Evaluation of research studies into the development of perspective taking in children

**AO3 = 4 marks** Evaluation of the methodology of studies

Methodological evaluation and criticism of studies would qualify for AO3 marks. AO2 material could include the support that studies provide for models and theories of the development of perspective taking, but the link between the studies described and any theory/model should be explicit. General commentary could refer to the significance of perspective taking in the development of the self-concept, social cognition and social behaviour. Reference to developmental disorders of perspective taking (eg autism) would also be creditable.  
Issues, debates and approaches relevant to this question could include ethical issues involved in work with children, cultural bias, the nature/nurture debate and the cognitive and behavioural (social learning) approaches. Reference to at least two of these would be necessary for marks in the top 2 bands.

**AO2 / AO3 Mark bands**

<p><b>16-13 marks Effective</b>  Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. 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. There is evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches. There is some evidence of synopticity. 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>  Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating 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 or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. 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>

---

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES UNIT 3**

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1 mark</b>	<b>AO2 mark</b>	<b>AO3 mark</b>	<b>Total</b>
01	9	12	4	<b>25</b>
02	9	12	4	<b>25</b>
03	9			
04		12	4	<b>25</b>
05	9	12		<b>25</b>
06	5			
07	4	12	4	<b>25</b>
08	9	12	4	<b>25</b>
09	9			
10		12	4	<b>25</b>
11	9	12	4	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>75</b>

---