

OXFORD

INTERNATIONAL
AQA EXAMINATIONS

INTERNATIONAL A-LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY

PS04

Unit 4 Approaches and Application

Mark scheme

January 2021

Version: 1.0 Final Mark Scheme



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead 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 oxfordaqaexams.org.uk

Copyright information

OxfordAQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for OxfordAQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: OxfordAQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2021 Oxford International AQA Examinations and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A: Approaches in Psychology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
01	<p>Outline how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the incident with the car Sam has associated fear with cars • The sudden stopping of the car was the unconditioned stimulus (UCS) and fear the unconditioned response (UCR) • Travelling in the car, the neutral stimulus (NS), and the incident of the sudden stopping of the car (UCS), have been paired together and produced the UCR of fear in Sam • Now car journeys have become the conditioned stimulus (CS) which elicits the conditioned response (CR) of fear in Sam. <p>Accept a diagram as part of the answer.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 947 1326 1621"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Descriptor</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is relevant, but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	5–6	2	Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is relevant, but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO2 = 6</p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	5–6															
2	Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is relevant, but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4															
1	Outline of how Sam’s fear of car journeys can be explained by the process of classical conditioning is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks												
02	<p>Briefly evaluate classical conditioning as a way of understanding behaviour.</p> <p>Possible evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on measuring observed behaviour in a highly controlled laboratory setting gives this approach scientific credibility • The principles of classical conditioning can be applied in the real-world eg to explain/treat phobias • Pavlov carried out research on non-human animals and this has been beneficial as animals can be studied in a controlled laboratory which could be a difficult environment for humans • Takes a very mechanistic/machine-like view of human behavior ie does not consider mental events (eg motivation) during learning • Other approaches (eg SLT) have shown that people play a more active role in their learning (mediational processes) • Classical conditioning is deterministic as it believes behaviour is determined by past associations. <p>Credit other evaluative points.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 1016 1310 1395"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>The evaluation of the process of classical conditioning as a way of understanding behavior has some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>The evaluation of the process of classical conditioning as a way of understanding behavior is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	2	The evaluation of the process of classical conditioning as a way of understanding behavior has some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3–4	1	The evaluation of the process of classical conditioning as a way of understanding behavior is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>4</p> <p>AO3 = 4</p>
Level	Description	Marks												
2	The evaluation of the process of classical conditioning as a way of understanding behavior has some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3–4												
1	The evaluation of the process of classical conditioning as a way of understanding behavior is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2												
0	No creditable content.	0												

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
03	<p>Describe and evaluate the biological approach in psychology. In your answer, refer to at least one topic you have studied.</p> <p>Possible knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolution and behaviour • The influence of genes on behaviour • Genotype and phenotype • The influence of biological structures on behaviour • The influence of neurochemistry on behaviour. <p>Credit other relevant knowledge.</p> <p>Possible topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localisation/lateralisation; Broca’s and Wernicke’s; plasticity and functional recovery after trauma • Baillargeon – innate object knowledge/innate fast learning • Evolutionary explanation for sleep • Biological explanations/treatments for schizophrenia. <p>Credit other relevant topics.</p> <p>Possible evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a scientific approach/uses scientific method/establishes cause and effect • Technology used is objective eg PET, EEG etc • Evidence for the biological basis of behaviour, including case studies eg HM, Phineas Gage etc • Supports the nature side of the nature-nurture debate • Real-life application eg development of anti-psychotics • Deterministic – leaves no room for free will • Biological determinism leads to legal arguments eg reduced responsibility for actions • Reductionist – reduces all human behaviour to biological processes • Comparison with alternative approaches <p>Credit other relevant evaluation.</p>	<p>20</p> <p>AO1 = 8 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8</p>

Level	Descriptor	Marks
4	Knowledge of the biological approach in psychology is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Application is appropriate. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	16–20
3	Knowledge of the biological approach in psychology is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation/application. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	11–15
2	Limited knowledge of the biological approach in psychology is present. Any evaluation/application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	6–10
1	Knowledge of the biological approach in psychology is very limited. Evaluation/application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–5
0	No creditable content.	0

Section B: Issues and Debates in Psychology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
<p>04</p>	<p>Explain how writing a text message to a friend can be understood at a reductionist level and a holistic level.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductionist level - reduces behaviour down to its component parts, so writing a text to a friend could be explained at a biological level (lower level) eg neurotransmitters in the brain send messages to the fingers to press the keys/write the text message. • Holistic level – a holistic approach considers the behaviour as a whole rather than breaking it down to its component parts eg writing a text message to a friend could be explained with regard to social context eg arranging to meet a friend. <p>Credit other relevant content</p> <p>Award 2 marks for each level:</p> <p>2 marks for a clear level of explanation with reference to writing a text message.</p> <p>1 mark for a muddled or vague level of explanation with reference to writing a text message.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p>

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks																														
05	<p>Explain one strength and one limitation of using scientific methods in psychological research.</p> <p>Possible strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science uses empirical methods, eg the experimental method, that provide objective, replicable, generalisable results • Science involves the generation of hypotheses to support theories • Science can lead to general laws of behaviour • Scientific methods have credibility and give psychology scientific status • Science has provided many applications eg treatments for schizophrenia etc. <p>Accept other relevant strengths.</p> <p>For a strength award marks as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 862 1305 1220"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>A strength is explained in detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>A strength is explained but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>A strength is briefly presented but there is little or no explanation. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Possible limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using empirical methods with humans can lead to inaccurate results. For example, the experimental situation can lead to demand characteristics/researcher bias etc. • Ethical issues pose a particular problem with animals/humans. For example, studies causing anxiety, stress etc would not be ethical. This would not be a problem for other sciences in the same way. • Scientific methods require objectivity and control and it is not possible to control all variables with humans. <p>Accept other relevant limitations</p> <p>For a limitation award marks as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 1713 1305 2072"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>A limitation is explained in detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>A limitation is explained but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>A limitation is briefly presented but there is little or no explanation. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	A strength is explained in detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	A strength is explained but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	A strength is briefly presented but there is little or no explanation. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	Level	Description	Marks	3	A limitation is explained in detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	A limitation is explained but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	A limitation is briefly presented but there is little or no explanation. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks																														
3	A strength is explained in detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																														
2	A strength is explained but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																														
1	A strength is briefly presented but there is little or no explanation. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1																														
0	No creditable content.	0																														
Level	Description	Marks																														
3	A limitation is explained in detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																														
2	A limitation is explained but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																														
1	A limitation is briefly presented but there is little or no explanation. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1																														
0	No creditable content.	0																														

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks						
06	<p>Discuss the free will and determinism debate in psychology. Refer in your answer to two approaches you have studied.</p> <p>Possible knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A definition of the debate - concerns whether or not behavior is freely produced by choice or whether it is caused by forces (internal or external) over which the individual has no control • Hard determinism – excludes possibility of any free will • Soft determinism – allows for some free will • Types of determinism - biological and environmental determinism • Free will – the ability to make choices in life. <p>Credit other relevant knowledge.</p> <p>Possible approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviourist approach – environmental determinism/hard determinism • Social Learning theory – soft determinism • Cognitive approach – soft determinism • Biological approach – biological determinism/hard determinism <p>Possible discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determinism relates to the scientific emphasis on causal relationships where behavior has been caused by something that is not controlled by the individual. Scientific evidence is produced to support causation and thus determinism. • If behavior is externally caused, then the individual is not responsible; absence of moral responsibility. • Free will seems intuitively correct and most people feel that they have some control over their own actions and behaviours. However, free will is subjective and impossible to test as it is difficult to quantify and measure. • There may be a continuum rather than a dichotomy between free will and determinism. Behaviours may not be <u>either</u> determined <u>or</u> freely chosen but on a continuum with varying elements of each. • Topics might be used to illustrate the debate eg Cognitive development – Piaget’s maturational development model (determinist); Baillargeon (determinist); Schizophrenia – genetic explanation for schizophrenia (determinist); Cognitive therapy for schizophrenia contains some element of free will. Job motivation and satisfaction – Need theory (determinist); Expectancy theory (elements of free will) etc. <p>Accept other relevant discussion points.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 1906 1302 2040"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Knowledge of the free will and determinism debate is accurate and generally well detailed.</td> <td>16–20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	4	Knowledge of the free will and determinism debate is accurate and generally well detailed.	16–20	<p>20</p> <p>AO1 = 8 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8</p>
Level	Description	Marks						
4	Knowledge of the free will and determinism debate is accurate and generally well detailed.	16–20						

		Application/discussion is effective. The answer is clear, organised and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	
3		Knowledge of the free will and determinism debate is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some appropriate application/discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	11–15
2		Limited knowledge of the free will and determinism debate is present. There is some limited application/discussion. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	6–10
1		Knowledge of the free will and determinism debate is very limited. Application/discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–5
0		No creditable content.	0

Section C: Applied Psychology: Work and the Individual **Total for this section: 30 marks**

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
07	<p>Which two of the following are not resources in the job demands-resources (J D-R) model of workplace stress:</p> <p>A Burnout B Job appraisal C Job insecurity D Level of control E Training</p> <p>ANSWERS A C</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks						
08	<p>Evaluate the job demands-resources (J D-R) model of workplace stress.</p> <p>Possible evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model can explain both health impairment processes and motivational processes. • Research evidence supports the existence of the two pathways for health impairment and motivation in the model (Bakker and Demerouti 2007). • Research findings have supported the conceptual framework of the model • The positive aspects of job resources and well-being distinguish this model from earlier models (eg J-D-C) which, in comparison, were relatively simple. • The model is flexible and can be applied to any work environment. In a changing workplace and different work patterns, this means the model can incorporate new job demands and job resources for the digital age. • The model provides useful interventions to reduce strain and burnout in the workplace. • Because the model is so complex it is impossible to test all the variables at once. The earlier models were simpler and easier to test. • Examples of research that might form part of the evaluation include: Schaufell and Taris (2014); Nielsen et al. (2011); Baka (2015) etc. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 1899 1302 2033"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="300 1899 411 1951">Level</th> <th data-bbox="411 1899 1169 1951">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1169 1899 1302 1951">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1951 411 2033">3</td> <td data-bbox="411 1951 1169 2033">Evaluation of the job demands-resources (J D-R) model is accurate and effective. The answer is clear and</td> <td data-bbox="1169 1951 1302 2033">5–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Evaluation of the job demands-resources (J D-R) model is accurate and effective. The answer is clear and	5–6	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks						
3	Evaluation of the job demands-resources (J D-R) model is accurate and effective. The answer is clear and	5–6						

		organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.	
	2	Evaluation of the job demands-resources (J D-R) model is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4
	1	Evaluation of the job demands-resources (J D-R) model is either limited or very limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2
	0	No creditable content.	0

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
09	<p>Briefly outline what psychologists mean by cultural universals in facial expression.</p> <p>Possible content: Cultural universals in facial expressions mean that <u>certain</u> facial expressions are the same across cultures eg facial expression depicting emotions such as happiness, surprise, anger etc.</p> <p>2 marks for a clear outline of what is meant by cultural universals in facial expression. 1 mark for a muddled or vague outline.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
10	<p>Briefly explain one limitation of research into cultural universals in facial expression.</p> <p>Possible limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stimuli is in the form of photographs where ‘models’ produce facial expressions to a given emotion are commonly used (eg Ekman). Emotion, however, includes autonomic changes and feelings, so the stimuli may not be valid. Most research is laboratory based and may not reflect the intricacies of emotions in the real world, lacks mundane realism/ecological validity. <p>Accept other valid limitations</p> <p>2 marks for a clear limitation with some elaboration. 1 mark for a muddled or vague limitation.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO3 = 2</p>

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
11	<p>Use your knowledge of group processes to explain two factors that might have influenced the group’s decision-making on climate change.</p> <p>Possible knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Group polarisation</u> – this is shown where at first most people did not want to take extreme action but by the end of the meeting extreme action was agreed. The group decision was more extreme than the original attitudes on climate change. • <u>Risky shift</u> – This is a type of group polarisation where both the group view on action to take on climate change, and the individuals’ original views on climate change, become riskier. A risky decision (extreme action) is taken in the climate change action agreed. • <u>Groupthink</u> – sometimes groups drift into decisions without thinking of the consequences, which may have happened with the climate change group decision. The group may have wanted to avoid conflict within the group, and so came to a consensus decision without considering the consequences to their extreme action. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 1043 1323 1823"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Descriptor</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Explanation of two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is detailed and appropriate. Application is effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Explanation of two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is relevant, but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. OR one factor at L3</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Explanation of one or two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one factor at L2</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Explanation of two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is detailed and appropriate. Application is effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	5–6	2	Explanation of two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is relevant, but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. OR one factor at L3	3–4	1	Explanation of one or two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one factor at L2	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO2 = 6</p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Explanation of two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is detailed and appropriate. Application is effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	5–6															
2	Explanation of two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is relevant, but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. OR one factor at L3	3–4															
1	Explanation of one or two factors that may have influenced the group decision making on climate change is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one factor at L2	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks												
12	<p>Discuss one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction.</p> <p>Possible knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need theory – 12 main areas of human need (Farren, 1998); the needs and expectations of people at work (Mullins, 2007); Maslow (1987); McClelland's Achievement Motivation Theory (1988) • Expectancy theory – Vroom (1964) • Goal-setting theory – original theory by Locke (1968); recent research Gratton (2000), Farrell et al. (2005) • Warr's Vitamin model (1987) concerned with job characteristics and well-being. <p>Accept other relevant knowledge.</p> <p>Possible discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems with understanding the many interacting characteristics influencing job motivation and satisfaction • The Hawthorne effect – behaviour changes when being observed (Hawthorne experiments, 1933) • Answers may compare motivational theories (eg Need theory) with cognitive theories (eg Expectancy theory) • Discussion will largely depend on the theory (or theories) selected but will probably centre on the research to support the selected theory • Methodological issues with research should only be credited if related back to theory • The theories tend to focus on people in traditional types of employment rather than, say, people who work from home/self-employed etc – questioning the temporal validity of the theories. • Implications for theory – the ability to explain motivation/satisfaction at work. <p>Accept other relevant discussion points</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 1429 1302 2069"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. The answer is clear, organised and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td> <td>10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some appropriate discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.</td> <td>7–9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Limited knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is present. There is some limited discussion. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.</td> <td>4–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	4	Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. The answer is clear, organised and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	10–12	3	Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some appropriate discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	7–9	2	Limited knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is present. There is some limited discussion. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	4–6	<p>12</p> <p>AO1 = 6 AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks												
4	Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. The answer is clear, organised and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	10–12												
3	Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some appropriate discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	7–9												
2	Limited knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is present. There is some limited discussion. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	4–6												

	1	Knowledge of one or more theories of job motivation and satisfaction is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–3
	0	No creditable content.	0

PS04 grid

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Section A				
01		6		6
02			4	4
03	8	4	8	20
Section B				
04		4		4
05			6	6
06	8	4	8	20
Section C				
07	2			2
08			6	6
09	2			2
10			2	2
11		6		6
12	6		6	12
Unit total	26	24	40	90