

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO1 = 6 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 6]

Level	Mark	Description
4	13-16	Knowledge of one or more social psychological explanations for aggression is accurate and generally well detailed. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9-12	Knowledge of one or more social psychological explanations for aggression is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Application/discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5-8	Limited knowledge of one or more social psychological explanations for aggression is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion/application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-4	Knowledge of one or more social psychological explanations for aggression is very limited. Discussion/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.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- social learning theory explanation – aggression is the result of observation, identification, modelling, vicarious reinforcement (Bandura 1961); features of a model likely to be imitated include similarity, attractiveness, status etc; cognitive factors are involved, eg attention, retention, motivation, perceived ability to reproduce the behaviour
- deindividuation – individuals in a crowd feel less personal responsibility and are less constrained by social norm; private v public self-awareness
- frustration-aggression hypothesis – Dollard and Miller (1930s) proposed frustration results in aggression – obstruction of a goal and proximity to goal, hydraulic model, consistent with psychodynamic notion of catharsis; aggressive response may be displaced.

Possible application:

- social learning theory – Angel observes and imitates the aggressive

behaviour of her mother and sisters; Angel joins in with the hitting because she has observed her sisters (high status, similar) fighting with each other; Angel shouts at other children modelling the behaviour of her mother yelling at neighbours

- deindividuation – when Angel is with her sisters she feels less personal responsibility so becomes aggressively threatening, with her hood up she is deindividuated and therefore feels less responsible
- frustration-aggression – Angel is frustrated on the playground when she wants toys/equipment that others are using; Angel is frustrated having to wait for her dinner so pushes to the front.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence for and against the explanation(s), eg Harris (1974) jumping the queue; Pastore (1952) buses not stopping; Green (1968) jigsaws; Zimbardo (1969); Dodd (1985)
- frustration-aggression – difference between justified and unjustified aggression (Dill and Anderson 1995); individual differences in response to frustration; alternative explanations, eg self-preservation; cues as a mediating factor (Berkowitz and LePage 1967); catharsis may actually increase aggression (Bushman 2002)
- deindividuation does not always lead to aggression – can lead to pro-social behaviour, depends on role of the actor and the social norm
- social learning theory – better explains proactive instrumental aggression rather than reactive aggression; role of the media
- alternative explanations, eg genetics, evolution etc
- implications of the explanations, eg for discouraging aggression and encouraging prosocial behaviour
- links with broader debates, eg nature-nurture, determinism.

Credit other relevant material.

[16]

Q2.

[AO1 = 6]

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Knowledge of how de-individuation is involved in aggression is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
2	3-4	Knowledge of how de-individuation is involved in aggression is mostly appropriate but lacks detail and/or clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology
1	1-2	Knowledge of how de-individuation is involved in aggression is limited/very limited. The answer lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- loss of personal identity in a group situation leads to disregard for social norms and increased aggression
- sense of autonomy and personal responsibility for own actions is diminished – instead the individual is governed by the norms and expectations of the group
- inhibitions that normally regulate an individual's behaviour are reduced – there is a reduction in private self-awareness
- social identity model of de-individuation (Reicher, 1987) explains how some private situations also lead to de-individuation, eg the Internet which allows for anonymity
- knowledge of studies involving the effect of de-individuation on aggression, eg Zimbardo (1969).

Credit other relevant material.

[6]

Q3.

[AO3 = 6]

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Evaluation of the role of de-individuation in aggression is detailed and effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
2	3-4	Evaluation of the role of de-individuation in aggression is mostly effective but lacks detail and/or clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology
1	1-2	Evaluation of the role of de-individuation in aggression is limited/very limited. The answer lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible evaluation:

- use of evidence supporting or contradicting the explanation
- de-individuation/anonymity do not always lead to aggression – it depends on the norms of the group which may be antisocial or prosocial
- consideration of the role of anonymity – anonymity of a victim may be as important as anonymity of the aggressor
- implications for dealing with aggression, eg reduction in situational factors that contribute to de-individuation in order to promote personal responsibility and reduce aggressive behaviour
- comparison with alternative explanations.

Credit other relevant material.

[6]

Q4.**[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]**

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of the frustration-aggression hypothesis as an explanation for human aggression is accurate with some detail. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Knowledge of the frustration-aggression hypothesis as an explanation for human aggression is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Limited knowledge of the frustration-aggression hypothesis as an explanation for human aggression is present. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Knowledge of the frustration-aggression hypothesis as an explanation for human aggression is very limited. Discussion 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.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- Dollard and Millar (1939) stated frustration always results in aggression and aggression is always caused by frustration
- frustration equals blocking of any goal-directed action
- this leads to tension that can only be relieved by an aggressive act – aggression is cathartic
- focus of aggression is not always the cause of frustration – aggression can be displaced
- likelihood of aggression depends on proximity to goal and the chance aggression will enable the goal to be achieved
- aggression becomes the dominant/most likely response if it has been rewarded in the past
- original theory modified to include role of social/environmental cues, eg weapon effect (Berkowitz, 1989).

Possible discussion points

- use of evidence to support/contradict the FA hypothesis
- Berkowitz's arguments that aggression results from other factors too, eg negative mood/feelings
- aggression may not be cathartic – might stimulate more intense emotion

- differing effects depending on type of frustration – justified or unjustified – less aggression with justified frustration
- cannot explain aggressive acts that are cold and calculated
- discussion in the context of both psychodynamic theory (aggressive drives/catharsis) and learning theory (effects of past aggressive behaviour).

Credit other relevant material.

[8]