

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO2 = 2]

Award **1 mark** for **each** relevant suggestion (up to a maximum of 2 marks).

To be creditworthy, the example must be a revelation of some specific aspect of personal information, eg age, background, interests, hobbies, attitudes and must convey the idea of ‘telling/saying/informing...’

The suggestion may either be verbatim, eg ‘I am 20 years old’, ‘I like to go shopping at the weekend’, or may be a description of the disclosure, eg ‘telling people your age’, ‘telling people what you like to do at the weekend.’

[2]

Q2.

[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of the matching hypothesis 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 matching hypothesis 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	Knowledge of the matching hypothesis is present. Focus is mainly on description. 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 matching hypothesis 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:

- Walster (1966) proposed people choose romantic partners of similar attractiveness to themselves
- focus is on matching physical attractiveness
- individuals focus attention on prospective partners of perceived similar level of physical attractiveness – effectively narrowing the range to the attainable

- pragmatic balance between desire for the ideal most attractive partner and a realistic awareness of our own level of attractiveness to avoid rejection.

Possible discussion:

- evidence to support/contradict the matching hypothesis: Walster and Walster (1966) – randomly matched dance partners favoured physically attractive partners regardless of their own level of physical attractiveness, contradicting the theory; Murstein (1972) – members of real couples are each separately assessed for attractiveness rating, these are found to correlate for level of attractiveness – but not so for fictitious pairings; Taylor (2011) showed that in online dating people choose prospective partners who are much more attractive than themselves BUT those relationships that continue involve partners of similar attractiveness; matching hypothesis seems to hold true for pairs of friends, but more so for male pairs than for female pairs (Feingold 1988)
- validity of evidence – some studies use real life dating sites so it is likely that the findings have validity
- most studies only look at physical attractiveness but other aspects of similarity may be important, eg personality, background etc.

Credit other relevant material.

[8]

Q3.

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for clear and coherent knowledge with some detail.

1 mark for limited/muddled knowledge.

Possible content:

- revealing personal information about the self to another person
- information can be superficial, low-risk/breadth of disclosure, eg work or more intimate, high-risk/depth of disclosure, eg wishes, fears, attitudes and aspirations
- has the general effect of increasing attractiveness and closeness; encourages reciprocal disclosure.

Credit alternative valid material.

[2]

Q4.**[AO3 = 6]**

For both the strength and the limitation, award marks as follows:

3 marks for a clear, coherent and detailed outline.

2 marks for an outline which lacks some detail.

1 mark for a very limited/muddled outline.

Possible strengths:

- consistent with social penetration theory which suggests that for a relationship to develop partners must keep disclosing further personal information
- use of evidence to support the role of self-disclosure as an explanation, eg correlations between levels of self-disclosure and satisfaction with the relationship
- compatibility with filter theory; self-disclosure enables assessment of similarity of attitudes and complementarity of needs
- supported by evidence which shows that too much, too early can be off-putting to potential partner – acceptability depends on stage of relationship and appropriateness of the content.

Possible limitations:

- contrast with the relative importance of other factors, eg physical attractiveness/equity/social exchange
- cultural limitations; self-disclosure may be less appropriate for romantic relationships in cultures where partners are not allowed free choice; research is often culture specific
- difficult to determine cause and effect, ie whether self-disclosure leads to a stronger relationship or whether having a stronger relationship leads to greater self-disclosure.

Credit other relevant strengths and limitations, including those specific to virtual relationships.

[6]

Q5.**[AO2 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Knowledge of self-disclosure in virtual relationships is applied appropriately with some detail. The answer shows sound understanding and appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	There is limited/muddled knowledge and application of the role of self-disclosure in virtual relationships. The answer shows limited understanding. Use of specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible application:

- friend A's advice is in line with the hyper personal model of online relationships (Walther, 2011), suggesting greater/more rapid self-disclosure than in face-to-face relationships
- greater self-disclosure, as recommended by friend A, is said to lead to virtual relationships developing more quickly, being more intense
- friend A's advice seems to reflect the stranger-on-a-train effect (Bargh 2002)
- friend B warns against disinhibition which can occur in virtual relationships because of the anonymity/deindividuation
- disinhibition might lead to critical/aggressive/unkind comment about Anji's personal disclosures.

Credit other relevant material.

[4]

Q6.**[AO1 = 3 AO2 = 2 AO3 = 3]**

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of filter theory is accurate with some detail. Application is effective. Discussion is 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 filter theory 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	3-4	Limited knowledge of filter theory is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any application/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 filter theory is very limited. Application/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:

- Kerckhoff and Davis (1962) proposed we use filtering to reduce the field of available to a field of desirables
- when we meet people we engage in three levels of filtering: social demography, similarity in attitude, complementarity:
 - social demography – at the outset we screen out people who are different in terms of age, sex, education etc
 - then we choose people who have similar attitudes to our own
 - in the longer-term, we choose people who complement our own traits.

Possible application:

- social background is an aspect of social demography – the first level of filtering
- according to the filter theory view of social demography, we are more attracted to people from similar backgrounds
- the female participants will give higher ratings for liking to the similar descriptions than the different descriptions.

Possible discussion points:

- use of evidence to support/contradict filter theory, eg Taylor (2010) – people tend to marry someone from their own ethnic group; Kerckhoff and

David (1962) – attitude similarity is an important factor in staying together;
Gruber-Baldini (1995) – found similarities between spouses

- filter theory is consistent with the matching hypothesis
- cannot establish causality – maybe similarity of partners increases over time
- temporal validity – modern society is highly mobile and diverse; technology reduces/eliminates physical constraints to the establishment of relationships, eg with internet relationships.

Credit other relevant material.

[8]