

Mark schemes

Q1.**[AO1 = 1]****C** A theory that proposes individuals focus on getting out more than they put in.**[1]****Q2.****[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]**

Level	Marks	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of Duck's model 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 Duck's model 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 Duck's model 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 Duck's model 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:

- Duck (1982) described how relationship breakdown occurs in a sequence of four stages/phases
- intra-psychic stage – one partner is dissatisfied, keeps it to self, ruminates
- dyadic stage – problem is raised openly and discussed between partners
- social stage – friends/family are told, time of negotiation, settling of arrangements
- grave dressing stage – post-relationship rationalisation of events and re-building.

Full marks can be achieved by adopted a breadth or depth approach to the number of stages covered in the answer.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the stages
- recognises that breakdown is a process rather than a single event
- takes account of the social context in which the breakdown of relationships occurs
- grave dressing enables a positive view – a time of reflection for learning and changing
- inadequacy of the original model – Duck added a 5th stage ‘resurrection’ as a time to look towards future relationships
- useful for counsellors, eg could use cognitive therapy to focus on private thoughts in the intra-psychic stage or suggest focus on practicalities in the social stage
- does not account for the initial dissatisfaction so describes rather than explains
- although Duck proposed a sequence, stages do not always occur in the same order and we can revert to previous stages dependent on communication between partners
- model is largely built on retrospective, self-report evidence
- model is founded on western cultural ideals so has limited application in other cultures.

Credit other relevant material.

Q3.**[AO2 = 8]**

Level	Marks	Description
4	7-8	Application of knowledge of theories of romantic relationships is detailed and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Application of knowledge of theories of romantic relationships is evident and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Application of knowledge of theories of romantic relationships is present but of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Application of knowledge of theories of romantic relationships 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. Answers without explicit application – Max 2 marks
	0	No relevant content.

Possible application:

- social exchange theory – Chris refers to costs and rewards of the relationship – for him the benefits outweigh the costs (good deal). Chris considers the comparison level – compares his situation with other relationships
- equity theory – Sam says, it balances out. If there is ‘balance’, then neither party under-benefits or over-benefits as the theory suggests relationships are better if there is a balance between cost and reward with emphasis on fairness
- Rusbult’s investment theory – Sam notes how they have both invested time and effort in the relationship (intrinsic investment), and how they have such a nice home together (extrinsic investment)
- Sam refers to the alternatives – how it would be with another partner – social exchange and investment theory both look at comparison with alternatives.

Credit other relevant material.

Q4.**[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Description of Duck's model is clear, accurate and detailed, showing sound understanding. The answer is coherent with appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Description of Duck's model is limited/muddled. Detail is lacking, there is some misunderstanding or lack of clarity. Use of specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- a model that describes the four phases of relationship breakdown
- intra-psychic phase – a partner thinks about his/her dissatisfaction with the relationship but this is not disclosed to others/partner
- dyadic phase – both partners are aware of the problem – there is confrontation, discussion
- social phase – partners disclose their problems to others – friends, family become aware of the breakdown of the relationship
- grave dressing phase – each partner comes to terms with the breakdown and rationalises it by constructing a narrative of events.

[4]

Q5.**[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]**

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Outline of Rusbult's model is accurate with some detail. Explanation of strength(s) 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	Outline of Rusbult's model is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Explanation of strength(s) is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Limited outline of Rusbult's model is present. Any explanation of strength(s) is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Outline of Rusbult's model is very limited. Explanation 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:

- Rusbult developed/extended SET by proposing investment model
- Rusbult saw commitment is key factor in sustaining a relationship – commitment depends on satisfaction, comparison with alternatives and investment
- satisfaction is determined by available alternatives – better alternatives equal less satisfaction
- investment acts as a deterrent to leaving a relationship – intrinsic investment – resources put into the relationship directly, eg emotion, effort etc – extrinsic investment – resources arising out of the relationship, eg children, mutual friends, possessions bought together.

Possible strengths:

- use of evidence to support Rusbult's model, eg Rhatigan and Axsom (2006) – women who had made less investment were less satisfied; Le and Agnew (2003) – showed the importance of satisfaction, alternative and investment in commitment; Rusbult (1998) – support for the model in homosexual couples
- Rusbult's model explains why people stay in relationships that appear to offer few rewards
- Rusbult's model is an improvement in relation to other theories, eg social exchange, equity.

Credit other relevant material.