6.7 Plasticity and Functional Recovery of the Brain: 30-minute Pack

AQA 7182 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 Outline synaptic pruning and explain its importance for efficient brain functioning across the lifespan.

(Total for Question 1 is 4 marks)

2 Explain neural unmasking as a mechanism of functional recovery after localised brain damage and state why it can restore function.

(Total for Question 2 is 3 marks)

3 Explain axonal sprouting and one limitation for full recovery.

(Total for Question 3 is 3 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

4 Outline recruitment of homologous contralateral areas and one reason it might be limited.

(Total for Question 4 is 3 marks)

5 Apply recovery mechanisms to explain two ways Kwame might regain speech and why improvement could be partial.

(Total for Question 5 is 6 marks)

6 Discuss research into plasticity and recovery, using Maguire et al. as an example.

(Total for Question 6 is 8 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 6.7 Plasticity and Functional Recovery of the Brain: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

outlines synaptic pruning as the elimination of weaker or unused synaptic connections while stronger, frequently used connections are preserved oe	**M1**
explains that pruning increases processing efficiency by removing redundant connections oe	**A1**
states that pruning occurs particularly in childhood and adolescence but continues to some extent in adulthood oe	**M1**
explains why this matters: it refines neural networks, improving cognitive skills and allowing plastic adaptation to the environment oe	**A1**

Answer: Synaptic pruning removes weaker or unused synapses while preserving stronger ones; this increases processing efficiency and refines neural networks. Pruning is prominent in childhood and adolescence but continues into adulthood, helping optimise cognition and adaptation.

Question 2

explains neural unmasking as the activation of previously silent or less used synaptic connections when dominant pathways are damaged oe	**M1**
states that these dormant connections can become functionally effective after damage, increasing throughput in remaining networks oe	**A1**
gives reason this can restore function, e.g. by providing alternate routes for neural signals so lost functions can be partially recovered oe	**A1**

Answer: Neural unmasking is when previously silent or weak synaptic connections become active after dominant pathways are damaged; these dormant connections increase their efficacy and provide alternative routes for signals, allowing partial restoration of lost functions.

Question 3

explains axonal sprouting as the growth of new nerve endings from surviving neurons to re-establish synaptic connections after damage oe	**M1**
states that new connections can form networks that compensate for lost input, helping recovery of function oe	**A1**
identifies a limitation, e.g. new connections may be imprecise or maladaptive and may not fully replicate the original specialised circuitry oe	**A1**

Answer: Axonal sprouting is growth of new nerve endings from surviving neurons to form new synapses and reconnect networks; while this can help recovery by restoring pathways, the new connections may be imprecise or maladaptive and so may not fully restore specialised original function.

Question 4

outlines recruitment of homologous areas as the contralateral, corresponding brain region taking over some functions of the damaged area oe	**M1**
explains this can preserve or recover abilities if those contralateral areas can perform similar computations oe	**A1**
identifies a limitation, e.g. if the contralateral area is already specialised or overloaded, it may be unable to fully compensate oe	**A1**

Answer: Recruitment of homologous contralateral areas is when the matching region in the opposite hemisphere takes on some functions of the damaged area; this can aid recovery, but if the contralateral area is already specialised for other tasks or cannot match the original processing, compensation may be limited.

Question 5

identifies a plausible mechanism, e.g. recruitment of homologous areas in the right hemisphere oe	**M1**
explains how recruitment could support speech recovery by allowing right-hemisphere language homologues to assume some production tasks oe	**A1**
explains why this might be partial, e.g. right-hemisphere areas may be less specialised for fine-grained language production, limiting full restoration oe	**A1**
identifies a second mechanism, e.g. axonal sprouting or neural unmasking in perilesional left-hemisphere tissue oe	**M1**
explains how new connections or revealed dormant pathways could restore some language networks near the damaged area oe	**A1**
explains why recovery could be incomplete, e.g. new connections may be imprecise or insufficient to fully recreate the original specialised circuitry, and age-related limits reduce plasticity oe	**A1**

Answer: One mechanism is recruitment of homologous right-hemisphere language areas which can take over some speech functions, but improvement may be partial because those areas are less specialised for fine-grained language production. Another mechanism is axonal sprouting or neural unmasking in perilesional tissue of the left hemisphere, which can reconnect local circuits; recovery may be incomplete because new connections can be imprecise and older brains have reduced plasticity.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Question 6

Level 4 Knowledge of research into plasticity and recovery is accurate and well detailed. Evaluation is thorough and well focused, showing clear understanding of methodological strengths and limitations, and implications for real-world application. Maguire et al. is used appropriately as illustrative evidence, and discussion considers issues such as correlational design, generalisability and practical relevance. The answer is coherent and uses relevant terminology.	**7-8**
Level 3 Knowledge of research is generally accurate with some detail. Evaluation is present and relevant but may be less developed or less balanced. Maguire et al. is used as an example, with some comment on correlational limitations and implications. The answer is mostly clear and organised.	**5-6**
Level 2 Limited knowledge of research and mechanisms is present. Evaluation is superficial or one-sided. Reference to Maguire et al. may be brief and the issue of causality or generalisability may be mentioned but not developed. The answer may be descriptive rather than evaluative.	**3-4**
Level 1 Very limited knowledge or evaluation. Points are simplistic, fragmented or largely incorrect. Little or no effective use of Maguire et al. as evidence.	**1-2**
Level 0 No creditable content.	**0**

Indicative content:

- AO1: Key research includes studies showing experience-dependent changes, such as Maguire et al. finding larger posterior hippocampal volume in London taxi drivers related to spatial navigation experience.
- AO1: Mechanisms of plasticity and recovery include long-term potentiation, synaptic pruning, neural unmasking, axonal sprouting, denervation supersensitivity and recruitment of homologous contralateral areas.
- AO3: Strengths of research include clear, measurable structural differences linked to experience, and converging evidence from animal studies and human longitudinal rehabilitation studies supporting mechanisms such as sprouting and unmasking.
- AO3: Limitations include that Maguire's cross-sectional correlational design cannot prove causation; increased hippocampal volume may be a cause or consequence, or related to a third variable such as spatial skill preselection.
- AO3: Sample and generalisability issues, for example Maguire's sample of taxi drivers may not generalise to other populations or to recovery after injury; stroke and trauma involve different processes than experience-dependent growth.
- AO3: Methodological issues such as potential confounds, the need for longitudinal designs, individual differences in cognitive reserve and age affecting plasticity, and ethical constraints on experimental manipulation in humans.
- AO3: Applications and implications include targeted rehabilitation techniques that harness plasticity, such as speech therapy encouraging perilesional reorganisation, but real-world effectiveness varies and benefits may be partial.
- AO3: Conclude that the body of research gives strong evidence that plasticity and recovery mechanisms exist and can be harnessed clinically, but caution is needed over causal claims, generalisation and expectations about complete restoration.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk