



PSYCHOLOGY

9773/01

Paper 1 Key Studies and Theories

May/June 2018

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Section A

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|-----------------|---|--------------|
| 1 | <p>From the key study by Baron-Cohen et al. on autism, explain why the revised version of the eyes test gave participants four choices rather than two.</p> <p>A choice of two options leads to a high possibility of guessing the right answer. Similarly, if the two options are very different then the answer is more obvious. Increasing the number of choices to four reduces the possibility that participants were simply guessing the right answers.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear answer 2 marks – clear explanation of why the revised eyes test contained four choices rather than two.</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|-----------------|--|--------------|
| 2 | <p>From the key study by Samuel and Bryant on cognitive development, describe how the children's conservation skills were tested.</p> <p>The children's conservation skills were tested using three different materials: mass, number and volume. Candidates may give details of one of more of the specific procedures here or may outline the study. Details of conditions (one question, etc.) are testing effects of questioning on conservation.</p> <p>1–2 marks – brief outline of the way that conservation skills were tested. 3–4 marks – detailed outline of the way that conservation skills were tested. For 4 marks, some indication of the way that the DV was measured is required.</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|-----------------|---|--------------|
| 3 | <p>Suggest how the location of Milgram's study may have contributed to the level of obedience found.</p> <p>The location of Milgram's study was Yale University. It would also be acceptable for candidates to state that the location was a laboratory/ scientific environment or that the location was America. Answers should explain how the status/authority assumed in the location may have been one of the factors that increased obedience.</p> <p>1 mark – identification of location only / attempt at suggestion 2 marks – clear suggestion of how the location of the study may have contributed to the level of obedience.</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 4 | <p>Outline <u>one</u> ethical issue raised by the further research into bystander behaviour conducted by Fischer et al.</p> <p>The most likely answers are deception (belief that the interaction was real rather than staged), lack of informed consent, and potential distress (through viewing the final interaction). Any other appropriate answer may be credited.</p> <p>No marks to be awarded for simply identifying an ethical issue (for example, simply stating consent and giving no more information).</p> <p>1 mark – brief, unclear or generic answer 2 marks – clear answer which outlines one issue <i>in the context of</i> the further research by Fischer</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 5 | <p>Suggest <u>two</u> problems with the sample of the key study into learning aggression by Bandura et al.</p> <p>Answers relating to both the sample and the sample selection are acceptable. Likely answers include the restricted location that the sample was drawn from, the small number of children in each condition and the fact that children are not able to give consent. Any other appropriate answer may also be credited.</p> <p>1 mark for each problem in the context of the study</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 6 | <p>Outline the aim of the further research into romantic love as attachment conducted by Bartholomew and Horowitz.</p> <p>The study proposes (and investigates) a fourth type of attachment (dismissive-avoidant) that may have implications for therapeutic intervention. Also accept specific hypotheses as stated in the abstract.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear answer 2 marks – clearly stated aim of the further research</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 7 | <p>From the key study by Freud on psychosexual development, identify and describe the psychosexual stage of development that Little Hans is in.</p> <p>Little Hans is described as being in the phallic stage of development which lasts from approximately 3–6 years. During the phallic stage, the primary focus of the libido is on the genitals. At this age, children also begin to discover the differences between males and females.</p> <p>Freud also believed that boys begin to view their fathers as a rival for the mother’s affections. The Oedipus complex describes these feelings of wanting to possess the mother and the desire to replace the father. However, the child also fears that he will be punished by the father for these feelings, a fear Freud termed <i>castration anxiety</i>. (In contrast, girls experience the Electra complex). These complexes are resolved when the child identifies with the same sex parent.</p> <p>1 mark – identification of stage only 2 marks – identification of stage with 1 additional piece of information. Maximum of 2 marks for description of Oedipus complex with no identification of stage. 3 marks – identification of stage with 2 additional pieces of information. Maximum of 3 marks for description of phallic stage with no identification of name of stage. 4 marks – identification of stage with 3 additional pieces of information</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 8(a) | <p>From the key study by Rosenhan on diagnosing abnormality:</p> <p>Describe how the hospital staff responded to questions from the pseudopatients.</p> <p>Candidates can either provide numerical data here such as ‘they were ignored 80% of the time’ or they can provide a description such as ‘doctors did not respond to the questions asked by the pseudopatients’. For example (pseudopatient) ‘Pardon me, Dr. X. Could you tell me when I am eligible for grounds privileges?’ (physician) ‘Good morning, Dave. How are you today? (Moves off without waiting for a response.)</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear answer 2 marks – clear answer including at least one example of the way in which hospital staff responded to questions</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 8(b) | <p>Suggest <u>one</u> reason for these responses.</p> <p>The reasons could include the fact that they had been labelled as 'schizophrenic' and hence all their behaviour was interpreted as part of their illness. Candidates may also describe this in terms of 'dehumanising', 'controlling' or 'fear'. Any other appropriate suggestion may be credited.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear suggestion 2 marks – clear suggestion such as the one above</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 9 | <p>Suggest <u>two</u> problems with the way that the key study into gambling by Parke and Griffiths was conducted.</p> <p>Answers may relate to any aspect of the study, for example problems associated with observation, problems with the way that gamblers were questioned, the fact that the participants knew they were being observed, sample size etc. Any appropriate answers may be credited.</p> <p>For each problem 1 mark – brief or unclear answer 2 marks – clear outline of a problem in the context of the key study $2 \times 2 = 4$</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 10 | <p>Outline <u>one</u> suggestion for the treatment of patients with body dysmorphic disorder (BDD) made in the key study by Veale and Riley.</p> <p>Veale and Riley give a number of suggestions in their article. These include helping patients to interact with a mirror in a healthier manner (for example setting time limits or avoiding magnifying mirrors), identifying and questioning the usefulness of beliefs prior to mirror gazing, conducting cost-benefit analyses and the idea of a 'response cost' where the patient nominates their most hated organisation and agrees to pay a sum of money to this organisation for each check in the mirror (although they note that this requires a very compliant patient). Do not credit 'drugs'.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear answer. Award 1 mark for brief mention of CBT 2 marks – clear outline of one suggestion made by Veale and Riley.</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 11 | <p>Outline <u>one</u> conclusion that can be drawn from the further research into biological attraction by Perrett et al.</p> <p>From the abstract of the study,</p> <p><i>As predicted, subjects preferred feminized to average shapes of a female face. This preference applied across UK and Japanese populations but was stronger for within-population judgements, which indicates that attractiveness cues are learned. Subjects preferred feminized to average or masculinized shapes of a male face. Enhancing masculine facial characteristics increased both perceived dominance and negative attributions (for example, coldness or dishonesty) relevant to relationships and paternal investment. These results indicate a selection pressure that limits sexual dimorphism and encourages neoteny in humans.</i></p> <p>Likely answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjects preferred feminised to average shapes of female faces • Subjects preferred feminised to average or masculinised shapes of male faces • Strong within population effects suggest that attractiveness cues are learned • Enhancing masculine facial characteristics increased perceived dominance / increased negative attributions. <p>1 mark – brief or unclear conclusion (such as simply stating that subjects preferred feminised faces) 2 marks – clear conclusion from the further research by Perrett et al.</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 12 | <p>From the key study by Wang et al. on stress, explain why two of the participants had to be excluded from the research.</p> <p>Two of the 25 subjects participating in the stress experiment were excluded because of incomplete behavioural data and abnormally high baseline salivary cortisol levels.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear answer 2 marks – clear answer giving at least one of the reasons stated above.</p> | |

Section B

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|---|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 13(a) | <p>Describe research into prison simulation.</p> <p>From syllabus: Overview: Zimbardo's controversial prison experiment (1973) illustrates the power of social situations that make people act in uncharacteristic ways. The issue of social roles and deindividuation should be discussed in relation to the study. The BBC prison experiment has been selected as a more up-to-date replication of Zimbardo's experiment with findings that challenge the notion that people are simply controlled by social roles. Background theory: The dispositional hypothesis, social roles and social identity theory. Key study: Haney, C, Banks, C and Zimbardo, P (1973) A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison. Further research: Reicher, S and Haslam, S A (2006) Rethinking the Psychology of Tyranny: The BBC Prison Study</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="312 853 1321 1742"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 853 1150 1171"> Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 853 1321 1171">8–10 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1171 1150 1458"> Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1171 1321 1458">6–7 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1458 1150 1742"> Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1458 1321 1742">4–5 marks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good. | 8–10 marks | Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 6–7 marks | Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 4–5 marks | 10 |
| Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good. | 8–10 marks | | | | | | | |
| Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 6–7 marks | | | | | | | |
| Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 4–5 marks | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------|--|-----------|---|-----------|----|
| 13(a) | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 253 1150 533"> Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 253 1321 533">1–3 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 533 1150 589">No answer or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1150 533 1321 589">0 marks</td> </tr> </table> | Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. | 1–3 marks | No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | | | |
| Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. | 1–3 marks | | | | | | | |
| No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | | | | | | | |
| 13(b) | <p data-bbox="316 629 1321 685">Evaluate research into prison simulation.</p> <p data-bbox="316 696 1321 819">Candidates may use a variety of evaluation issues in their response (most likely will be issues relating to experimental design, ethics, the reliability and validity of conclusions, sampling, ecological validity, usefulness and applications).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 864 1150 1279"> Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 864 1321 1279">10–12 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1279 1150 1671"> Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1279 1321 1671">8–9 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1671 1150 2022"> Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1671 1321 2022">6–7 marks</td> </tr> </table> | Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough. | 10–12 marks | Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good. | 8–9 marks | Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited. | 6–7 marks | 12 |
| Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough. | 10–12 marks | | | | | | | |
| Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good. | 8–9 marks | | | | | | | |
| Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited. | 6–7 marks | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|-------|
| 13(b) | <p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues / debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p> | 4–5 marks | |
| | <p>Discussion is basic. Some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Points are not always organised into issues / debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Some or no use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is discernible or not present. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is rare or not present. Evaluation has meagre detail and understanding may not be evident.</p> | 1–3 marks | |
| | No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------|--|-----------|--|-----------|---------------------------------|---------|----------|
| 13(c) | <p>Explain how you would conduct a study which would extend our understanding of prison simulation.</p> <p>The alternative could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the syllabus or it could be based on that and/or any research from the ‘explore more’ section or it could be based on any relevant research surrounding this area that the candidate has explored. It could even be suggestions that the candidates themselves make based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="312 584 1318 1223"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 584 1150 768">Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive</td> <td data-bbox="1150 584 1318 768">5–6 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 768 1150 952">Suggestion is appropriate, Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good</td> <td data-bbox="1150 768 1318 952">3–4 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 952 1150 1171">Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic</td> <td data-bbox="1150 952 1318 1171">1–2 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1171 1150 1223">No answer or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1150 1171 1318 1223">0 marks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive | 5–6 marks | Suggestion is appropriate, Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good | 3–4 marks | Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic | 1–2 marks | No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | 6 |
| Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive | 5–6 marks | | | | | | | | | |
| Suggestion is appropriate, Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good | 3–4 marks | | | | | | | | | |
| Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic | 1–2 marks | | | | | | | | | |
| No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|---|-----------|---|-----------|---|-----------|---------------------------------|---------|----|
| 14(a) | <p>Describe research into eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>From specification: Overview: The key study by Loftus and Palmer (1974) has been selected to investigate the effect of leading questions on eyewitness recollection of an event. This study further supports Bartlett's view of memory as reconstructive and has evident implications for the legal system. The study by Wells and Bradfield (1998) illustrates one of these implications, that of misidentification in identity parades.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="312 551 1318 1776"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 551 1150 869"> Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 551 1318 869">8–10 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 869 1150 1155"> Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 869 1318 1155">6–7 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1155 1150 1442"> Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1155 1318 1442">4–5 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1442 1150 1729"> Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1442 1318 1729">1–3 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1729 1150 1776">No answer or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1150 1729 1318 1776">0 marks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good. | 8–10 marks | Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 6–7 marks | Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 4–5 marks | Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. | 1–3 marks | No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | 10 |
| Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good. | 8–10 marks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 6–7 marks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | 4–5 marks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. | 1–3 marks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------|--|-----------|---|-----------|--|-----------|----|
| 14(b) | <p>Evaluate research into eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>Candidates may use a variety of evaluation issues in their response (most likely will be issues relating to experimental design, ethics, the reliability and validity of conclusions, usefulness and applications).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="312 450 1318 2029"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 450 1150 869"> <p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1150 450 1318 869">10–12 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 869 1150 1256"> <p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1150 869 1318 1256">8–9 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1256 1150 1608"> <p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1256 1318 1608">6–7 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 1608 1150 2029"> <p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1150 1608 1318 2029">4–5 marks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> | 10–12 marks | <p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> | 8–9 marks | <p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> | 6–7 marks | <p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p> | 4–5 marks | 12 |
| <p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> | 10–12 marks | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> | 8–9 marks | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> | 6–7 marks | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p> | 4–5 marks | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|----------|
| 14(b) | <p>Discussion is basic. Some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Points are not always organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Some or no use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is discernible or not present. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is rare or not present. Evaluation has meagre detail and understanding may not be evident.</p> | 1–3 marks | |
| | No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | |
| 14(c) | <p>Explain how you would conduct a study which would extend our understanding of eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>The alternative could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the syllabus or it could be based on that and/or any research from the ‘explore more’ section or it could be based on any relevant research surrounding this area that the candidate has explored. It could even be suggestions that the candidates themselves make based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.</p> | | 6 |
| | <p>Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive</p> | 5–6 marks | |
| | <p>Suggestion is appropriate, Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good</p> | 3–4 marks | |
| | <p>Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic</p> | 1–2 marks | |
| | No answer or irrelevant answer. | 0 marks | |