



Cambridge Pre-U

PSYCHOLOGY

9773/01

Paper 1 Key Studies and Theories

For examination from 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Specimen

This specimen paper has been updated for assessments from 2020. The specimen questions and mark schemes remain the same. The layout and wording of the front covers have been updated to reflect the new Cambridge International branding and to make instructions clearer for candidates.

The specimen paper is for general illustrative purposes. Please see the syllabus for the relevant year of the examination for details of the current topics and studies.

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

This document has **16** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

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 Baron-Cohen et al. study on autism, why were participants given the choice of four responses rather than the original two?</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>The first version of this test published in 1997 had problems and the 2001 paper addresses these issues of which there are eight. The first problem involved a forced choice between the only two response items presented, so chance is 50-50. This is too narrow and may reveal autism for someone who guesses.</p> <p>1 mark partial e.g. 'two is forced choice', 2 marks elaboration e.g. correct answer with more detail.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Summarise the main findings from the study by McGarrigle and Donaldson on 'naughty teddy' and suggest how this could be applied to the study by Samuel and Bryant.</p> <p>AO1 = 4</p> <p>The test involves an adult moving the counters. McGarrigle extended the work by Samuel and Bryant (and Piaget) on the conservation of number and suggested that the moving of the counters by an adult might influence the child. So, they introduced 'naughty teddy' to be 'naughty' and move the counters. When this was done, the 4–6 year old children made the correct judgement on 70% of trials.</p> <p>Application speculative but could be in the form of: 1. child or naughty teddy doing volume or mass experiments; 2. using other children rather than experimenters to ask questions or 3. making the volume or mass experiments more child friendly.</p> <p>Up to 2 marks for increasing detail and accuracy of summary of study. Up to 2 marks for increasing detail and accuracy of application of study.</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Explain the agentic theory of obedience to authority suggested by Milgram.</p> <p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>The 'agentic' theory is that the experimenter is a legitimate authority and the participant is an 'agent' of that authority. They are only following orders.</p> <p>1 mark for identification/partial explanation and 2 marks for elaboration.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>For Haney, Banks and Zimbardo how does the ‘dispositional hypothesis’ differ from the ‘situational hypothesis’?</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>The dispositional (within people) hypothesis, in relation to this study, is: ‘the deplorable condition of our penal system (and its dehumanising effects upon prisoners and guards) is due to the nature of the people who administrate it or the nature of the people who populate it, or both. Guards are sadistic, uneducated and insensitive’. A situational hypothesis is that it is the prison itself that turns good people bad.</p> <p>1 mark partial description of both hypotheses, 2 marks for explanation of how hypotheses differ.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Suggest two ways in which Bandura, Ross and Ross in their study on aggression controlled situational variables.</p> <p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BRR used a controlled laboratory environment; • BRR used a one-way mirror, so same room each time; • BRR had the same toys in the same positions for all participants. <p>1 mark for each appropriate control.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Why is it difficult to assess the validity of the case study method used by Freud on little Hans?</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Difficult because many types of validity cannot be applied here. Usually assess validity by comparison with existing measures; by tightly controlling variables; by applying more scientific techniques. Alternative answer may be that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a case study may have only one participant (or very few) so cannot generalise to others, so may not be valid; • the participant may be unique, possibly not ‘normal’. Researchers may not know how to proceed; may draw false conclusions. Each factor reduces validity; • researchers may become emotionally attached if only one participant studied over time and so again reduces the validity. <p>Each factor up to 2 marks for description and up to 2 marks for referral to case study by Freud.</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p>Rosenhan suggests that failure to detect sanity may be due to a type two error. What is a type two error and why did it apply in this study?</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>A type two error is when a healthy person is labelled as being sick and in this study, given the ambiguous presentation of symptoms, it was the safe and correct option for the psychiatrists to make. A type 1 error would be to call a sick person healthy and in this study this would be the unsafe option.</p> <p>1 mark for type 2 error explanation and 1 mark for application to this study.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p>Outline Zillman's excitation transfer theory and give an example of how it may apply to slot machine gamblers.</p> <p>AO1 = 4</p> <p>Zillman's theory postulates that arousal in one situation can persist and intensify emotional reactions occurring in later situations. When this occurs, the individual fails to recognise that the level of anger experienced is caused by residual arousal from the previous situation. 1 mark for partial explanation and 2 marks for full and accurate outline.</p> <p>Applications to slot machine gamblers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> gamblers inflicting domestic violence on their spouses (e.g. Lorenz and Shuttlesworth, 1983) Muelleman, DenOtter, Wadman, Tran, and Anderson (2002) found that intimate partner violence (IPV) was predicted by pathological gambling in the perpetrator. After adjusting for age, education and ethnicity, logistic regression showed that a woman whose partner was a problem gambler was 10.5 times more likely to be a victim of IPV National Coalition Against Legalised Gambling (2003) reported that with the opening of casinos in South Dakota that year, child abuse and domestic assaults rose by 42% and 80% respectively. This was attributed to the increase in casino gambling. <p>Any appropriate application to receive credit by 1 mark for anecdotal application and 2 marks for appropriate psychological reference as in the three applications above.</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>People with body dysmorphic disorder often try do-it-yourself surgery. From the article by Veale give one example of do-it-yourself surgery.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>The Veale article outlines six examples of d-i-y surgery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The man who used a staple gun to tidy up loose skin; • The woman who filed her teeth to change the shape of her face; • The man who tried to fracture his jaw by running into the back of a lorry and changed his mind at the last moment and broke his skull instead; • The man who used sandpaper on his face to remove scars; • The man who exsanguinated himself by syringe and went to blood donor clinics to remove the redness from his skin; • The woman who could not afford liposuction so cut her thighs and tried to squeeze out the fat. <p>1 mark partial description, 2 marks elaboration.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	<p>In the study by Rhodes on facial symmetry, recall how participants rated levels of attractiveness in experiment 1.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>There were four versions of each face in experiment 1:</p> <p>Each subject rated the attractiveness (1_ <i>not at all attractive</i>, 10_ <i>very attractive</i>) and symmetry (1_ <i>not at all symmetric</i>, 10_ <i>perfectly symmetric</i>) of all four versions of all 48 faces (different versions in different booklets, as described above) and rated all four versions of all 24 opposite-sex faces for mate appeal (“How appealing is this person as a life partner?” 1_ <i>not at all appealing</i>, 10_ <i>very appealing</i>). Order of attractiveness and mate appeal ratings was counterbalanced with order of booklets. Symmetry ratings were always made last so that attention was not drawn to symmetry before the attractiveness and mate appeal ratings were made. Subjects were tested individually.</p> <p>1 mark for identification of 10 point rating scale; 2 marks elaboration e.g. three × 10 point rating scales with brief description of scale and measurement i.e. symmetry (1_ <i>not at all symmetric</i>, 10_ <i>perfectly symmetric</i>).</p>	2
10(b)	<p>How would you decide about the reliability of this type of measure?</p> <p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>Most likely: Test-retest reliability – test done twice with time period between. Whether participant ratings of photos are consistent also applicable. Split-half would not apply given the nature of the study. 1 mark partial, 2 marks elaboration.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>Contrast the BOLD technique with arterial spin labelling as used in the perfusion functional MRI study by Wang et al. on stress.</p> <p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>Perfusion functional MRI (fMRI) measures signal changes in the <u>brain</u> that are due to changing <u>neural</u> activity. One way to change activity is the BOLD technique, blood oxygenation level dependent imaging but in this study they employed arterial spin labelling or ASL. This technique directly measures cerebral blood flow (CBF) by using arterial blood water as an endogenous contrast agent.</p> <p>1 mark partial e.g. identification of terms, 2 marks correct contrast.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p>Dement and Kleitman looked at the relationship between eye movement and dreaming. What would you infer about the relationship between eye movement and dreaming from this study?</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>In order to infer candidates need to know specific detail of what was found in the study. For example P1: standing at bottom of cliff operating hoist and looking at climbers; P2: climbing ladders and looking up and down; P3: throwing basketballs at a net; P4: two people throwing tomatoes at each other; P5: driving a car then speeding car from left. These are examples and an example would be worth 1 mark. It is the relationship that is important i.e. direction of eye movement corresponds to dream (vertical = vertical etc.)</p> <p>1 mark partial i.e. dreams relate to eye movements with 2 marks for elaboration i.e. specific movements or correct example.</p>	2

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
13(a)	<p>EITHER</p> <p>Describe the relationship between theory and research on bystander behaviour.</p> <p>AO1 = 10</p> <p>Laboratory research by Latane and Darley (smoke-filled room experiment; a lady in distress, etc.) led to the theory of diffusion of responsibility and similar postulations. Piliavin et al. conducted the first field experiment which they explained with the cost-benefit analysis. The 'story' type answer is acceptable but should include:</p> <p><u>At least one theory:</u></p> <p>Diffusion of responsibility: This is the idea (Latane and Darley) that when one person is present they are 100% responsible and so are more likely to help. If there are two people they are 50% responsible and so are less likely to help.</p> <p>Pluralistic ignorance: (also Latane and Darley) where a person looks to others as a cue to action. If one person helps then others will follow. However, if one person looks to another and the other does nothing then no-one will help.</p> <p>Cost-benefit analysis: (Piliavin) before helping or not, people weigh up the costs and benefits of the situation.</p> <p><u>Answers should include research:</u> (most likely Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin, but also Latane and Darley) with details such as:</p> <p>Aim or objective, details of method including variables and controls, setting/ materials, participants and procedure. Results and conclusions.</p> <p><u>Explore more:</u></p> <p>Candidates could include additional theory such as the negative-state relief model, the empathy-altruism model or the empathic-joy hypothesis or any other relevant piece of research.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks		
13(a)	<p>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.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 237 1342 282">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 282 1342 618">8–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	8–10
	marks			
	8–10			
	<p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably 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.</p>	6–7		
	<p>Definition of terms is basic and 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.</p>	4–5		
<p>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.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks				
13(b)	<p>Discuss the effectiveness of Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin’s research.</p> <p>AO2 = 12</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Effectiveness can be assessed in relation to a number of aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which it applies to real-life situations (this study was based on a real-life event and was conducted in the field) • The extent to which it can be generalised to a wide range of participants. This study included male and female participants and ‘black’ and ‘white’ participants. It was limited in that it may have used the same participants over and over • The extent to which it applies to other countries (only conducted in one area of USA) • The extent to which it can be replicated (study was replicated many times by Piliavin’s students) • The extent to which it applies over a period of time (study was snapshot and may or may not apply over time) • The extent to which it can generalise to account for a wide range of variables (e.g. person in need was a victim. What if the person was being attacked?). <p>Any other appropriate aspect to receive credit.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1205 1326 1653"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 1205 1203 1256"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1205 1326 1256">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1256 1203 1653"> <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 summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1256 1326 1653" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<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 summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	10–12	12
	marks					
<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 summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	10–12					

Question	Answer	Marks
13(b)	<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>	<p style="text-align: center;">marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8–9</p>
	<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>	<p style="text-align: center;">6–7</p>
	<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>	<p style="text-align: center;">4–5</p>
	<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>	<p style="text-align: center;">1–3</p>
	<p>No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks										
13(c)	<p>What ideas can you add to our understanding of bystander behaviour? Support your answer with examples.</p> <p>The further research required in this question could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the specification 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> <p>AO2 = 6</p> <p>Details of the Fischer et al. further research study could be included which looks at helping (or not) in ‘dangerous’ emergencies.</p> <p>Details of any other appropriate research used by the candidate to be credited.</p> <p>Possible candidate suggestions could include: conducting research in other countries; collecting self reports of why or why not people helped/did not help. Using female victims (rather than male). Any appropriate suggestion is acceptable.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1066 1326 1771"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Suggestions are appropriate, show insight, elaboration and evidence of further reading. Further research suggested is relevant, description is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding of relationship of further research to bystander behaviour is impressive.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Suggestions are appropriate, with elaboration and possibly evidence of further reading. Further research suggested is relevant, mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding of relationship of further research to bystander behaviour is good.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Suggestions are appropriate. Further research suggested is peripherally relevant, has some accuracy, and has some detail. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is basic.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or inappropriate suggestion.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestions are appropriate , show insight, elaboration and evidence of further reading. Further research suggested is relevant, description is accurate, coherent and detailed . Understanding of relationship of further research to bystander behaviour is impressive .	5–6	Suggestions are appropriate , with elaboration and possibly evidence of further reading. Further research suggested is relevant, mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding of relationship of further research to bystander behaviour is good.	3–4	Suggestions are appropriate . Further research suggested is peripherally relevant, has some accuracy, and has some detail. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is basic.	1–2	No or inappropriate suggestion.	0	6
	marks											
Suggestions are appropriate , show insight, elaboration and evidence of further reading. Further research suggested is relevant, description is accurate, coherent and detailed . Understanding of relationship of further research to bystander behaviour is impressive .	5–6											
Suggestions are appropriate , with elaboration and possibly evidence of further reading. Further research suggested is relevant, mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding of relationship of further research to bystander behaviour is good.	3–4											
Suggestions are appropriate . Further research suggested is peripherally relevant, has some accuracy, and has some detail. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is basic.	1–2											
No or inappropriate suggestion.	0											

Question	Answer	Marks								
14(a)	<p>OR</p> <p>Describe theories of attachment including that by Hazan and Shaver.</p> <p>AO1 = 10</p> <p>Four (or more) theories apply here:</p> <p>Bowlby’s theory of maternal deprivation: how young infants become emotionally attached to their primary care-givers and become emotionally distressed when separated from them.</p> <p>Separation anxiety: protest, despair and detachment.</p> <p>Ainsworth’s theory of attachment styles: secure, anxious/ambivalent and avoidant.</p> <p>Shaver and Hazan’s love as attachment: with five components.</p> <p>Bartholemew and Henderson’s extension from Shaver involving four cells based on model of self and model of others.</p> <p>Fraley and Shaver’s adult romantic attachment could also be mentioned.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 891 1326 1861"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 891 1326 943">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 943 1206 1272"> 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="1206 943 1326 1272">8–10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1272 1206 1563"> Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1272 1326 1563">6–7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1563 1206 1861"> Definition of terms is basic and 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="1206 1563 1326 1861">4–5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	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	Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good . The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good .	6–7	Definition of terms is basic and 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	10
	marks									
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									
Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good . The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good .	6–7									
Definition of terms is basic and 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									

Question	Answer	Marks						
14(a)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> 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 style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		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	No 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							
No or irrelevant answer.	0							
14(b)	<p>Assess theories of attachment.</p> <p>AO2 = 12</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>To assess is to make judgements relating to the value or the quality of evidence. Most likely a consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • internal strengths and weaknesses; • theoretical issues such as reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism; • supporting/contradicting evidence; • comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory. • strengths and weaknesses of method (survey/questionnaire/self report), sample, controls, procedure; • evaluation of approach (developmental approach); comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches; • evaluation of issues and debates: ethics, nature of data i.e. subjective or objective, snapshot or longitudinal. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> Assessment (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (e.g. two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. 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 summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough. </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Assessment (positive and negative points) is comprehensive . Range (e.g. two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced . Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. 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 summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough .	10–12	12		
	marks							
Assessment (positive and negative points) is comprehensive . Range (e.g. two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced . Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. 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 summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough .	10–12							

Question	Answer	Marks		
14(b)	<p>Assessment (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. 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>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1203 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1203 293 1337 689">8–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	8–9
	marks			
	8–9			
	<p>Assessment (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points is sufficient and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Occasional use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is sufficient. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is sufficient.</p>	6–7		
	<p>Assessment (positive and negative points) 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		
<p>Assessment (positive and negative points) is basic. Some points are evident and may be only 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			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks										
14(c)	<p>Suggest how our understanding of romantic love as attachment could be extended, using examples from further research and your own ideas.</p> <p>The further research required in this question could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the specification 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 candidate themselves make based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.</p> <p>AO2 = 6</p> <p>Details of the Bartholemew et al. further research study could be included which looks at attachment styles in young adults.</p> <p>Details of any other appropriate research used by the candidate to be credited.</p> <p>Possible candidate suggestions could include: conducting research in other countries; collecting objective data; conducting a longitudinal study, using participants of different ages.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1032 1326 1704"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Suggestion is appropriate, shows insight, evidence of further reading and elaboration. Further research is relevant, description is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is impressive.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Suggestion is appropriate, with some evidence of further reading and elaboration. Further research is relevant, mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is good.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Suggestion is appropriate. Further research is peripherally relevant, has some accuracy, and has some detail. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is basic.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or inappropriate suggestion.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestion is appropriate, shows insight, evidence of further reading and elaboration . Further research is relevant, description is accurate, coherent and detailed . Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is impressive .	5–6	Suggestion is appropriate, with some evidence of further reading and elaboration. Further research is relevant, mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is good .	3–4	Suggestion is appropriate. Further research is peripherally relevant, has some accuracy, and has some detail. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is basic .	1–2	No or inappropriate suggestion.	0	6
	marks											
Suggestion is appropriate, shows insight, evidence of further reading and elaboration . Further research is relevant, description is accurate, coherent and detailed . Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is impressive .	5–6											
Suggestion is appropriate, with some evidence of further reading and elaboration. Further research is relevant, mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is good .	3–4											
Suggestion is appropriate. Further research is peripherally relevant, has some accuracy, and has some detail. Understanding of psychological terms and concepts is basic .	1–2											
No or inappropriate suggestion.	0											