



# Cambridge Pre-U

---

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**9773/02**

Paper 2 Methods, Issues and Applications

**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 **10** 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>What are the independent variable and dependent variable in this study?</b></p> <p>AO1 = 4</p> <p>The independent variable is the leading verb (or not) presented to participants one week before the test question is asked. There are three conditions: smashed, hit and a control condition with no leading verb.</p> <p>The dependent variable is the verbal response of participants which can be either 'Yes' or 'No'.</p> <p>2 marks for accurate description of IV and 2 marks for DV with elaboration. 1 mark for identification of IV and 1 mark for DV with no elaboration.</p>	<b>4</b>
1(b)	<p><b>Outline two conclusions that can be drawn from the table above and explain why the conclusions about eyewitness testimony may not be valid.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>Possible conclusions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More participants claimed they saw broken glass in the 'smashed condition' than either the 'hit' or 'control' conditions.</li> <li>• Variations of the above i.e. fewer participants in the 'control' condition. But reversal of same point is not acceptable.</li> <li>• Participants presented with a leading verb will be influenced by it whereas participants not presented with a leading verb are less likely to be influenced.</li> <li>• Participants who are not presented with leading verbs still have a tendency to be influenced if the question asked is a leading one.</li> <li>• Any appropriate conclusion to be accepted.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark for basic conclusion e.g. 'more participants saw broken glass in the smashed condition'; 2 marks for elaboration, such as reference to the other conditions or the addition of data to support the comment. Twice.</p> <p>The conclusions may not be valid because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study influenced participants twice in some conditions but only once in others (verb smashed one week earlier and then leading 'test' question). All participants including the control participants were asked the leading question 'did you see broken glass?' so the control is not really a control.</li> <li>• The study lacks ecological validity in that participants witness a film of a car crash and 'real life' eyewitness testimony may be different. For example: there is less emotional involvement when watching a film; the panoramic view of a film is restricted.</li> <li>• The sample of participants was restricted in that only students were used and whether this can be generalised to all people is questionable.</li> <li>• Any appropriate conclusion to be accepted.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark for basic reason; 2 marks for elaboration, twice.</p>	<b>8</b>

Question	Answer	Marks								
1(c)	<p><b>Debate the use of the experimental method to investigate eyewitness testimony.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 409 1326 1868"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 409 1206 461"></th> <th data-bbox="1206 409 1326 461">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 461 1206 958"> <p>Debate (balance of positive and negative points) is <b>comprehensive</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>impressive</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>balanced</b> and <b>competently organised</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches. <b>Effective</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is <b>evident throughout</b>. Evaluation is <b>detailed</b> and quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>extensive</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 461 1326 958">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 958 1206 1391"> <p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>very good</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>clear and well developed</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>balanced</b> and <b>logically organised</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches. <b>Good</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>often evident</b>. Evaluation is <b>quite detailed</b> and quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>competent</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 958 1326 1391">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1391 1206 1868"> <p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>good</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>reasonable</b>. Selection and range of arguments may be <b>imbalanced with some organisation</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. <b>Reasonable</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>sometimes evident</b>. Evaluation <b>has some detail</b> and quality of written communication is <b>good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1391 1326 1868">3–4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Debate (balance of positive and negative points) is <b>comprehensive</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>impressive</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>balanced</b> and <b>competently organised</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches. <b>Effective</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is <b>evident throughout</b>. Evaluation is <b>detailed</b> and quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>extensive</b>.</p>	7–8	<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>very good</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>clear and well developed</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>balanced</b> and <b>logically organised</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches. <b>Good</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>often evident</b>. Evaluation is <b>quite detailed</b> and quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>competent</b>.</p>	5–6	<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>good</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>reasonable</b>. Selection and range of arguments may be <b>imbalanced with some organisation</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. <b>Reasonable</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>sometimes evident</b>. Evaluation <b>has some detail</b> and quality of written communication is <b>good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>good</b>.</p>	3–4	8
	marks									
<p>Debate (balance of positive and negative points) is <b>comprehensive</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>impressive</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>balanced</b> and <b>competently organised</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches. <b>Effective</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is <b>evident throughout</b>. Evaluation is <b>detailed</b> and quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>extensive</b>.</p>	7–8									
<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>very good</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>clear and well developed</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>balanced</b> and <b>logically organised</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches. <b>Good</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>often evident</b>. Evaluation is <b>quite detailed</b> and quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>competent</b>.</p>	5–6									
<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>good</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>reasonable</b>. Selection and range of arguments may be <b>imbalanced with some organisation</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. <b>Reasonable</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>sometimes evident</b>. Evaluation <b>has some detail</b> and quality of written communication is <b>good</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>good</b>.</p>	3–4									

Question	Answer	Marks		
1(c)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1–2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Debate (positive and negative points) is <b>reasonable</b>. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are <b>adequate</b>. Selection and range of arguments are <b>often imbalanced</b> with <b>attempted organisation</b> into issues/debates, methods or approaches <b>evident</b>. <b>Some</b> use of appropriate supporting examples which are <b>often peripherally related</b> to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>discernible</b>. Evaluation <b>has little detail</b> and quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are <b>sufficient</b>.</p>	marks	1–2	
marks				
1–2				

Question	Answer	Marks				
2(a)	<p><b>Outline the free-will and determinism debate using examples.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 6</p> <p>The debate revolves around whether or not people are free to choose how to think and behave or whether behaviour is determined and caused by factors outside the individual's control. Determinism is the idea that all behaviour is caused. This could be biological, environmental, climatological or other. There is the 'hard' variety, and 'soft'. Free-will is the view that the person has total freedom to choose what to think and how to behave. Between the two extremes are the probabilism and possibilism alternatives. Examples can be taken from key studies, from further research or from 'explore more'. Examples can be taken from a Paper 3 option. The choice of example will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole two-year course.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1–2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Description of the free-will determinism debate is accurate, includes all aspects and has elaboration. The candidate clearly understands what they have written. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Description of the free-will determinism debate is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Description of the free-will determinism debate is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p>	marks	5–6	3–4	1–2	<b>6</b>
marks						
5–6						
3–4						
1–2						

Question	Answer	Marks								
2(b)	<p data-bbox="304 232 1281 300"><b>Contrast the free-will approach with the deterministic approach when investigating driving ability.</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 338 416 367">AO1 = 6</p> <p data-bbox="304 409 1315 544">The question requires not only knowledge of the free-will determinism debate but also the ability to compare and contrast. Further than this, it requires applying the debate to the driving ability. This is deliberately vague so the candidate can focus on any aspect of their choice.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 584 1326 990"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 584 1203 629"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 584 1326 629">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 629 1203 752">Contrasts are apposite. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of driving ability to debate is explicit. Understanding is full.</td> <td data-bbox="1203 629 1326 752">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 752 1203 875">Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of driving ability to debate is evident. Understanding is good.</td> <td data-bbox="1203 752 1326 875">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 875 1203 990">Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of driving ability to debate is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.</td> <td data-bbox="1203 875 1326 990">1–2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Contrasts are apposite. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of driving ability to debate is explicit. Understanding is full.	5–6	Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of driving ability to debate is evident. Understanding is good.	3–4	Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of driving ability to debate is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	1–2	<b>6</b>
	marks									
Contrasts are apposite. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of driving ability to debate is explicit. Understanding is full.	5–6									
Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of driving ability to debate is evident. Understanding is good.	3–4									
Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of driving ability to debate is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	1–2									

Question	Answer	Marks												
2(c)	<p><b>Using examples, explain why determinism inevitably implies reductionism.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>This is a question that will test even the most able candidates. A deep understanding is needed of both issues and the ability to express understanding clearly is needed. The use of apposite examples will also be an indicator of understanding and the choice of examples will reflect the range of reading/‘explore more’.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 618 1326 2029"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 618 1203 672"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 618 1326 672">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 672 1203 1032"> <p>Explanation is <b>accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>.</p> <p>Apposite examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer is <b>competently structured</b> and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 672 1326 1032">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1032 1203 1361"> <p>Explanation is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>.</p> <p>Appropriate examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has <b>structure</b> and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1032 1326 1361">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1361 1203 1691"> <p>Explanation is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>.</p> <p>Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has some <b>structure</b> or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1361 1326 1691">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1691 1203 1984"> <p>Explanation and use of psychological terminology are <b>evident</b>.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>sometimes accurate, has coherence</b> and is brief.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>discernible</b>.</p> <p>Examples are used occasionally.</p> <p>The answer has discernible <b>structure</b> or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1691 1326 1984">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1984 1203 2029">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1203 1984 1326 2029">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Explanation is <b>accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>.</p> <p>Apposite examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer is <b>competently structured</b> and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.</p>	7–8	<p>Explanation is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>.</p> <p>Appropriate examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has <b>structure</b> and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	5–6	<p>Explanation is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>.</p> <p>Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has some <b>structure</b> or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	3–4	<p>Explanation and use of psychological terminology are <b>evident</b>.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>sometimes accurate, has coherence</b> and is brief.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>discernible</b>.</p> <p>Examples are used occasionally.</p> <p>The answer has discernible <b>structure</b> or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.</p>	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	8
	marks													
<p>Explanation is <b>accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>.</p> <p>Apposite examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer is <b>competently structured</b> and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.</p>	7–8													
<p>Explanation is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>.</p> <p>Appropriate examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has <b>structure</b> and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	5–6													
<p>Explanation is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b>.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>.</p> <p>Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has some <b>structure</b> or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	3–4													
<p>Explanation and use of psychological terminology are <b>evident</b>.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>sometimes accurate, has coherence</b> and is brief.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>discernible</b>.</p> <p>Examples are used occasionally.</p> <p>The answer has discernible <b>structure</b> or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.</p>	1–2													
No or irrelevant answer.	0													

Question	Answer	Marks								
3(a)	<p><b>Describe psychological evidence to explain the issues/assumptions raised in the source.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 8 AO2 = 4</p> <p>Two components are necessary: identification and description of an appropriate issue/debate, which in this case is the nature-nurture debate; identification and description of relevant evidence to explain the nature-nurture debate. From the key studies and theories, the Bandura study is an example of how behaviours are learned and the background theory is behaviourism which has the assumption that all behaviour is learned. Candidates can use any appropriate evidence from any other key theory and study or from any key application. They can use evidence from 'explore more' too. For example, evidence on studies using PET scans suggests what areas of the brain are involved in various aspects of processing and the Raine et al. study suggests areas of the brain function differently for murderers. This could be used for a biological argument that violence is not learned.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 891 1326 2063"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 891 1326 943">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 943 1206 1339">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>impressive</b>.            Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>.            Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.            The theories/studies described are <b>wide-ranging</b>.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>.            The answer is <b>competently structured</b> and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).            Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 943 1326 1339">10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1339 1206 1704">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>very good</b>.            Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>.            Use of terms is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is competent.            The theories/studies described cover a <b>reasonable range</b>.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>.            The answer has some <b>structure</b> and organisation.            Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1339 1326 1704">7–9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1704 1206 2063">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>competent</b>.            Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b>.            Use of terms is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological terminology is adequate.            The theories/studies described cover a <b>range</b>.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>.            The answer has some <b>structure</b> and organisation.            Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1704 1326 2063">4–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>impressive</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b> . Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are <b>wide-ranging</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b> . The answer is <b>competently structured</b> and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b> .	10–12	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>very good</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b> . Use of terms is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a <b>reasonable range</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b> . The answer has some <b>structure</b> and organisation. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b> .	7–9	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>competent</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b> . Use of terms is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a <b>range</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b> . The answer has some <b>structure</b> and organisation. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b> .	4–6	12
	marks									
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>impressive</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b> . Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are <b>wide-ranging</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b> . The answer is <b>competently structured</b> and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b> .	10–12									
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>very good</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b> . Use of terms is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a <b>reasonable range</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b> . The answer has some <b>structure</b> and organisation. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b> .	7–9									
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>competent</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b> . Use of terms is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a <b>range</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b> . The answer has some <b>structure</b> and organisation. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b> .	4–6									

Question	Answer	Marks						
3(a)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 235 1203 293"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 235 1326 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 293 1203 656">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>basic</b>.            Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>sometimes accurate</b>, has some coherence but is <b>brief</b>.            Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are <b>discernible</b>.            The theories/studies described cover a <b>narrow range</b>.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>sufficient</b>.            The answer has a little <b>structure</b> and/or organisation.            Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 293 1326 656" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 656 1203 714">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1203 656 1326 714" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>basic</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>sometimes accurate</b> , has some coherence but is <b>brief</b> . Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are <b>discernible</b> . The theories/studies described cover a <b>narrow range</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>sufficient</b> . The answer has a little <b>structure</b> and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b> .	1–3	No or irrelevant answer.	0	
	marks							
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are <b>basic</b> . Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is <b>sometimes accurate</b> , has some coherence but is <b>brief</b> . Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are <b>discernible</b> . The theories/studies described cover a <b>narrow range</b> . Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>sufficient</b> . The answer has a little <b>structure</b> and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b> .	1–3							
No or irrelevant answer.	0							

Question	Answer	Marks												
3(b)	<p><b>Suggest what research could be done to investigate further one of the issues/assumptions raised in the source.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>It is likely that candidates will suggest research based on an experiment, questionnaire or observation. They could consider the relative advantages and disadvantages of each of these. They could suggest an ‘original’ piece of research based on their knowledge or they could base it on a modification of existing research. The suggested research must address the issues raised.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 618 1326 2074"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 618 1203 672"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 618 1326 672">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 672 1203 1032"> <p>Suggestion is <b>appropriate</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion has insight and is clearly based on psychological knowledge, possibly from evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 672 1326 1032">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1032 1203 1393"> <p>Suggestion is <b>largely appropriate</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is good and is based on psychological knowledge possibly from evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1032 1326 1393">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1393 1203 1711"> <p>Suggestion is <b>peripherally related</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is based on psychological knowledge. Little or no evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>often accurate, generally coherent with some detail</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1393 1326 1711">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1711 1203 2029"> <p>Suggestion is <b>vaguely related</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is anecdotal. No evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and is brief</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is <b>discernible or absent</b>. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>sufficient</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1711 1326 2029">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 2029 1203 2074">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1203 2029 1326 2074">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Suggestion is <b>appropriate</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion has insight and is clearly based on psychological knowledge, possibly from evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.</p>	7–8	<p>Suggestion is <b>largely appropriate</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is good and is based on psychological knowledge possibly from evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	5–6	<p>Suggestion is <b>peripherally related</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is based on psychological knowledge. Little or no evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>often accurate, generally coherent with some detail</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	3–4	<p>Suggestion is <b>vaguely related</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is anecdotal. No evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and is brief</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is <b>discernible or absent</b>. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>sufficient</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.</p>	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	8
	marks													
<p>Suggestion is <b>appropriate</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion has insight and is clearly based on psychological knowledge, possibly from evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>very good</b>.</p>	7–8													
<p>Suggestion is <b>largely appropriate</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is good and is based on psychological knowledge possibly from evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	5–6													
<p>Suggestion is <b>peripherally related</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is based on psychological knowledge. Little or no evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>often accurate, generally coherent with some detail</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>good</b>.</p>	3–4													
<p>Suggestion is <b>vaguely related</b> to the issues raised. Suggestion is anecdotal. No evidence of wider reading. Description of suggested research is <b>sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and is brief</b>. Use of psychological and methodological terminology is <b>discernible or absent</b>. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>sufficient</b>. Quality of written communication is <b>adequate</b>.</p>	1–2													
No or irrelevant answer.	0													