



Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

PSYCHOLOGY

9773/02

Paper 2 Methods, Issues and Applications

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 **11** 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	Methodology	
1(a)	<p>Give <u>one</u> example of quantitative data and <u>one</u> example of qualitative data collected in the study by Rosenhan on being sane in insane places.</p> <p>Possible examples of quantitative data include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pseudopatients remained in the hospital for 7 to 52 days (average 19 days) • Forty-one patients were alleged, with high confidence, to be pseudopatients by at least one member of the staff. Twenty-three were considered suspect by at least one psychiatrist. • On average, daytime nurses emerged from the cage 11.5 times per shift, including instances when they left the ward entirely (range, 4 to 39 times). • Late afternoon and night nurses were even less available, emerging on the average 9.4 times per shift (range, 4 to 41 times). • On average, physicians emerged on the ward 6.7 times per day (range, 1 to 17 times). • 71% of psychiatrists and 88% of nurses ignored the pseudopatients by moving on with their head averted and offering either no response or a very brief response. <p>Possible examples of qualitative data include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the first three hospitalisations, when accurate counts were kept, 35 of a total of 118 patients on the admissions ward voiced their suspicions, some vigorously. 'You're not crazy. You're a journalist, or a professor [referring to the continual note-taking]. You're checking up on the hospital.' • All pseudopatients took extensive notes publicly. The closest any staff member came to questioning these notes occurred when one pseudopatient asked his physician what kind of medication he was receiving and began to write down the response. 'You needn't write it,' he was told gently. 'If you have trouble remembering, just ask me again.' • Nursing records for three patients indicate that the writing was seen as an aspect of their pathological behaviour. 'Patient engages in writing behaviour' was the daily nursing comment on one of the pseudopatients who was never questioned about his writing. • one kindly nurse found a pseudopatient pacing the long hospital corridors. 'Nervous, Mr. X?' she asked. 'No, bored,' he said. • One psychiatrist pointed to a group of patients who were sitting outside the cafeteria entrance half an hour before lunchtime. To a group of young residents he indicated that such behaviour was characteristic of the oral-acquisitive nature of the syndrome. <p>NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</p> <p>2 marks awarded for an example of quantitative data and 2 marks for an example of qualitative data. 1 mark for generic identification i.e. nurses were not often available and 1 mark for sufficient detail i.e. emerging on the average 9.4 times per shift (range, 4 to 41 times).</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Describe <u>two</u> ethical guidelines that were <u>not</u> followed in this study <u>and</u> suggest how the ethics of this study could be improved.</p> <p>Possible ethical issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deception/lack of informed consent as hospitals were unaware that a study was taking place. • Psychological harm as the pseudopatients had to stay in the hospital for an average of 19 days and nurses would have been embarrassed when the findings became available. They were asked to consume a number of pills that could have been potentially harmful. • Right to withdraw as the pseudopatients were unable to be released from the hospital despite them claiming that they were better <p>NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</p> <p>1 mark for identification of an ethical issue and another mark for elaboration. Twice.</p> <p>Possible ways that the ethics of the study could be improved include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask the hospitals for consent before the study takes place. • Make sure that all the pseudopatients can be released from the hospital if they wished to. • Install CCTV cameras to collect data instead of sending pseudopatients in the hospital. <p>NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</p> <p>1 mark for identification of a way that the ethics of the study could have been improved and 1 mark for an explanation as to how this will improve the ethics of the study. Twice. Please note that answers need to be fully contextualized.</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p>Using examples from research, debate the use of participant observations when investigating abnormality.</p> <p>Strengths and weaknesses need to be closely related to abnormality. Strengths and weaknesses need to be fully explained and not merely identified. Strengths and weaknesses can be taken from any key studies, from further research, from the 'explore more' section or from a Paper 3 option. The choice of examples will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course.</p> <p>Strengths of participant observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow us to study situations that otherwise would have been difficult to investigate. • Allow researchers to uncover factors that were unknown when the study was designed. • Allows for more natural behaviour if researchers successfully conceal their identity. <p>Weaknesses of participant observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If participants know that they are being studied they might alter their behaviour to how they think they are expected to behave. • The experimenter might consciously or unconsciously affect group dynamics just by being a group member. • The researcher might develop bias towards the group and interpret their behaviour according to his expectations. • Difficulty in documenting data while you are part of a group. 	8

Question	Answer		Marks
1(c)	<p>Debate is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is impressive. Selection and range of arguments is balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is extensive.</p>	7–8	8
	<p>Debate is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments is balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is competent.</p>	5–6	
	<p>Debate is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is reasonable. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation has some detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is good.</p>	3–4	
	<p>Debate is reasonable. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is adequate. Selection and range of arguments is often imbalanced with attempted organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Some use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation has little detail and quality of written communication is adequate. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is sufficient.</p>	1–2	
	No or irrelevant answer.	0	

Question	Answer	Marks								
2	Issues, Approaches And Perspectives									
2(a)	<p>Outline <u>two</u> practical applications of the physiological approach in psychology, using examples from any research.</p> <p>Practical applications can include: Stress management techniques, drug therapy for mental illness, pain management techniques, sexual offenders treatments programme.</p> <p>NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</p> <p>Research examples can be taken from key studies, from further research or from the 'explore more'. Research can be taken from a Paper 3 option. The choice of research will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="301 781 1331 1252"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 781 1235 965">Description of the two practical applications is accurate, includes most 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.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 781 1331 965">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 965 1235 1084">Description of the two practical applications is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 965 1331 1084">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1084 1235 1202">Description of the two practical applications is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1084 1331 1202">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1202 1235 1252">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1202 1331 1252">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description of the two practical applications is accurate, includes most 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.	5–6	Description of the two practical applications is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	3–4	Description of the two practical applications is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	6
Description of the two practical applications is accurate, includes most 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.	5–6									
Description of the two practical applications is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	3–4									
Description of the two practical applications is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	1–2									
No or irrelevant answer.	0									

Question	Answer	Marks								
2(b)	<p>Contrast determinist and free-will explanations of underage drinking.</p> <p>The question requires not only knowledge of determinism and free-will but also the ability to contrast. Further than this, it requires candidates to apply their knowledge to explain underage drinking.</p> <p>The determinist view will suggest that underage drinking is the result of causal factors, such as upbringing, biological disposition, peer group pressure. The free-will view suggests that underage drinking derives from personal decisions and choices.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 618 1329 1088"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 618 1235 768">Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of underage drinking to the contrasts is explicit. Understanding is full.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 618 1329 768">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 768 1235 887">Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of underage drinking to the contrasts is evident. Understanding is good.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 768 1329 887">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 887 1235 1037">Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of underage drinking to contrasts is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 887 1329 1037">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1037 1235 1088">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1037 1329 1088">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of underage drinking to the contrasts is explicit. Understanding is full.	5–6	Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of underage drinking to the contrasts is evident. Understanding is good.	3–4	Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of underage drinking to contrasts is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	6
Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of underage drinking to the contrasts is explicit. Understanding is full.	5–6									
Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of underage drinking to the contrasts is evident. Understanding is good.	3–4									
Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of underage drinking to contrasts is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	1–2									
No or irrelevant answer.	0									
2(c)	<p>Using examples from research, outline the strengths of the determinist viewpoint.</p> <p>Any relevant research will be credited. Research can be taken from key studies, from further research or from ‘explore more’. Research can be taken from a Paper 3 option. The choice of research will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course.</p> <p>Strengths can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour can be tested scientifically. • Can identify causes of behaviour by studying variables in isolation. • By identifying the causes of negative behaviour treatments can be developed. • Make the world more understandable and predictable. 	8								

Question	Answer		Marks
2(c)	<p>Strengths are accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> <p>Apposite examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	7–8	8
	<p>Strengths are mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>Appropriate examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has structure and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>	5–6	
	<p>Strengths are basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has some structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>	3–4	
	<p>Strengths and use of psychological terminology is evident.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>Examples are used occasionally.</p> <p>The answer has discernible structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–2	
	No or irrelevant answer.	0	

Question	Answer	Marks										
3	Applications											
3(a)	<p>Describe psychological evidence and/or theories that could be relevant to the issues raised in the source.</p> <p>Candidates can use any appropriate evidence from any other key theory and study or from any key application and 'the explore more' section.</p> <p>Possible studies/theories include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freud's psychosexual stages – anal retentive personality • Operant conditioning – negative reinforcement • Attachment styles – Ainsworth, Hazan and Shaver • Social learning theory. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 725 1235 1077"> Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. 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="1235 725 1331 1077" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">8–10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1077 1235 1397"> Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. 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="1235 1077 1331 1397" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">5–7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1397 1235 1718"> Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. </td> <td data-bbox="1235 1397 1331 1718" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1718 1235 2002"> Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. The theories/studies described cover a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. </td> <td data-bbox="1235 1718 1331 2002" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 2002 1235 2051">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 2002 1331 2051" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. 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	Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. 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.	5–7	Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	3–4	Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. The theories/studies described cover a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	10
Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. 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											
Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. 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.	5–7											
Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	3–4											
Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. The theories/studies described cover a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											

Question	Answer	Marks										
3(b)	<p>Explain the issues raised in the source using the evidence and/or theories you described in part (a).</p> <p>Candidates are required to apply their knowledge of the studies and/or theories described in part (a) to explain the events raised in the source. At least two events need to be explained with the evidence explicitly applied to the source.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 483 1329 1944"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 483 1235 869"> Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) described in part a) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. 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. Relationship to the events raised in the source is explicit. </td> <td data-bbox="1235 483 1329 869">8–10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 869 1235 1223"> Quality of explanation and depth of argument is very good. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. 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. Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident. </td> <td data-bbox="1235 869 1329 1223">5–7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1223 1235 1576"> Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident in parts. </td> <td data-bbox="1235 1223 1329 1576">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1576 1235 1895"> Quality of explanation and depth of argument is basic. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. Relationship to the events raised in the source is implicit </td> <td data-bbox="1235 1576 1329 1895">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1895 1235 1944">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1895 1329 1944">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) described in part a) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. 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. Relationship to the events raised in the source is explicit.	8–10	Quality of explanation and depth of argument is very good. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. 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. Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident.	5–7	Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident in parts.	3–4	Quality of explanation and depth of argument is basic. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. Relationship to the events raised in the source is implicit	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	10
Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) described in part a) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. 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. Relationship to the events raised in the source is explicit.	8–10											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument is very good. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. 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. Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident.	5–7											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident in parts.	3–4											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument is basic. Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. Relationship to the events raised in the source is implicit	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											