



PSYCHOLOGY

9773/01

Paper 1 Key Studies and Theories

May/June 2017

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 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 **15** printed pages.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>From the further research by Wells and Bradfield, outline <u>one</u> effect of giving confirming feedback to the participants.</p> <p>Wells et al. argue that giving confirming feedback to participants affected their reports of certainty, view, ability to make out the features, attention, basis for making an identification, ease of making an identification, length of time taken to make an identification, willingness to testify and trust of the identification. It is likely that candidates will focus on certainty but any of the above may be credited.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or unclear answer (e.g. certainty) 2 marks – full answer (e.g. participants given confirming feedback about their identification later rated themselves as more certain of their identification than those not given confirming feedback)</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Explain what is meant by ‘theory of mind’.</p> <p>By theory of mind we mean being able to infer the full range of mental states (beliefs, desires, intentions, imagination, emotions, etc.) that cause action. In brief, having a theory of mind is to be able to reflect on the contents of one’s own and other’s minds. Difficulty in understanding other minds is a core cognitive feature of autism. (Baron-Cohen, 2001)</p> <p>1 mark – brief or incomplete answer (such as understanding how people feel) 2 marks – clear description of theory of mind</p>	2
2(b)	<p>Outline <u>one</u> piece of evidence from the study by Baron-Cohen et al. that suggests that people with autism lack a theory of mind.</p> <p>The AS/HFA group found the eyes test significantly more difficult than normal controls. People with autism were less able to infer the emotion from a static picture of the eyes.</p> <p>1 mark – brief or muddled answer 2 marks – clear explanation of one piece of evidence</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Outline <u>one</u> of the three variables that were tested in the study by Samuel and Bryant into cognitive development.</p> <p>This could be to test if older children do better on conservation tasks than younger children, or to test whether asking only question leads to better performance or to test the ability to conserve different materials (i.e. age, number of questions, type of material).</p> <p>1 mark – brief or muddled/incomplete answer or one condition of a variable identified. 2 marks – clear outline of one appropriate variable.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Outline <u>two</u> differences between the methodology used in Milgram's research and the methodology used in Slater's research into obedience.</p> <p>There are several possible answers of which the most likely are as follows: Milgram's research was conducted in a 'real' environment and Slater's in a virtual one. Milgram's study (the key study) had a male victim and Slater's study had a female victim. In the Slater study, several detailed physiological measures were taken from the participant. In Slater's study the victim cries out 'I never agreed to this'. Slater's study did not use prods. Any other appropriate answer may be credited.</p> <p>For each difference 1 mark – difference identified but lacking detail/comparison 2 marks – a clear difference between the studies outlined</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Outline <u>one</u> finding from the further research into prison simulation by Reicher and Haslam.</p> <p>From the abstract</p> <p><i>This was an experimental case study that examined the consequences of randomly dividing men into groups of prisoners and guards within a specially constructed institution over a period of 8 days. Unlike the prisoners, the guards failed to identify with their role. This made the guards reluctant to impose their authority and they were eventually overcome by the prisoners. Participants then established an egalitarian social system. When this proved unsustainable, moves to impose a tyrannical regime met with weakening resistance.</i></p> <p>This is a 'Further research' so we should only be expecting candidates to have a broad understanding of this study. Any appropriate finding from the study to be credited.</p> <p>1 mark – incomplete or muddled answer 2 marks – clear outline of an appropriate finding</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>From the study by Bandura et al. into learning aggression, briefly outline the social learning theory.</p> <p>Candidates need only give a brief outline – answer should demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of imitation and modelling.</p> <p>1 mark – brief, incomplete or muddled answer 2 marks – clear suggestion</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p>Briefly outline the results of the further research by Bartholomew and Horowitz into romantic love as attachment.</p> <p>The study demonstrated a correlation between young people’s attachments to peers and their family attachments.</p> <p>1 mark – muddled/incomplete answer 2 marks – clear outline of results</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p>The research into diagnosing abnormality by Rosenhan is often considered unethical. Outline <u>two</u> reasons why this study should have been conducted.</p> <p>Note that the question asked for reasons why the study should have been conducted. This can be interpreted in a variety of ways: candidates may choose to justify unethical aspects of the study such as the lack of consent or may give broader justifications such as discovering exactly what goes on in psychiatric hospitals and attempting to improve conditions for patients.</p> <p>For each reason 1 mark – brief/muddled answer 2 marks – clear outline of appropriate reason</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>Suggest <u>one</u> reason for the aggressive behaviour seen in the study on gambling by Parke and Griffiths.</p> <p><i>Four categories of aggressive behaviour were seen (verbal aggression towards the gambling arcade staff; verbal aggression towards the slot machines; verbal aggression towards other slot machine players; and physical aggression towards the slot machines). It is suggested that the frustration, guilt and embarrassment of losing are the prime causes of such aggression.</i></p> <p>1 mark – brief/muddled answer 2 marks – clear reason</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p>Outline <u>one</u> of the goals Veale and Riley suggested would help sufferers of body dysmorphic disorder (BDD).</p> <p>Veale and Riley suggest the following: To use mirrors at a slight distance or ones that are large enough to incorporate most of their body; To deliberately focus attention on their reflection in the mirror rather than an internal impression of how they feel; To only use a mirror for an agreed function (e.g. shaving, putting on make-up) for a limited period of time; To use a variety of different mirrors and lights rather sticking to one which they “trust”; To focus attention on the whole of their face or body rather than a specific area; To suspend judgement about one’s appearance and distance oneself from automatic thoughts about being ugly or defective; Not to use mirrors that magnify their reflection; Not to use ambiguous reflections (for example windows, the backs of CDs or cutlery or mirrors that are dusty or cracked);. Not to use a mirror when they feel have the urge but to try and delay the response and do other activities until the urge has diminished.</p> <p>1 mark – brief/muddled answer 2 marks – clear outline of one strategy</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>From the further research into cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) by Harvey et al.:</p>	
11(a)	<p>Outline the aim of the further research.</p> <p>The article is a review and has several aims (one will be sufficient for full marks). These include overviewing the general principles of treatment, describing the components that comprise CBT for PTSD, the efficacy of CBT for the treatment of PTSD caused by various traumas as well as considering recent advances in early intervention.</p> <p>1 mark – brief/muddled outline of the aim 2 marks – clear aim outlined</p>	2
11(b)	<p>Outline <u>one</u> conclusion that can be drawn from the further research.</p> <p>The key conclusion is that ‘randomised controlled trials (RCT) of CBT for PTSD must be conducted with enhanced methodological rigour and public health relevance’. Other appropriate conclusions will be accepted.</p> <p>1 mark – brief/muddled conclusion 2 marks – clear conclusion outlined</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p data-bbox="312 248 1278 315">Suggest <u>one</u> weakness of the sample used in the study on sleep and dreaming by Dement and Kleitman.</p> <p data-bbox="312 349 1318 454">Any appropriate answer may be credited, e.g. small sample, biased towards males. Candidates should go further than just identify this and should explain that e.g. small samples are unrepresentative</p> <p data-bbox="312 488 1318 555">1 mark – identification of issue e.g. small sample 2 mark – clear suggestion of weakness e.g. small sample = unrepresentative.</p>	2

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
13(a)	<p>Describe research into psychosexual development.</p> <p>Research may include background, key study, further research and explore more. Candidates do not have to include all of these to achieve full marks. The abstracts for the key study and further research have been reproduced below but candidates should be credited for any appropriate content.</p> <p>Freud's psychosexual stages of development with an emphasis on the Oedipus complex will be examined in this section. The key study of 'little Hans' by Freud (1909) has been selected to provide a platform for further exploration of psychoanalytic theory and concepts. Psychoanalysis has been largely criticised amongst other things for not being falsifiable. The study by Anderson and Green (2001) demonstrates current efforts to test psychoanalytic theory with supporting evidence for Freud's theory of repression.</p> <p>Key Study</p> <p>No abstract exists for this study but candidates will be familiar with the broad aims, methodology and results of this case study. It is likely that this will used to illustrate the theory of psychosexual development.</p> <p>Abstract Further Research</p> <p>Freud proposed that unwanted memories can be forgotten by pushing them into the unconscious, a process called repression. The existence of repression has remained controversial for more than a century, in part because of its strong coupling with trauma, and the ethical and practical difficulties of studying such processes in controlled experiments. However, behavioural and neurobiological research on memory and attention shows that people have executive control processes directed at minimizing perceptual distraction, overcoming interference during short and long-term memory tasks and stopping strong habitual responses to stimuli. Here we show that these mechanisms can be recruited to prevent unwanted declarative memories from entering awareness, and that this cognitive act has enduring consequences for the rejected memories. When people encounter cues that remind them of an unwanted memory and they consistently try to prevent awareness of it, the later recall of the rejected memory becomes more difficult. The forgetting increases with the number of times the memory is avoided, resists incentives for accurate recall and is caused by processes that suppress the memory itself. These results show that executive control processes not uniquely tied to trauma may provide a viable model for repression.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
13(a)	<p>Definition of terms is 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>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	8–10 marks
	<p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has adequate structure and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>	6–7 marks
	<p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer has some structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–5 marks
	<p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>The answer has minimal structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3 marks
	No answer or irrelevant answer.	0 marks

Question	Answer	Marks
13(b)	<p>Evaluate research into psychosexual development.</p> <p>Candidates may use a variety of evaluation issues in their response (most likely will be issues relating to case studies, ethics, questioning, the reliability and validity of conclusions, usefulness and applications, etc.) but should also focus on the contribution made to the wider area of psychosexual development in order to access top band marks. This is most likely to be achieved through a discussion (even a brief one) of issues arising from this work and how later research has built on this.</p>	12

Question	Answer		Marks
13(b)	<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. <i>Candidates who do not make explicit reference to the contribution of this study to the wider area will not be able to be awarded marks in this band.</i> Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	10–12 marks	
	<p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p>	8–9 marks	
	<p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	6–7 marks	
	<p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p>	4–5 marks	

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

Question	Answer	Marks
14(a)	<p>Describe research into biological attraction.</p> <p><i>Research may include background, key study, further research and explore more. Candidates do not have to include all of these to achieve full marks. The abstracts for the key study and further research have been reproduced below but candidates should be credited for any appropriate content.</i></p> <p>The evolutionary perspective suggests that facial symmetry is preferred to asymmetry as it offers clues about the mating fitness of the beholder. The key study by Rhodes, Proffitt, Grady and Sumich (1998) provides evidence for the relationship between facial symmetry and attractiveness. The study by Perret et al. (1998) has surprising findings as it suggests that in both male and female faces, exaggerated feminine characteristics are perceived as more attractive, which is in contrast to most non-human species where males are preferred to females.</p> <p>Abstract Key Study: Evolutionary, as well as cultural, pressures may contribute to our perceptions of facial attractiveness. Biologists predict that facial symmetry should be attractive, because it may signal mate quality. We tested the prediction that facial symmetry is attractive by manipulating the symmetry of individual faces and observing the effect on attractiveness, and by examining whether natural variations in symmetry (between faces) correlated with perceived attractiveness. Attractiveness increased when we increased symmetry, and decreased when we reduced symmetry, in individual faces (Experiment 1), and natural variations in symmetry correlated significantly with attractiveness (Experiments 1 and 1A). Perfectly symmetric versions, made by blending the normal and mirror images of each face, were preferred to less symmetric versions of the same faces (even when those versions were also blends) (Experiments 1 and 2). Similar results were found when subjects judged the faces on appeal as a potential life partner, suggesting that facial symmetry may affect human mate choice. We conclude that facial symmetry is attractive and discuss the possibility that this preference for symmetry may be biologically based.</p> <p>Abstract Further Research: Testosterone-dependent secondary sexual characteristics in males may signal immunological competence and are sexually selected for in several species. In humans, oestrogen-dependent characteristics of the female body correlate with health and reproductive fitness and are found attractive. Enhancing the sexual dimorphism of human faces should raise attractiveness by enhancing sex-hormone-related cues to youth and fertility in females, and to dominance and immunocompetence in males. Here we report the results of asking subjects to choose the most attractive faces from continua that enhanced or diminished differences between the average shape of female and male faces. As predicted, subjects preferred feminized to average shapes of a female face. This preference applied across UK and Japanese populations but was stronger for within-population judgements, which indicates that attractiveness cues are learned. Subjects preferred feminized to average or masculinized shapes of a male face. Enhancing masculine facial characteristics increased both perceived dominance and negative attributions (for example, coldness or dishonesty) relevant to relationships and paternal investment. These results indicate a selection pressure that limits sexual dimorphism and encourages neoteny in humans.</p>	10

Question	Answer		Marks
14(a)	<p>Definition of terms is 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>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	8–10 marks	
	<p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has adequate structure and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>	6–7 marks	
	<p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer has some structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–5 marks	
	<p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>The answer has minimal structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3 marks	
	No answer or irrelevant answer.	0 marks	

Question	Answer	Marks						
14(b)	<p>Evaluate research into biological attraction.</p> <p>Candidates may use a variety of evaluation issues in their response (most likely will be issues relating to experimental design, the reliability and validity of measurements, usefulness and applications, etc.) but should also focus on the contribution made to the wider area of stress in order to access top band marks. This is most likely to be achieved through a discussion (even a brief one) of how this research has developed from work that was conducted before this and how later research has built on this.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 584 1321 1776"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 584 1177 1070"> <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. <i>Candidates who do not make explicit reference to the contribution of this study to the wider area will not be able to be awarded marks in this band.</i> Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1177 584 1321 1070">10–12 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1070 1177 1424"> <p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1177 1070 1321 1424">8–9 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1424 1177 1776"> <p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1177 1424 1321 1776">6–7 marks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. <i>Candidates who do not make explicit reference to the contribution of this study to the wider area will not be able to be awarded marks in this band.</i> Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	10–12 marks	<p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p>	8–9 marks	<p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	6–7 marks	12
<p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. <i>Candidates who do not make explicit reference to the contribution of this study to the wider area will not be able to be awarded marks in this band.</i> Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	10–12 marks							
<p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p>	8–9 marks							
<p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	6–7 marks							

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

Question	Answer	Marks								
14(c)	<p>Explain how you would conduct a study which would extend our understanding of biological attraction.</p> <p>The alternative could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the syllabus or it could be based on that and/or any research from the ‘explore more’ section or it could be based on any relevant research surrounding this area that the candidate has explored. It could even be suggestions that the candidates themselves make based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 584 1321 1220"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 584 1177 768">Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive.</td> <td data-bbox="1177 584 1321 768">5–6 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 768 1177 952">Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good.</td> <td data-bbox="1177 768 1321 952">3–4 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 952 1177 1171">Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic.</td> <td data-bbox="1177 952 1321 1171">1–2 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1171 1177 1220">No or inappropriate suggestion.</td> <td data-bbox="1177 1171 1321 1220">0 marks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive.	5–6 marks	Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good.	3–4 marks	Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic.	1–2 marks	No or inappropriate suggestion.	0 marks	6
Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive.	5–6 marks									
Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good.	3–4 marks									
Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic.	1–2 marks									
No or inappropriate suggestion.	0 marks									