

1.

(a) **Outline** the key research by Hall and Player (2008) and **use it to show the extent** to which bias affects the collection and processing of forensic evidence. (10)

Mark Scheme

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| (a) | <p>* Outline the key research by Hall and Player (2008) and use it to show the extent to which bias affects the collection and processing of forensic evidence.</p> <p>AO1 (5 marks) Candidates must refer to the key study by Hall and Player. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.</p> <p>A good (L4) response will typically include details of at least 3 of following features: - Why the study was done (e.g. background, aim or hypotheses) - Who was the study done on (e.g. details of sample) - How the study was done (e.g. research method used, method or procedure including materials) - What was found (e.g. the results or conclusions)</p> <p>A reasonable (L3) response will typically include 2-3 of the above features. A limited (L2) response will typically include 1-2 of the above features. A basic (L1) response will typically include 1 of the above features.</p> <p>AO2 (5 marks) Candidates should apply their knowledge and understanding of the study by Hall and Player to show the extent to which bias affects the collection and processing of forensic evidence. Answers can be expected to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How emotional context (murder vs forgery scenario) did not affect the decision-making of fingerprint experts. • How half of participants in the murder scenario thought that their judgements had been affected by the emotional context, i.e. perceived effect • How a number of participants (19%) did not read the crime scene report, so bias could not have affected their judgements. • 17% of those given the high context and 20% of those given the low-context scenario were sufficiently confident to present the mark as a positive identification to the court. • Professionals are less likely to be affected by bias. <p>Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without using it to show the extent to which bias affects the collection and processing of forensic evidence will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p> | <p>10 PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1</p> <p>Annotations Level to be annotated on the left hand side.</p> <p>√ Ticks for any feature (AO1). APP for what it tells us about how bias can affect the collection and processing of forensic evidence.</p> <p>Key features of the study: AIM: To see whether the written report of a crime affect a fingerprint expert's interpretation as well as to see if the fingerprint experts are emotionally affected by the circumstances of the case.</p> <p>RM: A field setting with an independent measures design. IV - low-context (forgery) or the high-context group (murder – firing two shots at the victim). Three DVs were: crime scene report read or not; analysis of the fingerprint (a match, not a match, not enough detail to make a comparison, some detail in agreement but not enough to individualise) and whether the participant would be confident to present the fingerprint as evidence at court.</p> <p>SAMPLE: Self-selected sample. 70 fingerprint experts from the MET Police. Their experience ranged from less than 3 months to over 30 years, with a mean length of experience of 11 years.</p> <p>PROCEDURE: A £50 note was digitally superimposed with a scan of a volunteer's right forefinger, which had been inked. The participants were given an envelope containing one of the test marks, the relevant 10-print fingerprint form, the relevant scene examiner's examination report and a sheet of paper advising participants of the contents which also stated that the mark was made by the right forefinger. The participants completed: - a demographic information sheet - fingerprint analysis – i.e. whether mark was a match/not a match etc. including how and why they have made their decision. - a feedback sheet - have they read the crime scene report? if so, did it affect them and how.</p> |
|-----|---|--|

APPENDIX 1

Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (a) QUESTIONS

AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)

| Level | Marks | Generic mark scheme (Part a) | Guidance |
|-------|--------|--|--|
| 4 | 9 – 10 | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. | Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the answer may contain detailed knowledge of the study (e.g., a number of accurate fine details) and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it (e.g. making a number of different, relevant application points, rather than just one application point). Alternatively, answers may 'go beyond' by bringing in additional supporting research (i.e., use more than just the key study to address the question) where the wording of the question permits this. |
| 3 | 6 – 8 | Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. | A standard response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). The answer is essentially accurate. There is adequate description of the key study, and it is applied in the way that the question requires. Broadly speaking, the candidate is correct in what they are saying. However, their answer lacks the extension (detailed knowledge of the study and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it) that typifies answers in the top band. |
| 2 | 3 – 5 | Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. | Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, description of the study may lack the detail (or accuracy) that can be expected of a standard response; the key study may be described but not actually applied in the way that the question requires; the examiner may not be convinced of the candidate's understanding. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. | Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but essentially are wrong/flawed in what is being said. |
| 0 | | No creditworthy response. | Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material. |

(b) Discuss to what extent research into the collection and processing of forensic evidence is scientific. **(15)**

Mark Scheme

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----|---|
| (b) | * | <p>Discuss to what extent research into the collection and processing of forensic evidence is scientific.</p> <p>AO1 (2 marks) Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of psychology as a science.</p> <p>AO3 (13 marks) Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate research into the collection and processing of forensic evidence in relation to the psychology as a science debate.</p> <p>As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research relating to motivating factors and bias in the collection and processing of forensic evidence. Any relevant research is creditworthy.</p> <p>Answers may refer to features of science such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replicability • Objectivity • Falsifiability • The use of controls • Manipulation of variables • Collection of quantitative data • Cause and effect • Standardisation • Hypothesis testing • Induction/Deduction • Empiricism/empirical evidence <p>Candidates may suggest the research is scientific, or equally, they may argue that it is not (e.g. research in the field creating extraneous variables). Points about whether the research is scientific need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p> | 15 | <p>PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2</p> <p>Annotations Level to be annotated on the left hand side.</p> <p>Answers need to be focused on the <u>research</u> (rather than techniques for example).</p> |
|-----|---|---|----|---|

APPENDIX 2

Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (b) QUESTIONS

AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (2 marks)

AO3: Analyse, interpret and evaluate scientific information, ideas and evidence (13 marks)

| Level | Marks | Generic mark scheme (part b) | Guidance |
|-------|-------|--|--|
| 4 | 12–15 | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates many points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. | Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the candidate may present intellectually surprising arguments, their arguments may centre on well-informed comparisons of evidence, or they may explore (quantitatively) more arguments than a 'standard' response will. |
| 3 | 8–11 | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a reasonable number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Reasonable use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent, and understanding is reasonable. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. | A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 9-10 marks). Answers in this band are evaluative rather than descriptive, and points made are backed up with relevant supporting evidence. If one evaluative point is explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 8 marks. If two evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 9-10 marks. If three evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 10-11 marks. |
| 2 | 4–7 | Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a limited number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation which are limited in range. Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. Demonstrates some understanding. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. | Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, they may be essentially descriptive (rather than evaluative); the examiner may not be convinced that the answer is discussing the relevant concept (e.g., in a question about validity, the candidate's answer may seem to be more about reliability); the response may raise appropriate evaluative points but these may lack relevant supporting evidence. |
| 1 | 1–3 | Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a few basic points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues and arguments show little understanding. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. | Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., in a question about discussion of ethical considerations, ethical guidelines are named but they are not then related to the topic in the question). |
| 0 | | No creditworthy response. | Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material. |

(c) From a crime scene, the police recover different examples of forensic evidence including fingerprints and a handwritten note. Experts will analyse the forensic evidence to help the police identify a suspect.

Outline at least one strategy a psychologist might suggest to the experts to reduce bias in the collection and processing of forensic evidence. (10)

Mark Scheme

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----|--|
| (c) | * | <p>Outline at least one strategy a psychologist might suggest to the experts to reduce bias in the collection and processing of forensic evidence.</p> <p>AO2 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one strategy for reducing bias in the collection and processing of forensic evidence.</p> <p>Suggestions may refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of the principles behind the ACE-V approach to fingerprint identification and/or Linear Sequential Unmasking (LSU). • A 'line-up' approach could be suggested (and this could be linked to the filler-control method and/or Miller's 'six-pack' approach). • Only using experienced analysts and/or to withhold crime scene information from them (from the key research). • 'Blind testing' in which information about judgements made by other handwriting analysts is withheld (especially if the judgements are from someone more senior). • Training experts in their own biases. • Comparing latent and comparison print separately. <p>Answers could focus in depth on one suggestion or refer to a range of suggestions. It is important that suggestions are related to the context of the question and are suggestions that a psychologist might potentially make (so should therefore be within ethical and legal guidelines).</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p> | 10 | <p>PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3</p> <p>Annotations Level to be annotated on the left hand side.</p> |
|-----|---|---|----|--|

**APPENDIX 3
GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION B PART (c) QUESTIONS**

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (10 marks)

| Level | Marks | Generic Mark Scheme (part c) | Guidance |
|-------|-------|--|---|
| 4 | 9–10 | Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. | Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. This might be because the advice comprises a range of different suggestions (e.g., three or more explained in context and with appropriate psychological rationale for them, e.g. names psychological research, concepts or theories or explicit appropriate psychological terminology). Alternatively, if taking a 'depth' approach, the answer would contain one application and rationale explained in detail, beyond that seen in standard, accurate responses. |
| 3 | 6–8 | Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. | A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). Advice put forward by the candidate will be related to the scenario in the question and there will be explicit and appropriate psychological rationale for the advice (e.g., named psychological research, concepts or theories or appropriate psychological terminology). It is clear what is being suggested (i.e., it is specific) and why it is being suggested. Candidates can take either a 'breadth' or 'depth' approach (e.g., the advice may comprise two or possibly even three suggestions, but it could equally well centre on one suggestion explained in detail). |
| 2 | 3–5 | Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may relate to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. | Answers can be in this band for a number of reasons. For example, the advice offered may not be related to the scenario in the question (i.e., it may be generic) or it may lack appropriate psychological rationale. It is unclear what is being suggested (i.e., what the precise advice is) or why it is being suggested. |
| 1 | 1–2 | Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: Responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. | Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., advice is offered but it is generic and has no psychological rationale behind it). |
| 0 | | No creditworthy response. | Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material. |

2.

(a) Outline the key research by Memon and Higham (1999) and explain what it tells us about training police interviewers. (10)

Mark Scheme

| | | | |
|-----|--|----|-------------------------------|
| (a) | <p>* Outline the key research by Memon and Higham (1999) and explain what it tells us about training police interviewers.</p> <p>AO1 (5 marks) Candidates must refer to the key study by Memon and Higham (1999). Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.</p> <p>A good/Level 4 response will typically include detailed outline of the following features: - Identification of the research method used (i.e. a review) or its aim. - Outline of what the cognitive interview technique involves. - Outline of how the CIT was assessed (comparison to other interview techniques and/or measures of memory and/or citing of research into different components by other psychologists)</p> <p>A reasonable/Level 3 response will typically include 2 of the above features, or 3 but not in detail A limited/Level 2 response will typically include 1-2 of the above features. A basic/Level 1 response will typically include 1 of the above features.</p> <p>AO2 (5 marks) Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Memon and Higham. The explanation of what it tells us about training police interviewers can be marked in relation to what the study advises about effective CIT training.</p> <p>Award 5 marks for different aspects of CIT training. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on context reinstatement and recalling in forward order once followed by reverse order as these components have been found to be particularly effective. • Focus less on changing the perspective as it can be confusing for witnesses • Do over two days • Give to motivated police officers (chosen for their potential) • Get a police sergeant delivering the training • Don't get a University lecturer doing the training • Give trainees feedback • Provide opportunities for practice • Give all trainees training in the same interview techniques (not like the 'standard' police interview) <p>The AO2 marks can be awarded in relation to either breadth (e.g. listing five of these) or depth (e.g. taking a more detailed approach in relation to two or three of them) Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without explaining what it tells us about training police interviewers will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p> | 10 | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1 |
|-----|--|----|-------------------------------|

APPENDIX 1

Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (a) QUESTIONS

AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)

| Level | Marks | Generic mark scheme (Part a) | Guidance |
|-------|--------|--|--|
| 4 | 9 – 10 | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. | Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the answer may contain detailed knowledge of the study (e.g., a number of accurate fine details) and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it (e.g. making a number of different, relevant application points, rather than just one application point). Alternatively, answers may 'go beyond' by bringing in additional supporting research (i.e., use more than just the key study to address the question) where the wording of the question permits this. |
| 3 | 6 – 8 | Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. | A standard response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). The answer is essentially accurate. There is adequate description of the key study, and it is applied in the way that the question requires. Broadly speaking, the candidate is correct in what they are saying. However, their answer lacks the extension (detailed knowledge of the study and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it) that typifies answers in the top band. |
| 2 | 3 – 5 | Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. | Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, description of the study may lack the detail (or accuracy) that can be expected of a standard response; the key study may be described but not actually applied in the way that the question requires; the examiner may not be convinced of the candidate's understanding. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. | Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but essentially are wrong/flawed in what is being said. |
| 0 | | No creditworthy response. | Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material. |

(b) Discuss ethical considerations in relation to collection of evidence. **(15)**

Mark Scheme

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----|----------------------------|
| (b) | * | <p>Discuss ethical considerations in relation to collection of evidence.</p> <p>AO1 (2 marks) Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations.</p> <p>AO3 (13 marks) Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate collection of evidence in relation to ethical considerations. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research relating to collection and use of evidence from witnesses and suspects. Any relevant study is creditworthy, including those relating to the collection of forensic evidence and also Loftus and Palmer.</p> <p>Candidates may approach this question by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting on <i>research</i> into collection of evidence in relation to ethical guidelines (informed consent, withdrawal, protection from harm, etc.). <p>However, stronger responses may broaden out the discussion to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of evidence in relation to <i>the experience of being an interviewee</i> – the rights of interviewees, and whether 'the end justifies the means'. <p>Candidates may be critical in the points they make but, equally, they may defend the ethics of collection of evidence. Points about ethical considerations need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p> | 15 | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2 |
|-----|---|---|----|----------------------------|

APPENDIX 2

Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (b) QUESTIONS

AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (2 marks)

AO3: Analyse, interpret and evaluate scientific information, ideas and evidence (13 marks)

| Level | Marks | Generic mark scheme (part b) | Guidance |
|-------|-------|--|--|
| 4 | 12–15 | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates many points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. | Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the candidate may present intellectually surprising arguments, their arguments may centre on well-informed comparisons of evidence, or they may explore (quantitatively) more arguments than a 'standard' response will. |
| 3 | 8–11 | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a reasonable number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Reasonable use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent, and understanding is reasonable. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. | A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 9-10 marks). Answers in this band are evaluative rather than descriptive, and points made are backed up with relevant supporting evidence. If one evaluative point is explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 8 marks. If two evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 9-10 marks. If three evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 10-11 marks. |
| 2 | 4–7 | Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a limited number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation which are limited in range. Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. Demonstrates some understanding. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. | Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, they may be essentially descriptive (rather than evaluative); the examiner may not be convinced that the answer is discussing the relevant concept (e.g., in a question about validity, the candidate's answer may seem to be more about reliability); the response may raise appropriate evaluative points but these may lack relevant supporting evidence. |
| 1 | 1–3 | Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a few basic points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues and arguments show little understanding. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. | Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., in a question about discussion of ethical considerations, ethical guidelines are named but they are not then related to the topic in the question). |
| 0 | | No creditworthy response. | Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material. |

(c) Tom was in his local supermarket doing some shopping when he witnessed another customer stealing some goods from the shelves.

Outline at least one suggestion a psychologist might make to the police regarding how to interview Tom about what he saw. (10)

Mark Scheme

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|----|----------------------------|
| (c) | * | <p>Outline at least one suggestion a psychologist might make to the police about how to interview Tom about what he saw.</p> <p>AO2 (10 marks) Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one strategy for police interviews.</p> <p>Suggestions may refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Features of the cognitive interview technique. • The enhanced cognitive interview technique. • The PEACE model. • Avoiding using leading questions • Application of context-dependent memory <p>Answers could focus in depth on one suggestion or refer to a range of suggestions.</p> <p>It is important that suggestions are related to the context of the question and are suggestions that a psychologist might potentially make (so should therefore be within ethical and legal guidelines).</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p> | 10 | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3 |
|-----|---|---|----|----------------------------|

**APPENDIX 3
GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION B PART (c) QUESTIONS**

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (10 marks)

| Level | Marks | Generic Mark Scheme (part c) | Guidance |
|-------|-------|--|---|
| 4 | 9–10 | Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. | Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. This might be because the advice comprises a range of different suggestions (e.g., three or more explained in context and with appropriate psychological rationale for them, e.g. names psychological research, concepts or theories or explicit appropriate psychological terminology). Alternatively, if taking a 'depth' approach, the answer would contain one application and rationale explained in detail, beyond that seen in standard, accurate responses. |
| 3 | 6–8 | Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. | A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). Advice put forward by the candidate will be related to the scenario in the question and there will be explicit and appropriate psychological rationale for the advice (e.g., named psychological research, concepts or theories or appropriate psychological terminology). It is clear what is being suggested (i.e., it is specific) and why it is being suggested. Candidates can take either a 'breadth' or 'depth' approach (e.g., the advice may comprise two or possibly even three suggestions, but it could equally well centre on one suggestion explained in detail). |
| 2 | 3–5 | Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may relate to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. | Answers can be in this band for a number of reasons. For example, the advice offered may not be related to the scenario in the question (i.e., it may be generic) or it may lack appropriate psychological rationale. It is unclear what is being suggested (i.e., what the precise advice is) or why it is being suggested. |
| 1 | 1–2 | Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: Responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. | Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., advice is offered but it is generic and has no psychological rationale behind it). |
| 0 | | No creditworthy response. | Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material. |

