

---

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**9698/23**

Paper 2 Core Studies 2

**May/June 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

---

**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 document consists of **14** 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(a)	<p><b>Haney, Banks and Zimbardo conducted a simulation study on social roles in a mock prison environment. An alternative way to collect data about social roles would be to use the self-report method in real prisons.</b></p> <p><b>Describe the features of the self-report method in psychology.</b></p> <p>Any five correct points 1 mark for each point up to a maximum of five points.</p> <p>Indicative content: Used to gain insight into the thoughts, beliefs and feelings of participants Open questions Closed questions Qualitative data Quantitative data Likert scale questions Questionnaire Interviews Interviews can be structured/semi-structured.</p> <p>Any other appropriate point.</p> <p>No marks are awarded for evaluation of self-reports.</p>	5

Question	Answer	Marks												
1(b)	<p><b>Design an alternative investigation on social roles in real prisons using the self-report method and describe how it could be conducted.</b></p> <p>Candidates will most likely describe either an interview and/or questionnaire.</p> <p>Candidates need to describe the ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘how’.</p> <p>Major omissions include the ‘what’ and ‘how’. Candidates must describe some of the questions asked and at least an indication of how this information would be collected (e.g. interview/questionnaire). There must be an indication that it is being done in a real prison.</p> <p>Minor omission includes ‘who’.</p> <p>It is possible to achieve 9 marks with a small minor omission (e.g. sampling method or unclear questions).</p> <p>Unethical procedure, max 4 marks (e.g. replication of Zimbardo).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 887 1331 1252"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Alternative study is incomprehensible.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative study is muddled and impossible to conduct.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative study is muddled but possible and/or there are major omissions.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative study is clear with a few minor omissions and possible.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative study is described with one minor omission and in some detail.</td> <td>7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative study is described in sufficient detail to be replicable.</td> <td>9–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Alternative study is incomprehensible.	0	Alternative study is muddled and impossible to conduct.	1–2	Alternative study is muddled but possible and/or there are major omissions.	3–4	Alternative study is clear with a few minor omissions and possible.	5–6	Alternative study is described with one minor omission and in some detail.	7–8	Alternative study is described in sufficient detail to be replicable.	9–10	<b>10</b>
Alternative study is incomprehensible.	0													
Alternative study is muddled and impossible to conduct.	1–2													
Alternative study is muddled but possible and/or there are major omissions.	3–4													
Alternative study is clear with a few minor omissions and possible.	5–6													
Alternative study is described with one minor omission and in some detail.	7–8													
Alternative study is described in sufficient detail to be replicable.	9–10													

Question	Answer	Marks												
1(c)	<p><b>Evaluate this alternative way of studying social roles in methodological and ethical terms.</b></p> <p>Candidates need to consider a number of points regarding their study. These points can be positive and/or negative.</p> <p>Appropriate points could include a discussion about:            Ethics of self-report or anything specific to their study,            Demand characteristics/social desirability,            Qualitative/quantitative data or data collection method,            researcher bias,            Generalisability of the sample,            Reliability of data collection method,            Validity of data collection method,            Difficulty in participants misunderstanding questions or researcher misunderstanding the responses of the participants.</p> <p>Any other appropriate point.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 887 1326 1420"> <tbody> <tr> <td>No evaluation.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation is muddled and weak.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation is simplistic and not specific to the investigation. May include one point that is somewhat detailed but specific to the investigation.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one point that is detailed and specific to the investigation.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological <b>and</b> an ethical issue.</td> <td>7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological <b>and</b> an ethical issue.</td> <td>9–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No evaluation.	0	Evaluation is muddled and weak.	1–2	Evaluation is simplistic and not specific to the investigation. May include one point that is somewhat detailed but specific to the investigation.	3–4	Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one point that is detailed and specific to the investigation.	5–6	Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological <b>and</b> an ethical issue.	7–8	Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological <b>and</b> an ethical issue.	9–10	10
No evaluation.	0													
Evaluation is muddled and weak.	1–2													
Evaluation is simplistic and not specific to the investigation. May include one point that is somewhat detailed but specific to the investigation.	3–4													
Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one point that is detailed and specific to the investigation.	5–6													
Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological <b>and</b> an ethical issue.	7–8													
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological <b>and</b> an ethical issue.	9–10													
2(a)	<p><b>Loftus and Pickrell conducted a study to investigate the formation of false memories.</b></p> <p><b>What is meant by the ‘cognitive approach’ in psychology?</b></p> <p>1 mark partial 2 marks full</p> <p>The cognitive approach is the study of thinking. – 1 mark            The cognitive approach is about understanding thinking processes/information processing and the effect these have on behaviour. – 2 marks</p> <p>Answers which describe the different types of cognitive processes investigated (e.g. language, memory, perception) are also creditworthy.            Appropriate answers could include assumptions of the cognitive approach.</p>	2												

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Explain why the Loftus and Pickrell study is an example of the cognitive approach.</b></p> <p>1–2 marks partial 3 marks full</p> <p>Indicative content: The study is about memory/false memories – 1 mark The study is about creating a false memory in the participants and the cognitive approach studies memory – 2 marks The study attempts to create a false memory as the participant may believe this has really happened to them due to their family member reporting the memory. This shows that a false memory can be created. – 3 marks</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks												
2(c)	<p><b>Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the cognitive approach using the Loftus and Pickrell study as an example.</b></p> <p>Appropriate strengths and weaknesses will be varied. These could include:</p> <p><b>Strengths</b> Useful. As research is often in a lab accept any strengths connected to lab experiments. e.g. control, ecological validity, reliability More scientific/objective Nomothetic – assumes all cognitive processes are the same (could be argued this is a weakness as it ignores individual differences). Explanatory power. Can show development of cognitive behaviours (e.g. the development of a false memory through the use of a study over a number of weeks). Tends to be ethical as the studies just look at cognitions (such as a false memory) that don't do anything particularly harmful to the participants.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses</b> Any weaknesses of laboratory experiments, e.g. lacks ecological validity. Difficult to ensure everything is exactly the same for each participant. If too artificial can give way to demand characteristics. As collects data via self-report in order to access cognitions these can produce socially desirable responses. Reductionist. Deterministic. Difficult to measure as cannot see inside the cognitive workings of the participant (may link this to self-report data). Approach may involve studies that take place over a number of weeks in order to look for the development of a cognition. These can be time consuming.</p> <p>Any other appropriate points.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1391 1331 1995"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1391 1235 1473">No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of cognitive approach.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1391 1331 1473">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1473 1235 1525">Comment given but muddled and weak.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1473 1331 1525">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1525 1235 1742">Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation <b>OR</b> Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to cognitive approach and investigation (could be two strengths and/or two weaknesses on its own)</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1525 1331 1742">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1742 1235 1825">Consideration of two or more points (at least one strength and one weakness) which are clear and specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1742 1331 1825">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1825 1235 1908">Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are clear and specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1825 1331 1908">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1908 1235 1995">Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are good and directly relevant to the investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1908 1331 1995">9–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of cognitive approach.	0	Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2	Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation <b>OR</b> Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to cognitive approach and investigation (could be two strengths and/or two weaknesses on its own)	3–4	Consideration of two or more points (at least one strength and one weakness) which are clear and specific to investigation.	5–6	Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are clear and specific to investigation.	7–8	Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are good and directly relevant to the investigation.	9–10	10
No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of cognitive approach.	0													
Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2													
Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation <b>OR</b> Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to cognitive approach and investigation (could be two strengths and/or two weaknesses on its own)	3–4													
Consideration of two or more points (at least one strength and one weakness) which are clear and specific to investigation.	5–6													
Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are clear and specific to investigation.	7–8													
Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are good and directly relevant to the investigation.	9–10													

Question	Answer	Marks												
2(d)	<p><b>Discuss the extent to which the Loftus and Pickrell study is ecologically valid.</b></p> <p>Appropriate points will be varied. These could include:</p> <p>High ecological validity due to: The participants believed the story of being lost in the mall was given by a family member. The other three stories were real.</p> <p>Low ecological validity due to: Interviews with the researchers. Writing about the memories. Rating scales.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 752 1331 1489"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 752 1235 804">No comment on ecological validity.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 752 1331 804">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 804 1235 855">Comment given but muddled and weak.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 804 1331 855">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 855 1235 1005">Comment on ecological validity which is not specific to the investigation <b>OR</b> consideration of ecological validity which is simplistic but specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 855 1331 1005">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1005 1235 1189">Consideration of ecological validity is simplistic but specific to investigation and somewhat detailed. This could include one detailed point. <b>OR</b> Consideration of ecological validity which is detailed but not specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1005 1331 1189">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1189 1235 1373">Consideration of ecological validity is good but brief (2 or more points) and specific to investigation. <b>OR</b> Consideration of ecological validity with one issue which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the other issue(s) is more simplistic. (2 or more points in some detail).</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1189 1331 1373">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1373 1235 1489">Consideration of ecological validity (2 or more points) which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. (2 or more points in some detail).</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1373 1331 1489">9–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No comment on ecological validity.	0	Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2	Comment on ecological validity which is not specific to the investigation <b>OR</b> consideration of ecological validity which is simplistic but specific to investigation.	3–4	Consideration of ecological validity is simplistic but specific to investigation and somewhat detailed. This could include one detailed point. <b>OR</b> Consideration of ecological validity which is detailed but not specific to investigation.	5–6	Consideration of ecological validity is good but brief (2 or more points) and specific to investigation. <b>OR</b> Consideration of ecological validity with one issue which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the other issue(s) is more simplistic. (2 or more points in some detail).	7–8	Consideration of ecological validity (2 or more points) which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. (2 or more points in some detail).	9–10	10
No comment on ecological validity.	0													
Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2													
Comment on ecological validity which is not specific to the investigation <b>OR</b> consideration of ecological validity which is simplistic but specific to investigation.	3–4													
Consideration of ecological validity is simplistic but specific to investigation and somewhat detailed. This could include one detailed point. <b>OR</b> Consideration of ecological validity which is detailed but not specific to investigation.	5–6													
Consideration of ecological validity is good but brief (2 or more points) and specific to investigation. <b>OR</b> Consideration of ecological validity with one issue which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the other issue(s) is more simplistic. (2 or more points in some detail).	7–8													
Consideration of ecological validity (2 or more points) which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. (2 or more points in some detail).	9–10													



Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Outline what is meant by the ‘individual differences approach’ in psychology.</b></p> <p>1 mark partial, 2 marks full</p> <p>This means where differences between people are identified. – 1 mark.</p> <p>This shows how all of us are unique in terms of our personality and our behaviour. – 2 marks.</p> <p>1 mark awarded for what is meant by individual differences (e.g. we are all unique) and the effect this could have on behaviour – 2nd mark.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>1 mark awarded for what is meant by individual differences (e.g. we are all unique) and an example of this ‘uniqueness’ (e.g. BDD behaviours) – 2nd mark</p> <p>Appropriate answers could include assumptions of the individual differences approach.</p>	<b>2</b>

Question	Answer	Marks												
<p><b>Using the studies from the list below, answer the questions which follow:</b></p> <p><b>Rosenhan (sane in insane places)</b>  <b>Veale and Riley (mirror gazing)</b>  <b>Billington et al. (empathising and systemising)</b></p>														
3(b)	<p><b>Describe the behaviours investigated in each of these studies.</b></p> <p><b>Rosenhan:</b> Investigated diagnosis of mental health. Diagnoses of the pseudopatients were recorded. While in the hospitals pseudopatients wrote in their diaries about the behaviour witnessed of both staff and patients in the hospitals. They recorded the behaviour of the staff and patients. Accept any appropriate behaviour described such as the treatment of other patients by staff, the comments made to the pseudopatients during their stay, description of events that led up to the diagnosis of oral acquisitive syndrome, number of pills given and discarded, results of request to be released, etc.</p> <p><b>Veale and Riley:</b> Investigated BDD. Investigated beliefs and behaviours in front of the mirror e.g. types of surfaces used, gazing time, thoughts during gazing, etc.</p> <p><b>Billington et al:</b> Subject choice at university, empathising and systemising were measured via the SQ and EQ. Intelligence was measured as well autism/AS features via IQ test and eyes test. Also used FC-EFT.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="301 1084 1331 1554"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="301 1084 1331 1133">For each study</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1133 1235 1182">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1133 1331 1182"><b>0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1182 1235 1301">Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about behaviours investigated. The description may be very brief or muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1182 1331 1301"><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1301 1235 1388">Description of point about behaviours investigated. (Comment with lack of understanding). A clear description that may lack some detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1301 1331 1388"><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1388 1235 1503">As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about behaviours investigated from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1388 1331 1503"><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1503 1235 1554">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1503 1331 1554"><b>9</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	For each study		No answer or incorrect answer.	<b>0</b>	Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about behaviours investigated. The description may be very brief or muddled.	<b>1</b>	Description of point about behaviours investigated. (Comment with lack of understanding). A clear description that may lack some detail.	<b>2</b>	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about behaviours investigated from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	<b>3</b>	Max mark	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
For each study														
No answer or incorrect answer.	<b>0</b>													
Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about behaviours investigated. The description may be very brief or muddled.	<b>1</b>													
Description of point about behaviours investigated. (Comment with lack of understanding). A clear description that may lack some detail.	<b>2</b>													
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about behaviours investigated from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	<b>3</b>													
Max mark	<b>9</b>													

Question	Answer	Marks												
3(c)	<p><b>What problems may psychologists have when they try to investigate individual differences?</b></p> <p>Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.</p> <p>Indicative content:            Often unethical as participants are vulnerable (e.g. have mental health problems).            May have to ask quite intrusive questions.            Demand characteristics.            Social desirability.            Difficult to make studies ecologically valid.            Validity of measures used to collect data.            Difficult to make general conclusions about human behaviour.            Study lacks generalisability.            Problems with self-report when studying individual differences – the participant may not want to discuss what is really going on – lacks validity.            Longitudinal (using Thigpen and Cleckley/Freud as the example).            Allow case studies as these are often used for individual differences (using Thigpen and Cleckley/Freud as the example).</p> <p>Or any other relevant problem.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1055 1331 1453"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1055 1331 1104"><b>Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1104 1235 1153">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1104 1331 1153"><b>0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1153 1235 1202">Identification of problem.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1153 1331 1202"><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1202 1235 1323">Description of problem related to individual differences <b>OR</b> a weak description of a problem related to individual differences and applied to a study.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1202 1331 1323"><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1323 1235 1408">Description of problem related to individual differences and applied to the study effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1323 1331 1408"><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1408 1235 1453">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1408 1331 1453"><b>9</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.</b>		No answer or incorrect answer.	<b>0</b>	Identification of problem.	<b>1</b>	Description of problem related to individual differences <b>OR</b> a weak description of a problem related to individual differences and applied to a study.	<b>2</b>	Description of problem related to individual differences and applied to the study effectively.	<b>3</b>	Max mark	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.</b>														
No answer or incorrect answer.	<b>0</b>													
Identification of problem.	<b>1</b>													
Description of problem related to individual differences <b>OR</b> a weak description of a problem related to individual differences and applied to a study.	<b>2</b>													
Description of problem related to individual differences and applied to the study effectively.	<b>3</b>													
Max mark	<b>9</b>													

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p><b>Outline what is meant by the term ‘generalisations’ in psychology.</b></p> <p>1 mark partial, 2 marks full</p> <p>Generalisations are possible where the study is realistic <b>or</b> has a good sample – 1 mark  The extent to which the situation in the study is realistic – 1 mark  Conclusions that can be applied beyond the sample <b>or</b> setting tested = 2 marks</p> <p>Generalisations are possible where the setting is realistic <b>and</b> can be applied to other settings. = 2 marks  The extent to which one group’s results can be applied to the general/target population – 2 marks.</p> <p>The candidate needs to outline the fact that this refers to the application of the results outside of the specific setting and/or sample in the specific study in order to achieve 2 marks.</p>	<b>2</b>

Question	Answer	Marks												
<p><b>Using the studies from the list below, answer the questions which follow:</b></p> <p><b>Mann et al. (lying)</b>  <b>Held and Hein (kitten carousel)</b>  <b>Schachter and Singer (emotion)</b></p>														
4(b)	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> generalisation that can be made from each of these studies.</b></p> <p><b>Mann et al.:</b> Lying behaviours generally vary a lot across people, however two lying behaviours seem to be fairly consistent. These include making less eye contact and having longer pauses. Increase in pauses and decreases in blinking when lying.</p> <p><b>Held and Hein:</b> All kittens/animals/people require movement in order to achieve depth perception. The passive kittens moved randomly in the visual cliff test but when allowed to move freely they then moved to the shallow side showing they had learned depth perception.</p> <p><b>Schachter and Singer:</b> Generalisations made about the two factor theory of emotion. Participants based their emotions on the situation they were in (euphoric or angry) if they were not given a physiological explanation for the physical feelings (e.g. increased heart rate) they had experienced. Can generalise this to other situations and/or people.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="301 1050 1331 1554"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="301 1050 1331 1099">For each study</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1099 1235 1151">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1099 1331 1151">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1151 1235 1267">Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about generalisation. The description may be very brief or muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1151 1331 1267">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1267 1235 1388">Description of point about generalisation from the study. (Comment with lack of understanding). A clear description that may lack some detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1267 1331 1388">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1388 1235 1503">As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about generalisation. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1388 1331 1503">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="301 1503 1235 1554">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1503 1331 1554">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	For each study		No answer or incorrect answer.	0	Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about generalisation. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1	Description of point about generalisation from the study. (Comment with lack of understanding). A clear description that may lack some detail.	2	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about generalisation. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	3	Max mark	9	9
For each study														
No answer or incorrect answer.	0													
Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about generalisation. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1													
Description of point about generalisation from the study. (Comment with lack of understanding). A clear description that may lack some detail.	2													
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about generalisation. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	3													
Max mark	9													

Question	Answer	Marks												
4(c)	<p><b>What are the problems when making generalisations from psychological research?</b></p> <p>Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.</p> <p>Indicative content:            Difficult to get a varied sample.            Difficult to make studies high in ecological validity without sacrificing control.            Temporal validity (generalisations could be accurate in one time period and this changes as time changes).            Ethnocentric nature of psychological research.            Problems with reliability such as control, extraneous variables, etc.            Problems with validity such as demand characteristics, social desirability, etc.</p> <p>Any other appropriate problem.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 819 1331 1218"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="304 819 1331 869">Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 869 1235 918">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 869 1331 918" style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 918 1235 967">Brief description of problem.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 918 1331 967" style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 967 1235 1086">Description of problem related to making generalisations OR a weak description of problem related to making generalisations and applied to a study.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 967 1331 1086" style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1086 1235 1171">Description of problem related to making generalisations and applied to the study effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1086 1331 1171" style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1171 1235 1218">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1171 1331 1218" style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.		No answer or incorrect answer.	<b>0</b>	Brief description of problem.	<b>1</b>	Description of problem related to making generalisations OR a weak description of problem related to making generalisations and applied to a study.	<b>2</b>	Description of problem related to making generalisations and applied to the study effectively.	<b>3</b>	Max mark	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.														
No answer or incorrect answer.	<b>0</b>													
Brief description of problem.	<b>1</b>													
Description of problem related to making generalisations OR a weak description of problem related to making generalisations and applied to a study.	<b>2</b>													
Description of problem related to making generalisations and applied to the study effectively.	<b>3</b>													
Max mark	<b>9</b>													