
PSYCHOLOGY

9698/23

Paper 2 Core Studies 2

October/November 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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **11** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks												
1	Billington et al. (empathising and systemising) conducted a snapshot self-report study to investigate cognitive style and entry into physical sciences and humanities courses. An alternative way to investigate this would be to conduct a longitudinal study.													
1(a)	<p>Describe the features of the self-report method.</p> <p>Any five correct points</p> <p>Indicative content: Used to gain insight into the thoughts, beliefs and feelings of participants. Open/closed questions. Qualitative/quantitative data. Likert scale questions. Questionnaires/interviews Interviews can be structured/semi-structured.</p>	5												
1(b)	<p>Design an alternative investigation into cognitive style and entry into physical sciences and humanities courses as a longitudinal study, and describe how it could be conducted.</p> <p>Candidates should describe the <i>who, what, where</i> and <i>how</i>.</p> <p>Major omissions include the <i>when, what</i> and <i>how</i>. Candidates must describe the behaviour being measured (e.g. cognitive style and entry into physical sciences and humanities). Some details must be given of long the study is to indicate it is a longitudinal study OR an indication that it is investigating the development of behaviour over time. The response must also give an indication of how the data is collected from participant (e.g. through a number of interviews and/or cognitive style tests).</p> <p>Minor omissions include details of <i>who</i> and <i>where</i> and unclear details of <i>what</i> and <i>how</i> (e.g. questions asked, questionnaires used).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 1384 1300 1877"> <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 2+ minor omissions.</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 2+ minor omissions.	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	10
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 2+ minor omissions.	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>Evaluate this alternative way of studying cognitive style and entry into physical sciences and humanities courses in methodological and ethical terms.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time consuming Difficult to find a willing and suitable person to do the case study Generalisability of the sample Ecological validity Poor/strong validity due to data collection method chosen in the study Good reliability if highly controlled or poor reliability if lacking in controls Social desirability/demand characteristics as participants will know they are in a study and are likely to know the aim. Strengths and weaknesses of qualitative/quantitative data collected Researcher bias Difficulties in collecting data in a longitudinal study Participant attrition. Most likely to be ethical as participant agreed to be in the study. Any other appropriate point. <table border="1" data-bbox="331 1021 1299 1644"> <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 brief and 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 detailed point.</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 and 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 and 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 brief and specific to the investigation.	3–4	Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one detailed point.	5–6	Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological and an ethical issue.	7–8	Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological and 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 brief and specific to the investigation.	3–4													
Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one detailed point.	5–6													
Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological and an ethical issue.	7–8													
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points that cover both a methodological and an ethical issue.	9–10													

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Freud conducted a case study to investigate the Oedipus complex in little Hans.	
2(a)	<p>What is meant by the psychodynamic perspective?</p> <p>1 mark partial, 2 marks full.</p> <p>Indicative content: Unconscious mind The importance of dreams and fantasies The effect of childhood trauma on later psychological problems. Id, ego and super-ego. This perspective investigates the unconscious mind. – 1 mark. This perspective believes the unconscious mind has an impact on our behaviour. We can bury past experiences and this could come out in our dreams. – 2 marks.</p>	2
2(b)	<p>Describe <u>one</u> qualitative finding from the Freud study.</p> <p>1–2 marks partial, 3 marks full.</p> <p>Indicative content: Any finding from the Freud study will be relevant. Examples of the Oedipus complex. Giraffe fantasy or any other fantasy. Phobia of bath. Phobia of horses.</p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks												
2(c)	<p>Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of investigating the Oedipus complex using qualitative data, using examples from the Freud study.</p> <p>Appropriate strengths and weaknesses will be varied. These could include:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth • Useful • Holistic • Explanatory power. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot make comparisons • Can be open to interpreter bias • Cannot use statistical tests/analyse data/put in bar chart (only credit once) <p>Any other appropriate point</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 898 1302 1592"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 898 1166 999">No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative data.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 898 1302 999">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 999 1166 1066">Comment given but muddled and weak.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 999 1302 1066">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1066 1166 1263">Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation OR Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to qualitative data and investigation. (could be two strengths and/or two weaknesses on its own)</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1066 1302 1263">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1263 1166 1397">Consideration of two or more points (at least one strength and one weakness) which are clear and specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1263 1302 1397">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1397 1166 1498">Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are clear and specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1397 1302 1498">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1498 1166 1592">Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are good and directly relevant to the investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1498 1302 1592">9–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative data.	0	Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2	Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation OR Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to qualitative data 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 qualitative data.	0													
Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2													
Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation OR Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to qualitative data 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>Compare the psychodynamic perspective with <u>one</u> other approach/perspective in psychology, using studies as examples.</p> <p>Indicative content: Candidates may describe/evaluate perspectives and/or approaches with no comparison point. These candidates can achieve up to 4 marks maximum.</p> <p>Appropriate comments: Both are useful. Both are reductionist (or one is reductionist and the other holistic) Both do studies that can have good ecological validity (or one is good and the other is poor) Both are deterministic (or one is deterministic and the other shows free will) Time period when developed in psychology. Psychodynamic has a poor sample and the other approach/perspective may not or might have good generalisability.</p> <p>Any other appropriate comment.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 887 1302 1615"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 887 1166 952">No comment on comparison of perspective/approach.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 887 1302 952">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 952 1166 1016">Comment given but muddled and weak.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 952 1302 1016">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1016 1166 1149">Comparison of approaches but not specific to investigation(s) OR Consideration of comparisons of perspective/approach which is simplistic but specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1016 1302 1149">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1149 1166 1314">Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is simplistic but specific to investigation OR Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is detailed and specific to investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1149 1302 1314">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1314 1166 1514">Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is good but brief and specific to investigation. OR Consideration of one comparison issue which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the other issue is more simplistic.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1314 1302 1514">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1514 1166 1615">Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1514 1302 1615">9–10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No comment on comparison of perspective/approach.	0	Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2	Comparison of approaches but not specific to investigation(s) OR Consideration of comparisons of perspective/approach which is simplistic but specific to investigation.	3–4	Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is simplistic but specific to investigation OR Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is detailed and specific to investigation.	5–6	Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is good but brief and specific to investigation. OR Consideration of one comparison issue which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the other issue is more simplistic.	7–8	Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	9–10	10
No comment on comparison of perspective/approach.	0													
Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2													
Comparison of approaches but not specific to investigation(s) OR Consideration of comparisons of perspective/approach which is simplistic but specific to investigation.	3–4													
Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is simplistic but specific to investigation OR Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is detailed and specific to investigation.	5–6													
Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is good but brief and specific to investigation. OR Consideration of one comparison issue which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the other issue is more simplistic.	7–8													
Consideration of comparison of perspective/approach which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	9–10													

Question	Answer	Marks												
3(a)	<p>Outline what is meant by the term ‘ethical guideline’.</p> <p>1 mark partial, 2 marks full.</p> <p>Examples of ethical guidelines will receive 1 mark maximum. E.g. An ethical guideline is informed consent. – 1 mark Ethical guidelines are put in place by psychologists to protect participants in their studies (e.g. informed consent). – 2 marks</p>	2												
<p>Using the studies from the list below, answer the questions which follow:</p> <p>Held and Hein (kitten carousel) Rosenhan (sane in insane places) Schachter and Singer (emotion)</p>														
3(b)	<p>Describe how <u>one</u> ethical guideline was broken in each of these studies.</p> <p>Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):</p> <p>Held and Hein – Harm and distress or any issues relating to studies with animals. Issues like informed consent, right to withdraw are not relevant.</p> <p>Rosenhan – Any ethical issue related to the staff and patients in the hospitals (but not the pseudopatients) such as deception, lack of informed consent.</p> <p>Schachter and Singer – Harm and distress, deception, etc.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 1249 1300 1809"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="331 1249 1300 1317">For each study</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1317 1166 1384">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1317 1300 1384">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1384 1166 1518">Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about ethics from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1384 1300 1518">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1518 1166 1619">Description of point about ethics from the study. A clear description that may lack some detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1518 1300 1619">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1619 1166 1753">As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about ethics collected from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1619 1300 1753">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1753 1166 1809">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1753 1300 1809">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 ethics from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1	Description of point about ethics from the study. A clear description that may lack some detail.	2	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about ethics collected from the study. 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 ethics from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1													
Description of point about ethics from the study. A clear description that may lack some detail.	2													
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about ethics collected from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	3													
Max mark	9													

Question	Answer	Marks												
3(c)	<p>What are the advantages when psychologists follow ethical guidelines in their studies?</p> <p>Emphasis on advantages. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.</p> <p>Indicative content: Does not harm the participant Raises the status of psychology More people will want to participate in psychology studies in future</p> <p>Any other appropriate advantage.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 685 1302 1137"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="331 685 1166 748">Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.</th> <th data-bbox="1166 685 1302 748"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 748 1166 810">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 748 1302 810" style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 810 1166 873">Identification of advantage.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 810 1302 873" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 873 1166 976">Description of advantage related to ethics OR a weak description of advantage related to ethics.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 873 1302 976" style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 976 1166 1079">Description of advantage related to ethics and applied to the study effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 976 1302 1079" style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1079 1166 1137">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1079 1302 1137" style="text-align: center;">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.		No answer or incorrect answer.	0	Identification of advantage.	1	Description of advantage related to ethics OR a weak description of advantage related to ethics.	2	Description of advantage related to ethics and applied to the study effectively.	3	Max mark	9	9
Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.														
No answer or incorrect answer.	0													
Identification of advantage.	1													
Description of advantage related to ethics OR a weak description of advantage related to ethics.	2													
Description of advantage related to ethics and applied to the study effectively.	3													
Max mark	9													

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p>Outline what is meant by ‘ecological validity’ in psychology.</p> <p>1 mark partial, 2 marks full.</p> <p>Ecological validity is how realistic something is. – 1 mark Ecological validity is how realistic a piece of research is. How similar the situation is to everyday life. – 2 marks</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks												
<p>Using the studies from the list below, answer the questions which follow:</p> <p>Milgram (obedience) Loftus and Pickrell (false memories) Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans)</p>														
4(b)	<p>Describe how the data were collected in each of these studies.</p> <p>Milgram: How far up the shock generator was recorded, participants were videotaped and their behaviour and comments were recorded (e.g. seizure, sweating, etc.). Participants were given a 14 point scale to rate how painful the shocks were at the end of the study.</p> <p>Loftus and Pickrell: Qualitative data was gathered by reminding participants about four events from childhood and then asking them to recall as much as they could about these events. They were also asked to rate the clarity on a scale of 1 to 10, confidence on a scale of 1 to 5. They were then encouraged to remember as much as they could about these events and were then interviewed 1 to 2 weeks later.</p> <p>Piliavin et al.: The observers sat in the adjacent area of the subway and recorded quantitative data – gender and race of the helper, number of people on subway, time taken to help, etc. They also recorded comments made by the passengers during the study.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 1086 1302 1608"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="331 1086 1302 1151">For each study</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1151 1217 1216">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1217 1151 1302 1216">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1216 1217 1350">Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about data collection. The description may be very brief or muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1217 1216 1302 1350">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1350 1217 1451">Description of point about data collection from the study. A clear description that may lack some detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1217 1350 1302 1451">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1451 1217 1552">As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about data collection. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.</td> <td data-bbox="1217 1451 1302 1552">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1552 1217 1608">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1217 1552 1302 1608">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 data collection. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1	Description of point about data collection from the study. A clear description that may lack some detail.	2	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about data collection. 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 data collection. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1													
Description of point about data collection from the study. A clear description that may lack some detail.	2													
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about data collection. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	3													
Max mark	9													

Question	Answer	Marks												
4(c)	<p>What are the problems for psychologists in trying to conduct studies with ecological validity?</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 make a study realistic (good ecological validity). Difficult to avoid social desirability/demand characteristics. Quantitative data lacks detail. Unethical if studies are quite realistic, can be harmful to participants. Difficult to control extraneous/confounding variables. May be hard to replicate if very realistic.</p> <p>Or any other relevant problem.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 786 1302 1274"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="331 786 1166 851">Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.</th> <th data-bbox="1166 786 1302 851"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 851 1166 916">No answer or incorrect answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 851 1302 916">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 916 1166 981">Identification of problem.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 916 1302 981">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 981 1166 1115">Description of problem related to ecological validity OR a weak description of a problem related to ecological validity and applied to a study.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 981 1302 1115">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1115 1166 1211">Description of problem related to ecological validity and applied to the study effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1115 1302 1211">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 1211 1166 1274">Max mark</td> <td data-bbox="1166 1211 1302 1274">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.		No answer or incorrect answer.	0	Identification of problem.	1	Description of problem related to ecological validity OR a weak description of a problem related to ecological validity and applied to a study.	2	Description of problem related to ecological validity and applied to the study effectively.	3	Max mark	9	9
Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.														
No answer or incorrect answer.	0													
Identification of problem.	1													
Description of problem related to ecological validity OR a weak description of a problem related to ecological validity and applied to a study.	2													
Description of problem related to ecological validity and applied to the study effectively.	3													
Max mark	9													