

## Mark Scheme (Results)

May 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCE In Psychology (8PS0) PAPER 1: Social and Cognitive Psychology

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at <a href="https://www.edexcel.com">www.btec.co.uk</a>. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at <a href="https://www.edexcel.com/contactus">www.edexcel.com/contactus</a>.

## Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: <a href="https://www.pearson.com/uk">www.pearson.com/uk</a>

Summer 2018
Publications Code 8PS0\_01\_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## **General Marking Guidance**

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
1(a)	AO1 (1 mark)	(1)
	One mark for stating an aim of the study.	
	For example:	
	To investigate whether in-group and out-group conflict can be produced in groups with no prior relationships (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
1(b)	AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identifying a strength in terms of validity (AO1) One mark for justification of the strength (AO3)	
	For example:	
	The study has high ecological validity as it is representative of a real-life situation (1). Sherif et al. (1954/1961) used a Boy Scout camp in America which was realistic for the boys in the study (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
1(c)	AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identification of a weakness in terms of ethical issues (AO1)	
	One mark for justification of the weakness (AO3)	
	For example:	
	There was a risk of potential physical and/or psychological harm to participants (1) as the boys raided the camps of the other group which could have resulted in injury (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
2(a)	AO2 (2 marks)	(2)
	One mark for identification of each feature of the situation in relation to the scenario (AO2)	
	For example:	
	<ul> <li>The café manager would have been in close proximity to Anja increasing her obedience (1)</li> <li>Anja would follow instructions as she perceives the manager to have legitimate authority (1).</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	
	Answers must relate to the scenario.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
2(b)	AO2 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for application of gender to the scenario (AO2) One mark for justification of effect of gender (AO3)	
	For example:	
	<ul> <li>Anja is female, but her gender would not have affected her obedience to the café manager (1) because, as Milgram found, females show no difference to males in their levels of obedience to authority (1).</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(a)	AO2 (1 mark)	(1)
	One mark for correct calculation of the mean score	
	• 9.5	
	Reject all other answers.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
3(b)	AO2 (1 mark)	(1)
	One mark for correct calculation of the mode/modal score	
	• 17	
	Reject all other answers.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
3(c)	AO2 (3 marks)	(3)
	One mark for correct calculation of sum of squared values = 109.40 One mark for dividing the sum of squared values by 6 (n-1) = 18.23 One mark for calculating the square root = 4.27 to two decimal places Look for other reasonable marking points.	

AO1 (2 marks), AO3 (2 marks)  One mark for identification of each strength/weakness (AO1) One mark for justification of each strength/weakness (AO3)  For example:  Burger (2009)  Strength  Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods with each participant (1) these enabled researchers to retest the reliability of the procedure as each participant received standardised instructions (1).  Weakness  Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong answers, reducing task validity (1).  Reicher and Haslam (2006)  Strength  Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).  Weakness  The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).  Cohrs et al. (2012)  Strength  The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).  Weakness  The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).	Question Number	Answer	Mark
One mark for justification of each strength/weakness (AO3)  For example:  Burger (2009)  Strength  Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods with each participant (1) these enabled researchers to retest the reliability of the procedure as each participant received standardised instructions (1).  Weakness  Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong answers, reducing task validity (1).  Reicher and Haslam (2006)  Strength  Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).  Weakness  The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).  Cohrs et al. (2012)  Strength  The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).  Weakness  The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).		AO1 (2 marks), AO3 (2 marks)	(4)
Burger (2009)  Strength  Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods with each participant (1) these enabled researchers to retest the reliability of the procedure as each participant received standardised instructions (1).  Weakness Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong answers, reducing task validity (1).  Reicher and Haslam (2006)  Strength Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).  Weakness The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).  Cohrs et al. (2012)  Strength The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).  Weakness The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).			
Strength  • Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods with each participant (1) these enabled researchers to retest the reliability of the procedure as each participant received standardised instructions (1).  Weakness  • Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong answers, reducing task validity (1).  Reicher and Haslam (2006)  Strength  • Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).  Weakness  • The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).  Cohrs et al. (2012)  Strength  • The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).  Weakness  • The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).		For example:	
Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods with each participant (1) these enabled researchers to retest the reliability of the procedure as each participant received standardised instructions (1).  Weakness Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong answers, reducing task validity (1).  Reicher and Haslam (2006)  Strength Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).  Weakness The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).  Cohrs et al. (2012)  Strength The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).  Weakness The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).		Burger (2009)	
<ul> <li>Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong answers, reducing task validity (1).</li> <li>Reicher and Haslam (2006)</li> <li>Strength         <ul> <li>Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Weakness         <ul> <li>The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Cohrs et al. (2012)</li> <li>Strength         <ul> <li>The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Weakness         <ul> <li>The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods with each participant (1) these enabled researchers to retest the reliability of the procedure as each participant received standardised</li> </ul>	
Strength  Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).  Weakness  The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).  Cohrs et al. (2012)  Strength  The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).  Weakness  The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).		<ul> <li>Participants were asked to electrocute a learner for incorrect responses to questions (1) which is a task that lacks mundane realism as people would not normally electrocute people for wrong</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or distress to the participants and achieved BPS approval (1).</li> <li>Weakness         <ul> <li>The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Cohrs et al. (2012)         <ul> <li>Strength</li> <li>The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Weakness         <ul> <li>The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Reicher and Haslam (2006)	
<ul> <li>The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they perceived the experimenter desired (1).</li> <li>Cohrs et al. (2012)</li> <li>Strength         <ul> <li>The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Weakness         <ul> <li>The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Participants for the study underwent medical checks before taking part and warned that the study may be stressful (1) this improved the ethics of the study by considering how to prevent harm or</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Strength         <ul> <li>The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Weakness         <ul> <li>The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul> <li>The prisoners and guards were fully aware that their behaviours were being observed and recorded (1) this may have created demand characteristics leading to participants behaving as they</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest the standardised questions increasing the reliability (1).</li> <li>Weakness</li> <li>The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).</li> </ul>		Cohrs et al. (2012)	
The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how well the results can represent the reasons for prejudice (1).		The prejudice questionnaire was standardised and all participants received the same questionnaire (1) so the researchers can retest	
Look for other reasonable marking points		<ul> <li>The use of closed questions about prejudice excludes participants from explaining their answers (1) this reduces the validity of how</li> </ul>	
Look for other reasonable marking points.		Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(a)	AO2 (1 mark)	(1)
	One mark for a question used to gather qualitative data (open question) in relation to social psychology practical investigation.	
	For example:	
	Describe an example of one situation where you have followed the instructions of someone in authority (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Answers must relate to the social practical.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
5(b)	AO2 (2 marks)	(2)
	Up to <b>two</b> marks for description of qualitative data analysis in relation to social psychology practical investigation.	
	For example:	
	<ul> <li>We identified themes in the answers given in open responses to questions about obedience from our questionnaire (1) such as phrases indicating obedience, for example 'follow rules', or resistance to obedience, for example 'my choice' (1).</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Answers must relate to the social practical.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	

Question	Indicative Content	Mark
Number		
6	AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks)	(8)
	<ul> <li>Social identity theory explains prejudice as a result of in-groups and out-groups.</li> <li>People experience social categorisation where they decide which group they belong to.</li> <li>Social comparison is perceiving the in-group as better than the out-group.</li> <li>Social identification is when the individual behaves in accordance with the norms and values of a group.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Evidence from Tajfel (1970) supports that prejudice comes from in-group favouritism.</li> <li>However, Sherif et al. (1954/1961) claimed prejudice was a result of inter-group conflict, not social comparison.</li> <li>The theory is applicable to society as it can be used to reduce prejudice, such as using common in groups.</li> <li>Adorno et al. (1950) used an F-scale questionnaire and found authoritarian personalities are more likely to be prejudice regardless of group belonging.</li> <li>Look for other reasonable marking points.</li> </ul>	

Level	Mark	Descriptor		
Can	AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks)  Candidates must demonstrate an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding vs evaluation/conclusion in their answer.			
	0	No rewardable material.		
Level 1	1-2	Demonstrates isolated elements of knowledge and understanding. (AO1)		
	Marks	A conclusion may be presented, but will be generic and the supporting evidence will be limited. Limited attempt to address the question. (AO3)		
Level 2	3-4	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1)		
	Marks	Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material, leading to a superficial conclusion being made. (AO3)		
Level 3	5-6	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1)		
	Marks	Arguments developed using mostly coherent chains of reasoning. leading to a conclusion being presented. Candidates will demonstrate a grasp of competing arguments but evaluation may be imbalanced. (AO3)		
Level 4	7-8 Marks	Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding. (AO1)		
		Displays a well-developed and logical evaluation, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments, presenting a balanced conclusion. (AO3)		

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
7(a)	AO1 (2 marks)	(2)
	Up to <b>two</b> marks for description of episodic memory	
	For example;	
	Episodic memory is of experiences and events that happen to a person (1) so it is like a mental diary of someone's life (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(b)	AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identification of strength (AO1) One mark for justification of strength (AO3)	
	For example:	
	<ul> <li>Episodic and semantic memory has supporting evidence for consisting of two distinct stores (1) from brain damage patients such as KC (Rosenbaum et al. 2005) who could not make or recall episodic memories, but could recall semantic facts and information (1).</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8(a)	AO2 (2 marks)	(2)
	Up to <b>two</b> marks for description in relation to the scenario	
	<ul><li>For example;</li><li>Participants may have had a prior schema of a fairy tale about</li></ul>	
	princesses (1) which would mean they replaced parts of the story with content from fairy tales they had previously read (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	
	Answers must relate to the scenario.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
8(b)	AO2 (1 mark)	(1)
	One mark for correct calculation of the range	
	• 9	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8(c)	AO2 (1 mark)	(1)
	<ul><li>One mark for correct calculation of the ratio of male to female participants</li><li>2:1</li></ul>	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8(d)	AO2 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identification of an improvement to the study (AO2) One mark for justification of the improvement (AO3)	
	George could use a larger sample of participants from locations other than the university (1) this would improve the representativeness of the participants to increase generalisability to a wider population (1)	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	
	Answers must relate to the scenario.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
8(e)	AO2 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identification of an appropriate conclusion for George's study (AO2)	
	One mark for justification of conclusion (AO3)	
	<ul> <li>Females have a more accurate recall for stories than males (1) as females make an average of 2.93 less recall errors than males (1)</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(a)	AO1 (1 mark)	(1)
	One mark for a definition of objectivity	
	Objectivity is being neutral and unbiased when collecting and interpreting research data in psychology (1)	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(b)	AO2 (4 marks)	(4)
	Up to <b>four</b> marks for appropriate field experiment procedure.	
	<ul> <li>The field experiment could be undertaken using a sample of ten schools with children aged nine (1). A teacher could project a standardised story on the board for the children to copy down (1). You could measure the time it takes each child to complete the task (1). Informed consent would need to be obtained from the parents of the children in the class (1).</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	
	Generic answers score 0 marks.	
	Answers must relate to the scenario.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10(a)	AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identification of strength (AO1) One mark for justification of strength (AO3)	
	Baddeley (1966b) used a standardised procedure, including standardised recorded/visual word lists (1) this allowed for replication of the study to retest the results which increases the reliability of the findings (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question	Answer	Mark
Number		
10(b)	AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)	(2)
	One mark for identification of weakness (AO1) One mark for justification of weakness (AO3)	
	Baddeley (1966b) used a word list recall task as a test of memory processing (1). This lacks validity as it does not represent the way in which memory is used for day-to-day functioning (1).	
	Look for other reasonable marking points.	

Question	Answer		
Number			
11	AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks)	(8)	
	<ul> <li>The multi-store model includes the sensory register, short-term memory store and long-term memory store.</li> <li>Atkinson and Shiffrin (1968) explain that rehearsal is necessary for transfer from short-term memory to long-term memory.</li> <li>The short term memory is claimed to be limited in duration and capacity.</li> <li>The model is a linear input-process-output model.</li> <li>AO3</li> <li>It is not a comprehensive model of memory as it ignores the complexities of processing like the separate stores in LTM proposed by Tulving (1972).</li> <li>The case of HM supports the idea of separate stores as he had a functioning STM and LTM but could not make new LTM memories.</li> <li>Peterson and Peterson (1959) and Miller (1956) provide supporting evidence that short term memory is limited.</li> <li>Describing memory as an input-process-output system is over simplistic and ignores individual differences in memory.</li> <li>Look for other reasonable marking points.</li> </ul>		

Level	Mark	Descriptor				
AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks) Candidates must demonstrate an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding vs evaluation/conclusion in their answer.						
	0	No rewardable material.				
Level 1	1-2 Marks	Demonstrates isolated elements of knowledge and understanding. (AO1)				
		A conclusion may be presented, but will be generic and the supporting evidence will be limited. Limited attempt to address the question. (AO3)				
Level 2	3-4 Marks	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material, leading to a superficial conclusion being made. (AO3)				
Level 3	5-6 Marks	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Arguments developed using mostly coherent chains of reasoning. leading to a conclusion being presented. Candidates will demonstrate a grasp of competing arguments but evaluation may be imbalanced. (AO3)				
Level 4	7-8 Marks	Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding. (AO1)				
		Displays a well-developed and logical evaluation, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments, presenting a balanced conclusion. (AO3)				

Question Number	Answer		
12	AO1 (6 marks), AO3 (6 marks)	(12)	
	<ul> <li>Blind obedience needs to be reduced to prevent atrocities such as genocide from occurring.</li> <li>Soldiers have claimed their actions have been a result of following the orders of their superiors in times of conflict, for example Rwanda.</li> <li>An in-group and out-group formation between the opposite sides in a war/conflict which can escalate to genocide in extreme cases such the Rwanda/WWII/Vietnam.</li> <li>Dyslexia can be explained through working memory model and the lower processing speeds of children, which means they struggle in education.</li> <li>Cognitive psychologists have been able to provide suggestions for classroom interventions, such as teaching styles and direct interventions to improve academic outcomes for children with dyslexia.</li> <li>Knowledge of memory has helped create practical, specific interventions such as Cogmed to improve the working memory of people with dyslexia.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Milgram (1963) demonstrated that the legitimacy of an authority figure was a key feature in obedience, which helps explain why soldiers obey their chain of command, which can help with training soldiers.</li> <li>Children may have been socialised to obey and follow instructions, such as Hitler's youth, from an early age, so research can be useful for explaining issues.</li> <li>Tajfel and Turner's (1986) social identity theory explained how differences can lead to prejudice, therefore aiding understanding of social groups in war/conflict.</li> <li>Deficits in central executive processing have been found in people with dyslexia (Sela, 2012), so research can provide effective guidance in education.</li> <li>Alloway et al. (2013) provide supporting evidence that cognitive interventions can help improve working memory scores which is a useful application of research.</li> <li>Cognitive interventions assume working memory is a key feature of Dyslexia and ignore other explanations for the disorder, so they may not be useful in explaining key questions.</li> <li>Look for other reasonable marking points.</li> </ul>		

Level	Mark	Descriptor				
AO1 (6 marks), AO3 (6 marks)  Candidates must demonstrate an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding vs judgement/conclusion in their answer.						
	0	No rewardable material.				
Level 1	1–3 Marks	Demonstrates isolated elements of knowledge and understanding. (AO1) A judgement/decision may be presented, but will be generic and the supporting evidence will be limited. Limited attempt to address the question. (AO3)				
Level 2	4–6 Marks	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material leading to a judgement/decision being presented. Candidates will demonstrate a grasp of competing arguments but response may be imbalanced. (AO3)				
Level 3	7–9 Marks	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Displays a mostly developed and logical argument, containing mostly coherent chains of reasoning. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments, presenting a judgement/decision which may be imbalanced. (AO3)				
Level 4	10-12 Marks	Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Displays a well-developed and logical argument, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments and presents a balanced response, leading to an effective, nuanced and balanced judgement/decision. (AO3)				