

Mark schemes

Q1.**[AO3 = 2]****2 marks** for a clear and coherent evaluation of post-event discussion.**1 mark** for a muddled or limited evaluation.**Possible evaluation:**

- evidence to support/contradict the effects of post-event discussion, eg Gabbert (2003), Skagerberg & Wright (2008)
- some research into post-event discussion has taken place in a laboratory so may not reflect real life
- research into post-event discussion suggests that younger and older participants are more vulnerable to its effects.

Credit other relevant material eg implications for real life.

[2]**Q2.****[AO1 = 3 AO2 = 2 AO3 = 3]**

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of post-event discussion is accurate with some detail. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Knowledge of post-event discussion is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some appropriate application/effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Limited knowledge of post-event discussion is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any application/discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Knowledge of post-event discussion is very limited. Application/discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- witnesses may discuss what they have seen (with co-witnesses or other people)
- this may lead to contamination of memory/unreliable recall/false memory/confabulation reducing the accuracy of eyewitness testimony
- knowledge of relevant research studies
- conformity effect – witnesses copy others' accounts to win social approval
- source monitoring – distortion of memory occurs when alternative accounts are heard, creating confusion).

Possible application:

- 'I'm not sure we're going to be able to use her statement...', suggests that contamination of memory has occurred/the account is unreliable
- '...may have just been repeating what she heard from other witnesses', suggests post-event discussion has occurred
- the witness is unsure whether her account is genuine – source monitoring/confusion.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support or refute the explanation, eg Gabbert et al (2003) – 71% of participants mistakenly recalled aspects of an event they had picked up in a discussion
- effects of post-event discussion can be reduced if participants are warned of the effects, eg Bodner et al (2009)
- difficulty in distinguishing between explanations
- comparison with alternative factors, eg leading questions, anxiety.

Credit other relevant material.

Q3.**[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Description of how post-event discussion can affect eyewitness testimony is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1-2	Description of how post-event discussion can affect eyewitness testimony is evident but lacks clarity and/or detail. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- occurs when there is more than one witness to an event
- witnesses discuss what they have seen (with co-witnesses or other people)
- memory conformity, false memory, reconstruction, confabulation can occur
- information is added to a memory after the event has occurred
- information that is added may be misleading
- the accuracy of the witness's recall may be reduced
- false memories can be stimulated by misleading post-event discussion
- use of evidence to illustrate, eg Gabbert et al. (2003)
- effects of post-event discussion can be reduced if participants are warned of the effects (eg Bodner et al. 2009).

Credit other relevant content.

There may be a depth/breadth trade-off: one effect in detail or more than one effect in less detail.

[4]

Q4.**[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]**

Level	Marks	Description
4	13-16	Knowledge of research into the effects of anxiety on eyewitness testimony is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9-12	Knowledge of research into the effects of anxiety on eyewitness testimony is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5-8	Limited knowledge of research into the effects of anxiety on eyewitness testimony is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-4	Knowledge of research into the effects of anxiety on eyewitness testimony is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Note that 'research' refers to theories and/or studies of the effects of anxiety on EWT.

Possible content:

- knowledge of studies of the effects of anxiety on EWT, eg Johnson and Scott (1976), Yuille and Cutshall (1986), Deffenbacher, Christiansen and Hubinette, Loftus and Burns
- knowledge of theories/explanations that account for the effects of anxiety, eg weapon focus; tunnel theory
- the inverted U hypothesis (Yerkes-Dodson) – concept of optimal arousal
- understanding that anxiety/arousal may have an enhancing or deleterious effect upon the reliability of EWT.

Accept other valid points.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the effects of anxiety on EWT, eg Johnson and Scott (knife/pen) supports weapon focus/tunnel theory; Christiansen and Hubinette – higher anxiety, superior recall
- the element of surprise, rather than anxiety, may account for findings, eg Pickel (scissors, handgun, wallet, chicken)
- cognitive factors in recall may be more important than emotional factors

- methodological strengths and weaknesses of research into anxiety and EWT eg demand characteristics vs real life
- discussion of contradictory findings of lab vs more real-life investigations
- ethical issues associated with manipulation of anxiety in studies
- alternative explanations for (un)reliability of EWT, eg misleading information.

Accept other valid points.

[16]