

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
in Psychology (6PS01/01) Paper 1

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

[www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus)

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6PS01\_01\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## General Guidance on Marking

All candidates must receive the same treatment.

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for incorrect or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing correct application of principles and knowledge.

Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even if it is not what is expected it may be worthy of credit.

Candidates must make their meaning clear to the examiner to gain the mark. Make sure that the answer makes sense. Do not give credit for correct words/phrases which are put together in a meaningless manner. Answers must be in the correct context.

Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the Team Leader must be consulted.

### Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

- an idea of the types of response expected
- how individual marks are to be awarded
- the total mark for each question
- examples of responses that should NOT receive credit.

- 1 / means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.
- 2 ( ) means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.
- 3 [ ] words inside square brackets are instructions or guidance for examiners.
- 4 Phrases/words in **bold** indicate that the meaning of the phrase or the actual word is **essential** to the answer.
- 5 ecf/TE/cq (error carried forward) means that a wrong answer given in an earlier part of a question is used correctly in answer to a later part of the same question.

### Quality of Written Communication

Questions which involve the writing of continuous prose will expect candidates to:

- show clarity of expression
- construct and present coherent arguments
- demonstrate an effective use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Full marks will be awarded if the candidate has demonstrated the above abilities.

Questions where QWC is likely to be particularly important are indicated "QWC" in the mark scheme BUT this does not preclude others.

## Section A

Question Number	Question	
1	In Milgram's (1963) original study, how many participants took part in the experiment?	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> 30 <b>B</b> <b>40</b> <b>C</b> 50 <b>D</b> 60	<b>(1 A01)</b>

Question Number	Question	
2	Forgetting could be described as:	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> Problems with interpreting information <b>B</b> Having the correct environmental cues at retrieval <b>C</b> Having the correct state cues at retrieval <b>D</b> <b>Problems with accessing information</b>	<b>(1 A01)</b>

Question Number	Question	
3	Which type of experimental design allows for the same participants to take part in all experimental conditions?	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> <b>Repeated measures</b> <b>B</b> Independent groups <b>C</b> Laboratory experiment <b>D</b> Field experiment	<b>(1 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
4	Levels of processing framework was proposed by:	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> Tulving et al <b>B Craik &amp; Lockhart</b> <b>C</b> Godden & Baddeley <b>D</b> Tajfel et al	<b>(1 A01)</b>

Question Number	Question	
5	Which one of the following strategies can be used to deal with order effects?	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A Randomisation</b> <b>B</b> Operationalisation <b>C</b> Dispersion <b>D</b> Generalisation	<b>(1 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
6	Rebecca is planning an experiment on Social Psychology. To avoid demand characteristics, she did not tell the participants the truth about the aim of her research. This is called:	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> Informed consent <b>B</b> Confidentiality <b>C</b> Right to withdraw <b>D Deception</b>	<b>(1 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
7	Which measure of central tendency is calculated by adding up all the scores in the condition and dividing the total by the number of participants?	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> Mode <b>B Mean</b> <b>C</b> Range <b>D</b> Median	<b>(1 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question *Clerical Mark*	
8	Which of the following research methods have you studied in the Cognitive Approach?	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A Natural experiment</b> <b>B</b> Interview <b>C Field experiment</b> <b>D</b> Correlation <b>E</b> Naturalistic observation	<b>(2 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question *Clerical Mark*	
9	Which <b>two</b> of the following statements about Hofling et al's (1966) study are <b>false</b> ?	
	Answer	Mark
	<b>A</b> The instructions were given over the phone <b>B</b> Participants were unaware they were taking part in a study <b>C Some of the participants were doctors</b> <b>D The nurses were prevented from administering a dangerous drug</b> <b>E</b> The stated maximum dose of the drug was 10mg	<b>(2 A01)</b>

## Section B

### General Instructions

**Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider 'or words to that effect'. Each bullet point is a marking point unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be clearly and effectively communicated.**

Question Number	Question	
<b>10</b>	<p>There are many examples in world history when two ethnic groups or two nations live peacefully alongside each other for many years. However conflict then develops, which could last for decades, with one group wanting to destroy the other.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of psychological research into prejudice and obedience, explain why such conflicts may develop.</p>	

	Answer	Mark
	<p>Read through the whole answer first for reference to the source/conflict/ethnic groups/etc.</p> <p>If appropriate mention made <b>once</b> (or more) full marks can be accessed.</p> <p>If no reference made max 2.</p> <p>1 mark per point/elaboration. Real life examples may be credited if it helps illustrate a point (<b>max 1 mark</b>). Examples of research can be credited as support for explanation(s).</p> <p>Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important so that the full range of marks is available.</p> <p>Concepts of deindividuation, conformity, crowd behaviour etc can only be credited if related to prejudice and/or obedience.</p> <p>This is an A02 question marks cannot be given for simply summarising a theory/study of prejudice / obedience.</p> <p>Possible material includes: social categorisation; social identification; social comparison; agency theory; social power; charismatic leadership; authoritarian personality; realistic conflict; etc.</p> <p>e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They may have categorised themselves as different to the other ethnic group based on skin colour/race/beliefs etc/eq;</li> <li>• SIT suggests we may put others down in order to raise our own self esteem/eq;</li> <li>• They may have believed themselves to be similar to their own in group rather than to the outsiders/out group/eq;</li> <li>• Thus in group favouritism may have led to discrimination in order to protect their own self esteem/eq;</li> <li>• Realistic conflict may occur because of competition for resources/eq;</li> <li>• E.g. Sherif found that boys went against each other when in competition/eq;</li> <li>• They may have been ordered by someone in a position of authority to carry out tasks they believed they had to do/eq;</li> <li>• One or both ethnic groups may be acting in an agentic state and showing destructive obedience/eq;</li> <li>• A charismatic leader may persuade people to act against their individual wishes leading to moral strain/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>(5 A02)</p>

Question Number	Question	
<b>11</b>	Describe Godden and Baddeley's (1975) study on cue-dependent forgetting	
	Answer	Mark
	<p><b>Ignore pure description of cue dependency theory</b>  <b>Max 2</b> for any one of APRC</p> <p>One mark per point/elaboration  Figures for procedure must be accurate to gain credit, e.g. number of divers/number of words.  Figures for results accept +/- 5%</p> <p>AIM(S):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To see whether words would be recalled better in the same environment or in a very different environment/eq;</li> <li>To investigate whether a natural environment can act as a cue for recall/eq;</li> </ul> <p>PROCEDURE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18 participants were given word lists to learn which were made up of 36 (accept 38) unrelated two or three syllable words/eq;</li> <li>The words were presented either on the beach approximately 20 feet (accept 15 feet) under water/eq;</li> <li>Participants then had to recall the words in one of two conditions, under water or on land, which they were randomly allocated to/eq;</li> <li>4 conditions:  learn and recall on the beach, learn and recall underwater, learn on the beach and recall underwater, learn underwater and recall on the beach/eq;  Also accept wet/wet, dry/dry etc</li> </ul> <p>RESULTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recall was about 50% higher when it took place in the same environment as learning/eq;</li> <li>The mean number of words recalled in  Learn and recall on beach = 13.5  Learn on beach recall underwater = 8.6  Learn and recall underwater = 11.4  Learn underwater recall on beach = 8.4  <b>(1 mark for single pair of results - 2 marks for all results)</b> /eq;</li> </ul> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Words were recalled better in the same environment than in a very different environment/eq;</li> <li>The study demonstrates how the environment can act as a contextual cue for learning/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(5 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>11(b)</b>	Evaluate Godden and Baddeley's (1975) study in terms of reliability <b>and</b> generalisability.	
	<p>Max 2 for either reliability or generalisability. 1 mark per point/elaboration No marks for generic points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study has strong controls such as times of learning and intervals between conditions so is replicable and can be tested for reliability/eq;</li> <li>The sample was small (18) which may not be/is not representative of the population as a whole so cannot be generalised/eq;</li> <li>However other elements were not as well controlled such as possible equipment failure/weather/dive conditions which could all make replication difficult and weaken its reliability/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 A02)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>12(a)</b>	<p>As a part of your course you conducted an experiment within the Cognitive Approach.</p> <p>Write a fully operationalised experimental/alternative hypothesis for your experiment in the Cognitive Approach</p>	Clip with 12b, c & d
	Answer	Mark
	<p>All parts of this question must be internally consistent. Do not go back and change the marks in light of later responses</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>    Either no mention of an experimental hypothesis or a very unclear prediction</p> <p><b>1 mark</b>      A <b>basic</b> experimental hypothesis so that the examiner can just about identify what was predicted. Either both IV and DV, or one of them, is not operationalised.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b>      A clear experimental hypothesis so that the examiner can identify and understand what was predicted. Both IV and DV are operationalised.</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>12(b)</b>	Describe the procedure of your experiment from the Cognitive Approach	Clip with 12 a, c & d
	Answer	Mark
	<p>To gain credit any point of the procedure must be both accurate, internally consistent and consistent with the hypothesis (Not contradictory)</p> <p>No credit for results, conclusions or the Social Approach practical.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> Muddled answer with no clear outline of how the experiment was carried out.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Very brief description of procedure; lack of important detail; unlikely to fit hypothesis; some irrelevant material is likely to be used.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> One point of the procedure explained well or two in less detail. May have described more points but lacks accuracy/consistency.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Two points of the procedure explained well or three in less detail: must be accurate and consistent</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> Clear and detailed description of the procedure; easy to understand how the experiment was carried out.</p>	<b>(4 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>12(c)</b>	Identify two variables that you controlled in your experiment from the Cognitive Approach, and explain how you controlled them.	Clip with 12a, b & d
	Answer	Mark
	<p><b>0 marks</b> No appropriate variables identified.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> One appropriate variable identified, but control is not explained or irrelevant.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> One appropriate variable is identified and control is explained well, or two variables identified correctly, but control is not explained or inappropriate</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Two variables identified and explained well, but one in less detail. One explained well and the other is identified/not explained.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> Two appropriate variables identified and control is explained clearly and in detail.</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>12(d)</b>	Outline one problem that occurred when planning and/or carrying out your experiment in the Cognitive Approach.	Clip with 12a, b & c
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Each part must be consistent. If there is more than one problem described mark all and credit the best up to full marks. No credit for solution of problem or for social practical.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> A muddled answer with no clear problem outlined or problem is inappropriate. No focus on the experiment being described or no answer at all.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> One appropriate problem outlined, but not explained or simplistic problem explained well. Can be an ethical or practical problem including one with the procedure.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> One appropriate problem identified and explained well, such as 'experiment may have suffered from demand characteristics' and the candidate has explained what this means</p> <p><b>Look for any other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question																
<b>13(a)</b>	The following four statements about the Agency Theory are either true or false. Put a cross <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in the correct box to indicate whether each statement is <b>true</b> or <b>false</b> .																
	Answer	Mark															
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Statement about Agency Theory</th> <th>True</th> <th>False</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>The autonomous state is when individuals decide what to do for themselves</td> <td><b>X</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Individuals are socialised to obey legitimate authority figures</td> <td><b>X</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moral strain occurs when an individual is happy to obey an authority figure</td> <td></td> <td><b>X</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agency Theory was proposed by Hofling et al</td> <td></td> <td><b>X</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Statement about Agency Theory	True	False	The autonomous state is when individuals decide what to do for themselves	<b>X</b>		Individuals are socialised to obey legitimate authority figures	<b>X</b>		Moral strain occurs when an individual is happy to obey an authority figure		<b>X</b>	Agency Theory was proposed by Hofling et al		<b>X</b>	<b>(4 AO1)</b>
Statement about Agency Theory	True	False															
The autonomous state is when individuals decide what to do for themselves	<b>X</b>																
Individuals are socialised to obey legitimate authority figures	<b>X</b>																
Moral strain occurs when an individual is happy to obey an authority figure		<b>X</b>															
Agency Theory was proposed by Hofling et al		<b>X</b>															

Question Number	Question	
<b>13(b)</b>	Evaluate the Agency Theory of obedience, using evidence from psychological research.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>1 mark per point/elaboration. Real life examples should <b>only</b> be credited if well explained. Any problems with the research that support the theory can be credited as long as it shows how the theory lacks empirical support.</p> <p><b>Max 2</b> if no reference to research</p> <p><b>Max 1</b> mark for evaluation of a relevant study that has already been used, e.g. 1 mark for Milgram and 1 mark for Hofling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ps in Milgram's experiment were seen to be following orders from the experimenter and had passed over responsibility for their actions/eq;</li> <li>• However in Milgram's experiment both the task(giving electric shocks) and setting were artificial giving it low ecological validity/eq;</li> <li>• In Hofling's experiment the nurses became agents of the 'doctors' who were the authority/eq;</li> <li>• The theory has real-life applications to explain obedience. For example it accounts for why so many soldiers in WWII followed orders without question/eq; <b>(1<sup>st</sup> mark)</b>. They saw themselves as agents for the person giving the orders, in this case Hitler/eq; <b>(2<sup>nd</sup> mark)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO2)</b>

### Section C

Question Number	Question	Mark
<b>14</b>	<p>In the Social Approach you will have studied a key issue.</p> <p>Describe the key issue you studied in the Social Approach.</p>	
	<p><b>Answer</b></p> <p>1 mark per point / elaboration.  <b>4 marks</b> are available for elaboration of the issue. Marks here are for describing the issue not explaining it.            If more than one issue mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>REJECT COGNITIVE KEY ISSUES</p> <p><b>Possible key issues include:</b></p> <p><b>Blind obedience to authority in a prison setting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In particular, this issue concerns the behaviour of US military personnel during the Iraq conflict, especially towards prisoners held an Abu Ghraib prison under US supervision.</li> <li>• In 2004, a series of photographs were published by various media around the world, revealing the instances of US military personnel abusing and humiliating Iraqi prisoners.</li> <li>• Publication of these evidence lead to the soldiers involved being investigated and court-marshalled, with 11 junior-ranking soldiers being convicted of abuse and neglect of duty.</li> <li>• No higher-order officers were found guilty of abuse, and only two were convicted of neglect of duty.</li> <li>• At the trial, prosecution put forward a case of the accused being 'corrupt cops', suggesting that their personality was to blame.</li> <li>• In contrary, defence has argued that the accused soldiers were simply obeying orders on the officers in authority.</li> </ul> <p><b>Football violence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trouble often flares up between rival sets of fans at the football matches.</li> <li>• This often takes form of two rival groups shouting insults at one another, or actual fighting at the stadium.</li> <li>• The police become involved in order to keep peace, and may themselves become targets for this behaviour.</li> <li>• In some people, caught up in the excitement of the match, this may go too far and lead to football hooliganism.</li> </ul> <p><b>Obedience during conflict</b></p>	<p><b>(4 AO1)</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Soldiers are trained to obey orders, but very often this fact is used as an excuse to commit atrocious acts of violence against a civilian population.</li><li>• One example is the My Lai massacre in Vietnam, where 26 US soldiers were charged with being involved in massacre of between 350 and 500 women, children and old men on 16 March 1968.</li><li>• Only one soldier of those charged, Lieutenant William Calley, was convicted. His defence claimed that he was simply obeying the orders of a superior officer.</li><li>• Calley was initially sentenced to life imprisonment, but after appeal his sentence was reduced to just four and a half years.</li><li>• The appeal judges stated that they believed Calley honestly thought he was obeying the orders.</li></ul> <p><b>There are other suitable key issues.</b></p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Question	
<b>15</b>	<p>A group of friends, Ben, Coleen and Khalil, need to learn the local traffic rules for a test before they are allowed to drive.</p> <p>Describe and evaluate the Levels of Processing framework, with reference to how the group of friends might learn the traffic rules.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
<b>QWC</b> <b>i,ii,iii</b>	<p><b>Read through the entire answer before referring to the levels at the end of the indicative content.</b></p> <p>Indicative content Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Craik and Lockhart argued LOP is necessary to explain the transfer of information into LTM without rehearsal</li> <li>• Memory is a consequence of how we process information - the deeper we process it the easier it will be remembered</li> <li>• Deep processing which is a form of elaborative rehearsal produces longer lasting memory traces.</li> <li>• For example, if one of the friends learns local traffic rules by imagining different road situations and applying the rules, they will create a longer lasting memory trace/eq</li> <li>• The deepest level is semantic processing, and the shallowest is structural processing</li> <li>• Information that is attended to on the basis of how it looks (structural processing) is not very durable.</li> <li>• For example, if Ben will learn traffic rules by trying to remember road signs images, his memory of them won't last very long/eq</li> <li>• Semantic analysis (understanding the meaning) results in deeper processing and deeper processing results in a more durable memory</li> <li>• It distinguishes between <i>maintenance rehearsal</i> which simply retains items for the time being and <i>elaborative rehearsal</i> which expands upon material and creates more lasting memories</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The model has support from Craik and Tulving's study which demonstrated that semantically processed words were more deeply processed and therefore better recalled than other shallow information.</li> <li>• This means that the group of friends may benefit from learning traffic rules semantically, for example, by playing online traffic rules game, because in that case they will process the rules more deeply, creating longer-lasting memory.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(6 AO1)</b> <b>(6 AO2)</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• However, Craik and Tulving's study is laboratory based and therefore lacks ecological validity as both task and setting were artificial, meaning that applying Level of Processing model may not work well for the group of friends learning traffic rules.</li><li>• There are too many problems with actually defining deep processing and why it is effective. E.g. Baddeley (1978) criticises it for being circular i.e. Material which has been deeply processed will be remembered better BUT you could say material is well remembered because it must have been processed deeply</li><li>• Eysenck and Eysenck (1980) argue even shallow processing could lead to better processing IF the material was distinctive. E.g. Ben and his friends may see road sign so distinctive that will create an instant mental image</li></ul> <p><b>Look for other relevant material</b></p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p><b>A01:</b> (Description) Knowledge and understanding of Levels of Processing model</p> <p><b>A02:</b> (Evaluation) Strengths and weaknesses of Levels of Processing model/ Application to everyday life (learning traffic rules)</p>
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3 marks	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief answers</b>, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic description of process/basic list of levels</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question.</li> <li>• Answer may not refer to the stem</li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6 marks	<p>Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description is likely to include 3 levels of processing / some explanation of the process</li> <li>• Some attempt at evaluation, refers to at least <i>one</i> from e.g. methodological, supporting studies and practical points in relation to actual theory</li> <li>• May include reference to the group of friends learning local traffic rules</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9 marks	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>two injunctions</b> in the question <b>well</b> and at least attempted the third.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description may include all 3 levels of processing defined well <b>or</b> some defined well and good explanation of process</li> <li>• Good evaluation, refers to more than one from e.g. methodological, supporting studies and practical points in relation to actual theory</li> <li>• Must include reference to the group of friends learning local traffic rules, but may not be elaborated well.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

<p><b>Level 4</b></p>	<p>10-12 marks</p>	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b><i>all three injunctions</i></b> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description includes all 3 levels of processing defined well -and appropriate elaboration/very good explanation of process</li> <li>• Very good evaluation e.g. refers to methodological, supporting studies and practical points in relation to actual theory.</li> <li>• Application to the stem clearly outlined and elaborated in both description and evaluation.</li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning. Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the information is present.</p>
-----------------------	--------------------	--