Mark schemes

**Q1.**

**[AO3 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3-4 | Suggestion of how two cognitive interview techniques might improve recall is clear, accurate and coherent. There is appropriate use of terminology. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Suggestion of how two cognitive interview techniques might improve recall is limited. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.  OR one technique at Level 1/2 |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   the participants could have been asked to report every detail; elaboration might refer to eg the colour of the cars, even if seemingly irrelevant, or how this technique might trigger additional information

•   the participants could have been asked to recall the events in a different order; elaboration might refer to starting eg from the point of impact to the start of the film, or how this technique might have disrupted the influence of schema/expectations

•   the participants could have been asked to recall the event from the perspective of others; elaboration might refer to eg the driver of one of the cars, or how this technique might disrupt the influence of schema/expectations

•   the participants could have been encouraged to mentally reinstate the context; elaboration might refer to eg being reminded of the weather and the general environment, or how this technique might trigger recall. Credit reference to the encoding specificity principle.

Credit other relevant suggestions eg strategies from the enhanced cognitive interview.

Simply naming two techniques, maximum **one** mark. Naming one technique is not creditworthy.

**[4]**

**Q2.**

**AO3 = 3**

Simply identifying or naming one or more potentially relevant ways of dealing with the ethical issue – maximum 1 mark. For example, confidentiality, anonymity, debrief. Further marks for explaining how psychologists could deal with this ethical issue.

For example:

Right to withdraw (1 mark)  
Participants should be reminded of their right to withdraw from the research (2 marks)  
If participants are showing signs of distress, the psychologist should remind the participants of their right to withdraw (3 marks).

**Q3.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

**AO2 = 4**

Differences could include effectiveness of cognitive interviews and implications such as cost of training required, time it takes, etc.

The main techniques used in a cognitive interview include context reinstatement (CR), reporting everything (RE), recall from a changed perspective (CP) recall in reverse order.  
Candidates who show some understanding of a cognitive interview, e.g. by naming / outlining one or more of the techniques above, but make no attempt to explain a difference should be awarded a maximum of 2 marks. Further marks for elaboration, eg a standard interview might just ask witnesses to recall an event, but a cognitive interview could ask them to recall the context in which the event occurred. This could include environmental details (such as the weather) and emotional factors (such as how they felt at the time).

**Q4.**

**AO1 = 6**

The main techniques used in the cognitive interview are summarised below.

*Context reinstatement* – trying to mentally *recreate* an image of the situation, including details of the environment, such as the weather conditions and the individual’s emotional state including their feelings at the time of the incident.

*Recall from changed perspective* – trying to mentally recreate the situation from different points of view eg describing what another witness present at the scene would have seen.

*Recall in reverse order* – the witness is asked to recall the scene in a different chronological order eg from the end to the beginning.

*Report everything* – the interviewer encourages the witness to report all details about the event, even though these details may seem to be unimportant.

Other techniques, including those used in enhanced cognitive interviews, should be credited.  
In both cases, 1 mark for identifying an appropriate technique and 2 further marks for accurate elaboration.

**Q5.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

•        A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills

•        Content appears as a bulleted list

•        No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

 (a)     **AO2 = 4**

The main techniques used in the cognitive interview are summarised below.  
*Context reinstatement* – trying to mentally recreate an image of the situation, including details of the environment, such as the weather conditions and the individual’s emotional state including their feelings at the time of the incident.  
*Recall from changed perspective* – trying to mentally recreate the situation from different points of view eg describing what another witness present at the scene would have seen.  
*Recall in reverse order* – the witness is asked to recall the scene in a different chronological order eg from the end to the beginning.  
*Report everything* – the interviewer encourages the witness to report all details about the event, even though these details may seem to be unimportant.  
1 mark for naming one relevant technique.  
2 marks for naming two or more relevant techniques or for a very brief outline of how one technique could be used.  
Further marks for elaboration. Candidates who refer to only one technique should include more detail than those who refer to more than one.  
3 or 4 marks can be awarded if the outline could relate to this event.

(b)     **AO2 = 6**

Candidates must refer to research where the anxiety component is clear.  
Candidates might refer to the Yerkes-Dodson law which suggests moderate anxiety is associated with better recall than very high or very low anxiety. In this case friends and relatives might show worse recall than other people in the crowd.  
Laboratory based research has generally shown impaired recall in high anxiety conditions. In Loftus’s (1979) weapon focus experiment more participants correctly identified a person when they were holding a pen (49%) than when they were holding a knife covered in blood (33%).  
Loftus and Burns (1982) found participants who saw a violent version of a crime where a boy was shot in the face had impaired recall for events leading up to the incident.  
However, in a real life study Yuille and Cutshill (1986) found witnesses who had been most distressed at the time of a shooting gave the most accurate account five months later. Also Christianson and Hubinette (1993) found victims of genuine bank robberies were more accurate in their recall than bystanders.  
There is a range of acceptable answers to this question and marks should be given for effective use of the material.  
Answers which do not make explicit reference to this event should be awarded a maximum of 4 marks.

|  |
| --- |
| **6 marks Effective explanation** Accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of how anxiety might affect eye-witness testimony of this event that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of relevant research. |
| **5 – 4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate** Less detailed but generally accurate explanation of how anxiety might affect eye-witness testimony of this event that demonstrates knowledge and understanding of relevant research. |
| **3 – 2 marks Basic** Basic explanation of how anxiety might affect eye-witness testimony of this event has that demonstrates some knowledge of relevant research but detail may be muddled. |
| **1 mark Very brief/flawed** Very brief or flawed explanation of how anxiety might affect eye-witness testimony of this event has that demonstrates very little knowledge of relevant research. |
| **0 marks** No creditworthy information. |

**Q6.**

**AO2 = 4**

The answer should clearly relate to one or more of the main techniques used in a cognitive interview (other than report everything):  
Context reinstatement.  
Recall from a changed perspective.  
Recall in reverse order.  
And / or the main additional features of the enhanced cognitive interview:  
Encourage to relax and speak slowly.  
Offer comments to help clarify their statements.  
Adapt questions to suit the understanding of individual witnesses.  
1 mark for simple identification of a relevant cognitive technique, or a very brief suggestion eg “tell me what you saw in reverse order.”  
2 marks for naming two or more relevant techniques or for a very brief outline of how one technique could be used eg “tell me what you saw in reverse order, starting with when the man was stabbed. A maximum of 2 marks can be awarded if there is no reference to details in the passage.  
Further marks for accurate elaboration including reference to details in the passage.  
Candidates who refer to only one technique should include more detail than those who refer to more than one.

**Q7.**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 6**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 4 | 10 – 12 | Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Evidence is clear.  Discussion / evaluation / application is effective. The answer is clear, coherent.  Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking. |
| 3 | 7 – 9 | Knowledge is evident. Evidence is presented. There are occasional inaccuracies. There is some effective Discussion / evaluation / application. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately. |
| 2 | 4 – 6 | Knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1 – 3 | Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application 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. |

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list.

**AO1**

Most answers will focus on the cognitive interview technique but any method / technique with a psychological basis should be credited (eg avoiding leading questions). Likely content: the original cognitive interview – 4 features: restore context; recall everything even trivial detail; recall in reverse order; recall from another perspective. Credit also features of the enhanced cognitive interview eg relax, speak slowly. Likely evidence: Geiselman (1985).

**AO3**

How / why recall is enhanced: eg role of context reinstatement; work on reconstructive memory; use of context; makes the event more meaningful. Limitations: eg usefulness of the cognitive interview with children; less useful when there is increased time between event and recall.

Relative effectiveness of individual features of the cognitive interview; better for recall of peripheral detail than central detail.

Use of relevant evidence to support / refute argument.

**Q8.**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 4 | 13 – 16 | Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking. |
| 3 | 9 – 12 | Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places. |
| 2 | 5 – 8 | Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any Discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1 – 4 | Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list

**AO1**

Most answers will focus on the cognitive interview technique but any method / technique with a psychological basis should be credited (eg avoiding leading questions). Likely content: the original cognitive interview – 4 features: restore context; recall everything even trivial detail; recall in reverse order; recall from another perspective. Credit also features of the enhanced cognitive interview eg relax, speak slowly. Likely evidence: Geiselman (1985).

**AO3**

How / why recall is enhanced: eg role of context reinstatement; work on reconstructive memory; use of context; makes the event more meaningful. Limitations: eg usefulness of the cognitive interview with children; less useful when there is increased time between event and recall.

Relative effectiveness of individual features of the cognitive interview; better for recall of peripheral detail than central detail.

Use of relevant evidence to support / refute argument.

**Q9.**

(a)     **AO2 = 3**

The answer must clearly relate to one or more of the main techniques used in a cognitive interview (other than report everything):-

Context reinstatement  
Recall from a changed perspective  
Recall in reverse order

Some of the main additional features of the enhanced cognitive interview could be relevant, as long as it could be explained to the participant: – eg Encourage to relax

1 mark for identification of a relevant cognitive technique.  
1 mark for very brief statement eg “tell me what you saw in reverse order”.  
Second mark for appropriate elaboration eg “Tell me what you saw on the film in a different order to how it actually happened.” If instructions are not suitable to be read out maximum 1 mark for this part.  
For 3 marks technique and instructions must match.

(b)     **AO3 = 2**

The researcher might conclude that the cognitive interview was effective because more correct items were recalled, but it did not affect the number of incorrect items recalled.

0 mark - the cognitive interview was effective with no explanation.  
1 mark - it was effective because there were more correct items recalled or it was not effective because the number of incorrect items stayed the same.  
2 marks - it was effective because there were more correct items recalled **and** the number of incorrect items stayed the same / didn’t increase.

1 mark for stating there were more correct items recalled with the cognitive interview than with the standard interview **and** the number of incorrect items recalled was the same. (There is no reference to effectiveness).

**Q10.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

•        A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills

•        Content appears as a bulleted list

•        No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

**AO1 = 4**

Note – There is a breadth / depth trade off here. Accurate answers which describe 1 technique in detail can be awarded full marks, as can answers which outline 4 techniques.

The main techniques used in a cognitive interview are:–  
Context reinstatement – trying to mentally recreate an image of the situation, including details of the environment, such as the weather conditions, and the individual’s emotional state including their feelings at the time of the incident.  
Recall from a changed perspective – trying to mentally recreate the situation from different points of view e.g. describing what another witness present at the scene would have seen.  
Recall in reverse order – the witness is asked to describe the scene in a different chronological order e.g. from the end to the beginning.  
Report everything – the interviewer encourages the witness to report all details about the event, even though these details may seem unimportant.

The main additional features of the enhanced cognitive interview are:–  
Encourage the witness to relax and speak slowly.  
Offer comments to help clarify witness statements.  
Adapt questions to suit the understanding of individual witnesses.

|  |
| --- |
| **AO1    Knowledge of the cognitive interview** |
| **4 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed** Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge of the cognitive interview. |
| **3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate** Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge of the cognitive interview. |
| **2 marks Basic** Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge of the cognitive interview, but lacks detail and may be muddled. |
| **1 mark Very brief / flawed** Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge of the cognitive interview. |
| **0 marks** No creditworthy material. |

**Q11.**

**[AO2 = 6]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 3 | 5-6 | Application of knowledge to Danielle’s experience is mostly clear and effective. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology. |
| 2 | 3-4 | There is some application of knowledge to Danielle’s experience. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | There is limited application of knowledge to Danielle’s experience. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   Danielle is encouraged to mentally reinstate the context, reminded of, eg why she was walking down the high street, the weather etc as this may trigger further information (reinstate the context)

•   Danielle should be asked to report every detail even if it seems irrelevant, eg what the attacker was wearing, the style of the handbag etc (report everything)

•   Danielle should be asked to recall the event in a different order, eg beginning from when she comforted the elderly woman and working backwards (changing order)

•   Danielle should recall the event from the perspective of others, eg the couple of other witnesses who were present at the time (changing perspective)

•   credit features of enhanced cognitive interview to facilitate recall if applied to Danielle’s experience.

Credit other valid applications.

Answers may cover fewer points in more depth or more points in less depth.

**[6]**

**Q12.**

**[AO1 = 6]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 3 | 5 – 6 | Knowledge of the cognitive interview is clear and accurate. There is clear explanation of how it improves the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 2 | 3 – 4 | Knowledge of the cognitive interview is present though there may be some inaccuracy/lack of clarity. There is some explanation of how it improves eyewitness testimony. The answer is mostly clear and organised. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Knowledge of the cognitive interview is briefly stated with little elaboration. The explanation of how it improves eyewitness testimony may be partial or absent. The answer may include inaccuracies and be poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

Not all features of the cognitive interview need to be covered for full marks:

•   Context reinstatement – trying to mentally recreate an image of the situation, including details of the environment, the individual’s emotional state including their feelings at the time of the incident – may all act as cues/triggers to recall

•   Recall from a changed perspective – trying to mentally recreate the situation from different points of view eg. describing what another witness present at the scene would have seen – promotes more ‘holistic’ view of the event which may enhance recall

•   Recall in reverse order – the witness is asked to describe the scene in a different chronological order eg. from the end to the beginning – to verify accuracy

•   Report everything – the interviewer encourages the witness to report all details about the event, even though these details may seem unimportant – may highlight something that has been ‘overlooked’

The main additional features of the enhanced cognitive interview are:-

•   Encourage the witness to relax and speak slowly – reduction in anxiety may enhance recall

•   Offer comments to help clarify witness statements – may improve detail of statement

•   Credit links to theory to explain how accuracy may be improved eg retrieval failure – importance of context

**Q13.**

**[AO1 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3 – 4 | Two techniques are clearly identified and outlined. Minor detail of outline is sometimes lacking or there is slight inaccuracy. The answer as a whole is clear with use of specialist terminology. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Two techniques are identified. The outline lacks detail / accuracy. The answer as a whole lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. **OR** one technique at Level 2. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•        reinstating the context – interviewee mentally reinstates the environmental and personal context of the incident, eg sights, sounds, weather etc

•        report everything – interviewer encourages the reporting of every single detail of the event, even though it may seem irrelevant

•        changing order – interviewer tries alternative ways through the timeline of the incident

•        changing perspective – interviewee recalls from different perspectives, eg how it would have appeared to other witnesses.

Credit other relevant cognitive interview techniques.

**Q14.**

**[AO3 = 2]**

**1 mark** – B

**1 mark** – D

**Q15.**

(a)    **[AO2 = 2]**

**2 marks** for 250 hours OR for 1000/10 x 2.5 = 250 hours OR for 100 x 2.5 = 250 hours

**1 mark** for correct workings but incorrect answer e.g. 15000 minutes.

**2**

(b)    **[AO2 = 2]**

**1 mark** for correct identification

**plus**

**1 mark** for correct explanation

**Possible content:**

•   primary data because the results came directly from the eye witnesses / because the data was collected by the psychologist specifically for the purpose of the investigation

•   quantitative data because the psychologist used closed questions

•   qualitative because the psychologist recorded what they said (in words).

Accept answers referring to levels of measurement with appropriate justification.

**2**

(c)    **[AO3 = 2]**

**2 marks** for relevant modification that would reduce investigator effects in this study.

**1 mark** for a brief or muddled explanation.

**Possible content:**

•   have an interviewer who had not witnessed the event / did not know the aims of the study so that they would not be affected by their own perception of the event

•   use open-ended questions so that the interviewees were able to give a more detailed and accurate version of what they saw

•   use questionnaire (or other means) to collect data without face to face interaction.

Credit other relevant suggestions that would reduce investigator effects in this study.

**2**

(d)    **[AO2 = 2]**

**2 marks** for a clear, coherent outline with some detail.

**1 mark** for a limited / muddled outline, e.g. ‘other psychologists assess / check / review her research report’.

**0 marks** for ‘other psychologists look at the research’.

**Possible content:**

•   her report would be sent for independent scrutiny (checked / reviewed) by other psychologists

•   they would consider e.g. validity, ethics, errors, significance, originality and possible improvements

•   to see whether it should be published.

Credit other relevant answers that can be applied to the stem.

**2**

**[8]**

**Q16.**

**[AO1 = 4 AO3 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 4 | 7-8 | Knowledge of techniques used in the cognitive interview is accurate with some detail. Discussion of the effectiveness of these techniques on the accuracy of eye witness testimony is effective. Minor detail and / or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 5-6 | Knowledge of techniques used in the cognitive interview is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies / omissions. There is some effective discussion of the effectiveness of these techniques on the accuracy of eye witness testimony. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Limited knowledge of techniques used in the cognitive interview is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion of the effectiveness of these techniques on the accuracy of eye witness testimony is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. OR One technique only at level 4. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Knowledge of techniques used in the cognitive interview is very limited. Discussion of the effectiveness of these techniques on the accuracy of eye witness testimony 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. OR One technique only at level 2. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   report everything – the interviewer encourages the witness to report all details about the event, even though these details may seem to be unimportant

•   context reinstatement – trying to mentally recreate an image of the situation, including details of the environment, such as the weather conditions and the individual’s emotional state including their feelings at the time of the incident

•   recall from changed perspective – trying to mentally recreate the situation from different points of view, e.g. describing what another witness present at the scene would have seen

•   recall in reverse order – the witness is asked to recall the scene in a different chronological order, e.g. from the end to the beginning.

Credit also features of the enhanced cognitive interview e.g. relax, speak slowly.

Candidates can achieve up to 4 marks by either outlining two techniques in some detail or by covering more than two in less detail.

**Possible discussion points:**

•   how / why recall is enhanced, e.g. role of context reinstatement; work on reconstructive memory; use of context; makes the event more meaningful

•   limitations, e.g. usefulness of the cognitive interview with children; less useful when there is increased time between event and recall

•   relative effectiveness of individual features of the cognitive interview; better for recall of peripheral detail than central detail

•   use of relevant evidence to support / refute argument, e.g. Kohnken et al (1999); Milne & Bull (2002).

Credit other relevant discussion.

**[8]**

**Q17.**

(a)  **[AO2 = 3]**

**1 mark** for identifying an appropriate technique, e.g. context reinstatement; recall from a changed perspective; recall in reverse order; encourage to relax and speak slowly; offer comments to help clarify the statements; non-leading questions; build rapport.

**Plus**

**2 marks** for clear and coherent instructions that use the technique identified, that is clearly linked to the scenario and is suitable to be read out (verbatim).

**1 mark** for brief or muddled instructions that use the technique identified, that is clearly linked to the scenario **OR** suitable to be read out but is not applied to the scenario.

**Possible content:**

•   **reverse order:** ‘Please tell me everything you can remember about the robbery, starting from the point the girl was robbed back to the beginning of the video’

•   **change perspective:** ‘Tell me everything that the boyfriend/another shopper saw when the robbery took place.’

•   **context reinstatement:** ‘Tell me how you were feeling at the time you watched the video of the robbery.’

The instructions must relate to the technique that is identified.

If no technique is identified credit the instructions if they are appropriate − **Max 2 marks**.

Accept other relevant application of the technique identified.

**3**

(b)  **[AO3 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3-4 | The explanation of how the study might have been improved by using a random sample is clear and detailed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology. |
| 1 | 1-2 | There is limited/partial explanation of how the study might have been improved by using a random sample. The answer may lack coherence. Use of terminology may be either absent or inappropriate. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   this reduces the likelihood of investigator effects/research bias

•   this would mean that she is more likely to get a range of students in her sample, not just psychology students

•   the likelihood of demand characteristics might be reduced, improving internal validity

•   her sample would be more representative of the student population and allow her to make a wider conclusion about the effectiveness of the cognitive interview.

•   the teacher would select a random sample using either a hat/lottery/computer method and a list of all the Year 12 students.

Students who only address the practicality of how to create the random sample rather than how/why this would be an improvement are restricted to **1 mark**.

Credit other relevant content.

**4**

(c)  **[AO2 = 3]**

**3 marks** for the correct answer given to two significant figures: 13 (even if no correct workings are shown).

**2 marks** for correct calculation not given to two significant figures e.g. 12.7 and no additional attempt at changing 12.7 to another answer.

**1 mark** if incorrect answer e.g. 12 is provided but all workings are correct.

Correct workings:

13 + 13 + 11 + 8 + 11 + 14 + 11 + 13 + 15 + 18 = 127

127/10 = 12.7

Answer = 13.

**3**

(d)  **[AO3 = 2]**

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent outline of an appropriate limitation of the cognitive interview.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited outline of an appropriate limitation of the cognitive interview.

**Possible limitations:**

•   requires special training and police forces do not have enough time to invest in training the officers to use it

•   reference to research support suggesting not all aspects of the cognitive interview are as useful as others, e.g. Milne and Bull (2002)

•   amount of inaccurate information gathered is also increased, e.g. Köhnken et al., (1999)

•   not all techniques are appropriate for use with children, e.g. change perspective not possible until children are no longer egocentric.

**2**

**[12]**

**Q18.**

**[AO1 = 2]**

**A**: Alter the perspective

**E**: Reverse the order

**[2]**

**Q19.**

**[AO3 = 6]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 3 | 5-6 | Evaluation of the cognitive interview is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Evaluation of the cognitive interview is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Evaluation of the cognitive interview is limited. The answer lacks clarity and organisation. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible evaluation points:**

•   use of evidence to support/challenge the effectiveness of cognitive interview (CI), e.g. Kohnken et al (1999)

•   although CI leads to more correct information, incorrect information also increases (although some studies, e.g. Geiselman dispute this)

•   some elements of CI may be more successful than others − Milne and Bull (2002)

•   the success of CI may be related to the age of witness

•   CI requires training and investment so it may not always be available because of limited resources

•   credit evaluation of enhanced cognitive interview

•   credit comparison with standard interview and enhanced CI.

Credit other relevant points.

**[6]**