

Hints on Writing the 8pt and 10pt on Paper 1 (AS 9990) (Updated)

The 8-pointer

- There is NO SET FORMAT for the question!
- The question can be based on a variety of aspects from a single study or multiple studies
 - Such as results/conclusions, psychology being investigated, approaches, issues/debates, data collection, etc.
- Past questions for this section have focused on various topics in various formats:
 - Sample: Explain one similarity and one difference between the study by Yamamoto and one other core study from the social approach. [8]
 - Sample: Explain one result from the Bandura study that supports the Social Learning Theory and one result that does not support the Social Learning Theory [8]
 - Sample: Explain two ethical guidelines in working with animals that were present in the Pepperberg study [8]
- Learners may or may not be given a specific topic to discuss in their answers
 - Such as discussing ethics (given) or two similarities of studies (learner-chosen)
- Make sure to *expand upon ideas and to use specific details/evidence from the study* throughout the answer
 - INCORRECT way: “One difference between Yamamoto and Piliavin is where they took place- the first in the lab and the second in the field. This difference made the studies look at helping in different locations, and this may give different results in understanding why people and chimps may or may not help”
 - CORRECT way: “One difference between Yamamoto and Piliavin is the type of study when researching helping behavior. Yamamoto investigated targeted helping behavior in a laboratory setting. This laboratory setting made it easier to possible cause and effect of the IV on the DV, such as being able to control whether the chimps could see or not see the situation of a conspecific. In comparison, Piliavin et al. conducted a field study in the New York City subway system while researching the bystander effect. Though the field study still allows the researchers to see cause and effect of the IV on the DV, this field situation makes it more difficult to control extraneous variables, such as the subway suddenly stopping, which could influence the data collection of that trial”
- This question is ‘level-scored’ based on the overall content of the response for each aspect asked
 - The marks earned from each portion is then tallied together for a total score out of 8 marks possible
 - For example, if a prompt was to discuss a similarity between two studies and a difference between those two studies, the ‘similarity’ part would be worth 4 marks and the ‘difference’ part would be worth 4 marks

8 point mark scheme (modified)

Level 4 (4 marks)	-The candidate has explained <u>(one similarity/difference between Canli and another biological study)</u> - Accurate knowledge and understanding is applied. - There is a clear line of reasoning which is logically structured and thoroughly evaluated.
Level 3 (3 marks)	-The candidate has given <u>(one similarity/difference between Canli and another biological study)</u> -Knowledge and understanding is applied. -There is evidence of some structured reasoning and some evaluation.
Level 2 (2 marks)	-The candidate has given <u>(one similarity/difference between Canli and another biological study)</u> -Some evidence that knowledge and understanding is applied but this may be limited. -There is evidence of some reasoning with limited evaluation.
Level 1 (1 mark)	-The candidate has given <u>(one similarity/difference between Canli and another biological study)</u> OR -The candidate has given one point that is basic.
Level 0 (0 marks)	-No response worthy of credit.

The 10-pointer

- This question will most likely ask learners to “Evaluate the study by _____ in terms of **two** strengths and **two** weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points must be about (named topic)”
- Learners must discuss the named topic, either framing it as a strength or weakness (their choice)
 - This is already one of their discussion topics, thus choose 3 other ones for a total of 4 topics to write about
- Learners are allowed to discuss methodology, issues, debates, and the approach
 - For example, with Piliavin (subway Samaritans), learners can discuss validity, such as ecological validity being higher (with a couple ideas to support), but the validity of the data collection possibly being a weakness given the issues of observation. Or learners could discuss usefulness of how the ACR Model arose from the study, but that the findings may not be as useful as they were ‘stuck’ on the subway and possibly coerced to help given this fact.
- Learners should include a ‘conclusion’ for each evaluative topic discussed
 - Such as “...based on the evidence of children imitating specific verbal-aggressive phrases and the inhibiting effect of non-aggressive male models, one can conclude that the Bandura study tends to lean more towards the nurture side of the debate”
- Learners can discuss methodological issues
 - Study type/design
 - Sampling
 - Procedure
 - Controls/standardization
 - Data collection
- Learner can discuss any applicable Issues and Debates in Psychology (9990 syllabus and in general)
 - Application to Every Day Life (Usefulness)
 - Nature vs. Nurture
 - Dispositional vs. Situational
 - Ethics (general, children, or animals)
 - Reductionism vs. Holism
 - Ethnocentrism
 - Psychometrics
 - Free Will vs. Determinism

‘Do’s and Don’ts’ of Writing the 10-pointer

- Strongly suggested that learners do a *quick, brief ‘skeleton outline’* for each evaluation topic before writing
- Make sure to *discuss the Named Topic* (aka Named Issue [NI])- otherwise you are capped at 6/10 points!
- There should be *distinct paragraphs* with one topic each (4 total paragraphs, skipping a line b/w each)
- Each strength & weakness must have *details from the study being discussed!*
- Always *include a brief ‘conclusion’* for the topic being discussed
 - GRAVE (generalizability, reliability, application to everyday life, validity, & ethics) concepts often can be used
- *Do not assume-* if it is not mentioned in the study directly, then do not discuss it as a main focus
 - Do NOT say “a strength of D&K is the self-selecting sample” when there is no mention of sampling in D&K
- Make sure to *expand upon ideas and to use specific details/evidence from the study* throughout the answer (P.E.E.!)
 - Do not simply just mention something and move on without explaining the idea with details and support!
 - INCORRECT way: “A strength of Canli was they used pics that were pre-rated to show the Ps to measure activation and their emotions. They then saw the correlation with brain activation and memory and this helps the study because the pictures were valid.”
 - CORRECT way: “A strength of the Canli et al. study was that the researchers used pre-rated pictures from the IAPS database (Point). These pictures were pre-rated from previous research for arousal and valence, also saving Canli et al. time and money in developing appropriate stimulus pictures for their study. Using these IAPS images helped to make sure that the response ratings from the Ps would align how they ‘should’- such as a picture of a ball of hay should be rated as a 0/1 low emotion, so if the P rated it as a 3 high emotion, then Canli would be able to highlight a P’s possible misunderstanding of the rating system (Evidence) as not to skew the data. Overall, the use of these IAPS pictures helps to increase the validity of the data collection in seeing if emotionally intense images are more likely to be remembered at a later time. (Explanation)”

10 point Mark Scheme

Level 4 (8-10 marks)	-Evaluation is comprehensive . -Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. -Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. -Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material
Level 3 (6-7 marks)	-Evaluation is good . -Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. -Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. -Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material
Level 2 (4-5 marks)	-Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited . -Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. -Analysis is limited. -Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.
Level 1 (1-3 mark)	-Evaluation is basic . -Answer demonstrates little organisation. -There is little or no evidence of analysis. -Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material
Level 0 (0 marks)	-No response worthy of credit.