

Eyewitness Testimony - Mark Scheme

Q1.

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).

Q2.

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).

Q3.

(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).

Q4.

(a) **[AO2 = 2]**

2 marks for 250 hours OR for $1000/10 \times 2.5 = 250$ hours OR for $100 \times 2.5 = 250$ 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]

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.

(a) **AO3 = 2**

A field experiment takes place in the real world rather than in a carefully controlled environment.

The IV is manipulated by the experimenter.

One mark for reference to the environment, real world, naturally occurring, etc.

One mark for reference to manipulating / changing an independent variable.

Candidates who simply restate the words – an experiment carried out in a field – should receive no credit.

(b) **AO3 = 2**

One weakness of using a field experiment is lack of control of variables. In this case, the participants would be different distances from the staged argument. It would be difficult to replicate the experiment precisely. Sampling difficulties. One mark for brief identification of a relevant weakness. Second mark for some elaboration.

(c) **AO2 = 2**

This is an example of misleading information, because neither man was wearing glasses. The psychologist could see whether participants' description of the event was influenced by the question about the man in glasses.

One mark for identification of misleading information or a leading question / trick question.

Second mark for some elaboration.

For example: it was a leading question (1 mark); the psychologist wanted to see whether including misleading information would affect the participant's memory of the event (2 marks).

Q6.

[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]

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.

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 = 6

Candidates must discuss 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 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 Cutshall (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.

AO2 = 6

Evaluation might relate to the contradictory nature of the research, possibly linked to lack of ecological validity in laboratory studies. Problems of control might also be relevant, eg in Yuille & Cutshall's study those who experienced the highest levels of stress were closer to the event, which might have helped their recall. Ethical issues could also be relevant as could the practical applications of research.

AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2 Analysis and evaluation
<p>5 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of one or more physiological methods of stress management. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.</p>	<p>5 marks Effective evaluation Effective use of material to address the question and provide informed commentary. Effective evaluation of research. Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. A coherent answer</p>
<p>4-3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p>	<p>4-3 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. A reasonably coherent answer.</p>
<p>2 marks Basic Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p>	<p>2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Answer lacks some coherence.</p>

<p>1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.</p>	<p>1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Answer is not coherent.</p>
<p>0 marks No creditworthy material.</p>	<p>0 marks No creditworthy material.</p>

Q9.

[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge of research is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation 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 is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation 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 is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation 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 is limited. Evaluation 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.

AO1 content

Knowledge of research (theories and/or studies) into the effects of misleading information on EWT.

Leading questions:

- Loftus and Palmer (1974) – estimates of speed based on changing verb in the critical question
- Loftus and Zanni (1975) – ‘Did you see the/a broken headlight?’
- Loftus (1975) – ‘How fast was the car going when it passed the white barn?’
- response-bias explanation – leading questions do not affect memory, just choice of

- answer
- substitution bias/explanation – question wording actually distorts memory.

Post-event discussion:

- Gabbert et al (2003) – paired discussions influence recall of crime
- memory contamination – co-witnesses mix (mis)information
- memory conformity – witnesses go along with others for social approval.

Accept other relevant theories/studies.

AO3 content

Evaluation/discussion of research into misleading information:

- real-life application – links to cognitive interview
- use of artificial materials in studies, eg films – less anxiety-inducing than in real-life
- demand characteristics in lab studies reduce validity
- lack of consequences in lab studies compared to real-life – Foster et al (1994)
- memory for important events/details is less susceptible to distortion
- credit other methodological issues in studies, eg sample bias
- credit ethical issues if made relevant to discussion
- use of evidence to support/challenge effects of misleading information.

Accept other valid evaluation points.