UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

9698 PSYCHOLOGY

9698/21 Paper 2 (Core Studies 2), maximum raw mark 70

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Section A

1 Baron-Cohen et al (eyes test) used a natural experiment to test for advanced theory of mind in adults with either high-functioning autism or Asperger syndrome. One way to improve the ecological validity of this study would be by using actors rather than photographs of eyes.

(a) Describe different types of validity in psychology. [5]

Any five correct points.
1 mark for each point up to a maximum of five points.
No answer or incorrect answer, 0.

Indicative content:
Validity – measuring what the experimenter intends to measure/ whether the dv appears to measure what is intended.
Face validity.
Ecological validity – whether the study is true to life.
Construct validity.
Concurrent validity.
Population validity.
Any other appropriate point.

Award a maximum of 2 marks for terminology on its own.

(b) Design an alternative study using actors rather than photographs and describe how it could be conducted. [10]

Candidates will most likely describe either another type of laboratory experiment or a field experiment.

Candidates should describe the who, what, where and how.

Major omissions include the what and how. Candidates must describe how the DV is collected. The candidate must give an indication of the behaviour measured and also how this data is collected (e.g. self report, quantitative measures, timing of conditions).

Minor omissions include who and where.

It is possible to achieve 9 marks with a small minor omission.

Alternative study is incomprehensible.	[0]
Alternative study is muddled and impossible to conduct.	[1–2]
Alternative study is muddled but possible and/or major omissions.	[3–4]
Alternative study is clear with a few minor omissions and possible.	[5–6]
Alternative study is described with one minor omission and in some detail.	[7–8]
Alternative study is described in sufficient detail to be replicable.	[9–10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(c) Evaluate this alternative way of studying advanced theory of mind in practical and methodological terms. [10]

Indicative content:
Candidates need to consider a number of points regarding their study. These points can be both positive and/or negative.

Appropriate points could include a discussion about:
Ecological validity of the situation in the study or the measuring device.
Generalisability of the sample chosen.
Reliability of the procedure/measuring device.
Usefulness of the findings.
Ethics of the procedure.
Demand characteristics if participants are aware they are in a study.
Validity of the measuring device.
Any other appropriate point.

In order to achieve higher marks the candidate must link their points to their investigation described in part (b).

No evaluation.	[0]
Evaluation is muddled and weak.	[1–2]
Evaluation is simplistic and/or not specific to the investigation. May include one point that is brief and specific to investigation.	[3–4]
Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one detailed point.	[5–6]
Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points.	[7–8]
Evaluation is very detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	[9–10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

2 Thigpen and Cleckley (multiple personality disorder) investigated Eve through hours of therapy and testing to find out more about her symptoms and help to treat her disorder.

(a) What is meant by a psychometric test? [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

A psychometric test is an IQ test – 1 mark (partial).
A psychometric test is a mathematical measure of the mind – 2 marks (full).

(b) Describe the results of the psychometric tests used in Thigpen and Cleckley's study. [3]

1–2 marks partial, 3 marks full (numbers required).

Full mark response –
IQ test – Eve White 110, Eve Black, 104.
Memory test – Eve White has a superior memory to Eve Black.

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(c) Compare and contrast the psychometric testing approach as used by Thigpen and Cleckley with one other way of gathering data. [10]

Candidates may describe/evaluate psychometric testing approach and one other with no comparison point. These candidates can achieve up to 4 marks maximum.

Other approaches could include -
Self reports with either qualitative or quantitative data.
Observations which are either structured or unstructured.
Qualitative/quantitative data collected in either a lab experiment or field experiment.

Appropriate comparison/contrast points will be varied. These could include –
Quantitative versus qualitative.
Validity of IQ tests can be low.
Reliability of IQ tests is high.
Ethics of IQ tests is usually low.
Reductionism versus holism – IQ tests are reductionist.
Demand characteristics – participant may purposefully do badly.
Social desirability.
Experimenter/observer bias – low with IQ tests.
Usefulness – can be used to compare participants. Provided proof of MPD.
Any other appropriate point.

The answer does not give any creditworthy material.	[0]
Comment on a comparison/contrast issue which is muddled and weak **OR** brief evaluation of psychometric testing approach and one other approach.	[1–2]
Comment on comparison/contrast issues which is weak **OR** a clear and fairly detailed description/evaluation of the psychometric testing approach and one other approach.	[3–4]
Comments on comparison/contrast issue/s which are simplistic with few examples/evidence.	[5–6]
Consideration of comparison and contrast issues which are fairly detailed with examples/evidence.	[7–8]
Consideration of comparison and contrast issues which are detailed and directly linked to relevant examples/evidence.	[9–10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(d) Discuss the extent to which individual and situational explanations of Eve's behaviour are supported by Thigpen and Cleckley's findings. [10]

Indicative content:
Individual explanations –
Eve is unique. There is no other case of MPD like hers.
Lots of people experience difficulties in childhood and do not develop MPD.
Only 12 cases of MPD recorded at the time of Thigpen and Cleckley's study.
Any other relevant point.

Situational explanations –
Eve's childhood experiences led to her developing MPD (could also be argued as part of the individual explanation). Candidates may give specific examples from Eve's childhood to back up their explanation.
Eve is reacting to the attention from Thigpen and Cleckley and faked her illness.
Any other relevant point.

No comment on individual/situational explanations.	[0]
Comment given but muddled and weak.	[1–2]
Consideration of both individual and situational but not specific to investigation **OR** consideration of one explanation is simplistic but specific to investigation.	[3–4]
Consideration of both individual and situational is simplistic but specific to investigation **OR** consideration of one explanation which is detailed and specific to investigation.	[5–6]
Consideration of both individual and situational which is good but brief and specific to investigation.	[7–8]
Consideration of both individual and situational which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	[9–10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

Section B

3 (a) Outline what is meant by the 'social approach' in psychology. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

The social approach is the study of people in groups – 1 mark.
The social approach is the study of the interaction of people between or within groups – 2 marks.

Appropriate answers could include assumptions of the social approach.

Using the studies from the list below, answer the questions which follow.

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation)
Milgram (obedience)
Piliavin et al (subway Samaritans)

(b) Describe the social processes that were investigated in each of these studies. [9]

Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):
Zimbardo: the interaction between the guards and prisoners. The initial interaction was passive but then the prisoners began to rebel. Guards quickly became increasingly more verbally aggressive toward prisoners until prisoners became very passive and withdrawn.
Milgram: The participant (teacher) initially went along with the instructions of the experimenter without question. As the participant increased the level of shocks given to the learner (stooge) the participant questioned the experimenter. The experimenter verbally prodded the participant and this caused 65% of the participants to continue to 450 volts.
Piliavin: The passengers on the train reacted very quickly to the victim falling over. The passengers helped more when the victim had the cane rather than when the victim was drunk. Men were more likely to help the victim than women.

For each study:	
No answer or incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about social processes from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about social processes from the study. (Comment lacks understanding.) A clear description that may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about social processes from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	[3]

[max 9]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(c) What problems may psychologists have when they investigate the social approach? **[9]**

Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.

Indicative content:
May be difficult to create studies that are ecologically valid.
May create unethical studies.
May be difficult to find a representative sample.
May be difficult to create a valid measuring device.
Ps may respond to demand characteristics if the study is unnatural.
The findings may offer a reductionist explanation of social processes.
Or any other relevant problem.

Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points:

No answer or incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of problem related to investigating social approach.	[1]
Description of problem related to investigating social approach **OR** a weak description of a problem related to investigating social approach and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of problem related to investigating social approach and applied to the study effectively.	[3]

[max 9]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

4 (a) Outline what is meant by 'application of psychology to everyday life'. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

This is whether a study has ecological validity – 1 mark.
This is whether a study is realistic and has good ecological validity – 2 marks.

OR

This is the usefulness of a study – 1 mark.
This is how useful a study is due to its ecological validity – 2 marks.

Using the studies from the list below, answer the questions which follow.

Billington et al (empathising and systemising)
Rosenhan (sane in insane places)
Maguire et al (taxi drivers)

(b) Describe how each of these studies is useful. [9]

Billington: Universities can screen applicants prior to study. Schools/HE establishments can help students to alter their cognitive style to better suit the type of courses they have chosen for A level/degree level.

Rosenhan: Observational research so very realistic. Can apply these results to other psychiatric institutions in USA. Shows lack of care of patients. Shows lots of areas of improvement for these institutions (treatment of patients, time spent with patients, attitude to patients, etc.).

Maguire: Helpful to medical professionals working with people with BDD. Can use behavioural training in front of mirrors to help those with BDD.

For each study:	
No answer or incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about usefulness from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about usefulness from the study. (Comment with lack of understanding.) A clear description that may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about usefulness from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	[3]

[max 9]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(c) What problems may psychologists have when they try to create useful studies? [9]

Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.

Indicative content:
May be difficult to create studies that are ecologically valid.
May create unethical studies.
May be difficult to find a representative sample.
May be difficult to create a valid measuring device.
Ps may respond to demand characteristics if the study is unnatural.
The findings may offer a reductionist explanation so are less useful in life.
May be difficult to replicate research due lack of control.
May be difficult to control variables.
Or any other relevant problem.

Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points:

No answer or incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of problem related to usefulness.	[1]
Description of problem related to usefulness **OR** a weak description of a problem related to investigating usefulness and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of problem related to usefulness and applied to the study effectively.	[3]

[max 9]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012