CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9698 PSYCHOLOGY

9698/22 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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Section A

1 Loftus and Pickrell conducted a laboratory experiment to investigate the formation of false memories. An alternative way to investigate this would be to conduct an investigation into false memories using the case study method.

(a) Describe the case study as a research method. [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:
Involves a few participants.
Participants are often 'special' in some way.
Lots of detailed data/qualitative data mainly collected
Often takes place over a long period of time.
Often looks at development of the individual or small group.
Researchers can build a relationship with the participant.
May be in context of research/therapy.
An example is acceptable but will only be given a maximum of one mark.
1 mark for naming an appropriate method used *within* a case study e.g. interview.

No credit for evaluation of case studies.

(b) Design an alternative study to the Loftus and Pickrell study as a case study and describe how it could be conducted. [10]

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

Major omissions include the who, what and how. Candidates must describe what the behaviour/beliefs/memories are that are being measured (e.g. memory of a childhood event). Some details must be given of who the participant(s) is in the study and how the data is collected from the participant (e.g. through a diary, questionnaire, etc.).

If it is a direct replication of Loftus & Pickrell then max 2. Also, if the study is wholly unethical then max 2.

Minor omissions include when 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 and/or there are major omissions	[3–4]
Alternative study is clear with a few minor omissions and possible to conduct	[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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

(c) Evaluate this alternative way of studying false memories in practical and ethical terms. [10]

Candidates needs 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:
Ethics of intrusive questioning, implanting memories, intensive researcher.
Qualitative/quantitative data collection methods used.
Social desirability of responses given by the participant(s).
Generalisability of the small sample.
Holistic as lots of information gathered in case studies.
Reliability is poor.
Over involvement of researcher.
Subject attrition etc.
Any other appropriate point.

In order to achieve more than 4 marks the candidate must link their points to their investigation described in part (b).

Candidates must discuss both practical and ethical points to achieve 7+ marks.

No evaluation	[0]
Evaluation is muddled and weak.	[1–2]
Evaluation is simplistic and not specific to the 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 that discuss both practical and ethical issues. May lack some detail.	[7–8]
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points.	[9–10]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

2 Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation) investigated the effect of social roles on behaviour.

(a) What is meant by qualitative data? [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Descriptions – 1 mark.
This is descriptive data that gives detailed information – 2 marks.

(b) Describe <u>one</u> qualitative finding from Haney, Banks and Zimbardo's study. [3]

1–2 marks partial, 3 marks full.

Indicative content:
Any finding from the study will be credited that is qualitative. Remember to focus on description of the actual behaviours (e.g. what was seen in the prisoners and guards) rather than the conclusions (e.g. this shows pathological prisoner syndrome).

Examples could include the specific behaviours of either the guards or prisoners during the six days of the study.
The prison breakout.
The arrest of the prisoners.
The conversations of the prisoners and/or guards.
The hunger strike.
Examples of poor treatment by the guards towards the prisoners (e.g. the count).

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

(c) Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of investigating behaviour using qualitative data. Use Haney, Banks and Zimbardo's study as an example. [10]

Appropriate strengths and weaknesses will be varied. These could include –

Strengths:
Detailed results of prison experience.
More useful as know the reasons behind prisoner/guard behaviour.
Holistic results (not reductionist) as detail given of behaviours of all participants.
More likely to show the reasons for certain behaviours in the prisoners/guards.

Weaknesses:
Difficult to make comparisons between individuals and groups
No statistical data.
More unethical as it gives in-depth detail which could be distressing for participants to give.
Some participants might find it difficult to give detailed responses.
Interpreter bias of results. May not have reported any of the positive behaviours of prisoners and/or guards.

No comment on qualitative data.	[0]
Comment given but muddled and weak.	[1–2]
Consideration of at least a strength and a weakness not specific to investigation. **OR** Consideration of either a strength/weakness that is specific to investigation.	[3–4]
Consideration of two or more points (at least one strength and one weakness) which are clear and specific to investigation.	[5–6]
Consideration of both strengths and weaknesses which is good but brief and specific to investigations.	[7–8]
Consideration of both strengths and weaknesses which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	[9–10]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

(d) Discuss the extent to which the findings of Haney, Banks and Zimbardo's study can be applied to everyday life. [10]

Indicative content

Candidates may describe how the findings of the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo are useful and to who without discussing the extent to which the findings are useful. Give a maximum of 4 marks to these candidates.

Appropriate comments could include linking usefulness to –

Sample used is unrepresentative as all males, from California, young, etc.
Lots of data collected using different methods (self report, physiological tests and observations) – holistic results – improves validity.
Demand characteristics of prisoners and guards to meet Zimbardo's aims.
Unable to replicate study as such a detailed piece of work.
Observer bias.
Simulation study was believable to the participants as they responded in such an extreme manner.
Simulation study is not like everyday life/real prisons.
Any other appropriate comment.

Extent – Sample used is unrepresentative as all males, so this makes it difficult to generalise to females. This limits usefulness as there are female prisons and prison guards and they may act differently *or* where females take on specific roles (e.g. the army).

No comment on usefulness.	[0]
Comment on usefulness is muddled and weak.	[1–2]
Comment on usefulness which is not specific to the investigation. **OR** A brief comment on usefulness which is specific to investigation.	[3–4]
Consideration of extent is simplistic but specific to investigation and somewhat detailed. This could include one point. **OR** Consideration of extent which is detailed but not specific to investigation.	[5–6]
Consideration of extent is good but brief (2 or more points) and specific to investigation.	[7–8]
Consideration of extent (2 or more points) which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	[9–10]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

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 or examples of behaviours studied by social psychologists (e.g. obedience, conformity, etc.).

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

Milgram (obedience)
Piliavin et al (subway Samaritans)
Tajfel (intergroup categorisation)

(b) Describe how data were collected in each of these studies. [9]

Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):
Milgram: The results were collected by noting how far up the shock generator each participant went (up to 450 volts). Unstructured observations were made of the participants' comments and behaviour during the study. Participants were asked to rate the pain level of the learner out of 4 in a post experiment questionnaire. Participants were followed up one year later and were asked if they were glad they participated in the research.
Piliavin: Data was collected by two independent female observers who sat in the adjacent area. They noted the number, gender and race of all passengers in the carriage. They noted the characteristics of who helped and how long it took before anyone helped. They also wrote down any comments made by participants during the study about the incident.
Tajfel: Participants were randomly told which group they belonged to after the dot estimation/picture preference task. They were placed in a room on their own and asked to complete the matrices booklet. Each participant had to indicate which reward they wished to allocate for each matrix.

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 data collection from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about data collection 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 data collection from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	[3]

[max 9]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

(c) What problems may psychologists have when investigating social behaviour? [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 behaviour.
Or any other relevant problem.

Just three 'named' problems and no description max 1 overall.

Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points.

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

[max 9]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

4 (a) Outline what is meant by the term 'quantitative data'. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Data that is numerical/numbers – 1 mark.
Data that is numerical/numbers with an example of method that could collect it (e.g. psychometrics) *or* that it can be analysed statistically *or* similar statement – 2 marks.

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

Dement and Kleitman (sleeping and dreaming)
Mann et al (lying)
Langlois et al (infant facial preference)

(b) Describe how the quantitative data were collected in each of these studies. [9]

Dement and Kleitman: Participants were woken at intervals in the night and asked whether they had been dreaming or not. Participants were also asked some of the time if the dream had lasted for 5 or 15 minutes. EEG and EOG readings were taken.
Mann et al: Amount of blinks, gaze aversion, head movements, hand/arm movements, pauses and speech disturbances were counted. Two observers watched the video footage and coded the behaviour.
Langlois: Looking time of the infants at each attractive/unattractive face in the first study and looking time at the black face of either a male or female adult in the second study. In study 3 the infants' looking time was recorded for looking at infant faces which varied in attractiveness.

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 quantitative data. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about quantitative data 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 quantitative data. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	[3]

[max 9]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013

(c) What problems may psychologists have when they collect quantitative data? [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:
Validity can be poor due to lack of detail.
Experimenter bias when interpreting numerical data.
Leading questions can lead to invalid data.
Lack of detail of data.
Social desirability/demand characteristics.
Reductionist due to lack of detail.
Less useful as reasons behind behaviour might not be known or only very limited information is gathered.

Or any other relevant problem.

Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points

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

[max 9]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2013