CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 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 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Section A

1 Freud conducted a case study to investigate the development of the Oedipus complex in little Hans. An alternative way to investigate this would be to conduct a self report into childhood sexuality.

(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
Identifying a case study as an example is not creditworthy.
Strengths and weaknesses are not allowed.

Indicative content:
In-depth study (not just large amount of data)
Small number of participants
Collects a wide variety of data (qualitative / quantitative) – allow 1 mark
Naming a technique used to collect the data (e.g. interview / questionnaire) – allow 1 mark
Usually over a long period of time / develop over time (not time-consuming)
Psychologists develop close relationship with participants
Action research / can help the participant overcome issues
The participant is unique

Any other appropriate point

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(b) Design an alternative investigation using a self report to study the Oedipus complex. **[10]**

Candidates will most likely describe either an interview and / or questionnaire conducted with young children. This could be with one participant or a number of participants. Candidates may use a different method (e.g. experimental) that includes a self report in the data collection.

The focus of the study must be on the Oedipus complex in order to be creditworthy.

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

Major omissions include the what and how. Candidates must describe the questions asked to the participants and at least an indication of how this information would be collected (e.g. interview / questionnaire).

Minor omissions include who and where. The sample must be male and of at least 3 years old to allow for the who. If includes males and females maximum of 8 marks. Retrospective studies are creditworthy.

It is possible to achieve 9 marks with a small minor omission (e.g. sampling method).

Alternative study is incomprehensible.	0
Alternative study is muddled and impossible to conduct.	1–2
Alternative study is muddled and / or major omissions but possible.	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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(c) Evaluate this alternative way of studying the Oedipus complex in practical and ethical 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:
Ethics of questionnaires which can be good as consent is obtained but the questions could be intrusive
Ethics of conducting studies on children
Qualitative / quantitative data collected via self report
Social desirability of responses given by parents / children
Leading questions to get the participants to answer in the way the researcher wants
Generalisability of the sample chosen
Validity of the self report – can be effected by demand characteristics, researcher bias, qualitative / quantitative data, etc.
Any other appropriate point

Evaluative points related to experimental and observational methods are **not creditworthy**.

In order to achieve higher marks (5+) 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 / or not specific to the investigation. May include one point that is brief and specific to the investigation.	3–4
Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation). May include one very detailed point.	5–6
Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation. Two or more points. This must include both a point on practical as well as ethical issues.	7–8
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation and the self-report method.	9–10

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

2 Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) investigated helping behaviour on a busy subway.

(a) 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.

Candidates need to refer to the effect / interaction of other people or the situation / environment to achieve 2 marks.

(b) Describe <u>one</u> finding from the study that supports a situational explanation of helping behaviour. [3]

1 mark – 1 finding that is brief / muddled **OR** attempt to explain why there is support for the situational explanation.
2 marks – clear finding with numerical data **OR** brief / muddled finding with attempt as to why the finding supports a situational explanation.
3 marks full (clearly explains why the finding supports a situational explanation).

Examples:
Helped the cane victim more than the drunk victim because the cane victim seemed safer to help and wouldn't harm the participant.
Help was provided very quickly to the victim because the participants were in an enclosed space and could not get away. Helping reduced their anxiety.
Men were more likely to help as the victim was male and so the male participants felt more comfortable helping than the female participants.
Same race helping was seen with the drunk victim as black men were more likely to help the drunk than a white man.

Accept the victim as 'ill' but not 'old'.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(c) Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the social approach using the Piliavin et al. study as an example. [10]

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

Weaknesses:

Often in a natural environment so there is a lack of control
Participants may not know they are in a study so lack of consent
Psychologists may create distressing social situations which may harm participants
As in the natural environment there may be practical issues with recording data
Psychologists may misinterpret the social behaviour or show bias when recording behaviour
Psychologists will try to create a believable situation but it may appear false to participants and this will affect their behaviour
Can provide reductionist explanations that do not take into consideration factors other than the social setting
Difficult to generalise beyond the social situation / people in the study (e.g. to other cultures)
As often in a natural environment difficult to replicate

Strengths:

Useful as the study is often naturalistic so can be applied to everyday life
Participants often do not know they are in a study so results are more natural
Participants often do not know they are in a study so results are more valid (demand characteristics / social desirability)
Can be holistic as the approach often considers both the situation and how we interact in groups
Provides useful explanations of behaviour

Points directly related to experimental methods are not creditworthy (e.g. control).

Any other appropriate point

No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of social approach.	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 approach and 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 at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are clear and specific to investigation.	7–8
Consideration of at least two strengths and two weaknesses which are good and directly relevant to the investigation.	9–10

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(d) Compare the social approach with one other approach in psychology using the Piliavin et al. study and any other study as examples. [10]

Candidates may describe / evaluate approaches with no comparison point. These candidates can achieve up to 4 marks maximum. Candidates who describe / evaluate just one approach can achieve up to 2 marks maximum.

Appropriate comments –

Both approaches are useful
Social approach produces more / less ethical studies
Both approaches are reductionist (or one is reductionist and the other holistic)
Both approaches do studies that can have good ecological validity (or one is good and the other is poor)
Both approaches are deterministic (or one is deterministic and the other shows free will)
Time period when approaches were developed in psychology
Both approaches can have wide and varied samples (or one does and the other doesn't or both do not have good generalisability)

Any other appropriate comment

No comment on comparison of approaches.	0
Comment given but muddled and weak.	1–2
Comparison of approaches that is brief but not specific to investigation(s). **OR** Comparison of appropriate studies from two different approaches with no link to the approaches.	3–4
Consideration of **one** comparison point that is detailed and specific to the investigation. **OR** Consideration of **one** comparison point that is brief but specific to the investigation and **one** that is not specific to the investigation.	5–6
Consideration of comparison of approaches which is good but brief (**2 or more points**) and specific to at least one of the investigations. **OR** Consideration of **one** comparison issue which is detailed and directly relevant to at least one of the investigations and the **other** comparison point is more simplistic.	7–8
Consideration of comparison of approaches which is detailed (**2 or more points**) and directly relevant to the investigation.	9–10

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

Section B

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

1 mark partial, 2 marks full

The cognitive approach is the study of thinking. – 1 mark
The cognitive approach is about understanding thinking processes / information processing. – 2 marks

Answers which describe the different types of cognitive processes investigated (e.g. language, memory, perception) are also creditworthy.

Appropriate answers could include assumptions of the cognitive approach.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

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

Loftus and Pickrell (false memories)
Held and Hein (kitten carousel)
Mann et al. (lying)

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

Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Loftus and Pickrell: Qualitative data was gathered by reminding participants about four events from childhood and then asking them to recall as much as they could about these events. They were also asked to rate the clarity on a scale of 1 to 10, confidence on a scale of 1 to 5. They were then encouraged to remember as much as they could about these events and were then interviewed 1 to 2 weeks later. All participants were interviewed face to face by female interviewer(s). Description of the creation of the materials for the study is **not** able to get more than 1 mark on its own.

Held and Hein: Quantitative data from visually guided paw placement, discrimination on a visual cliff (ratio of descents), blink response in active versus passive kittens. In addition, there were several additional tests – observation of pupillary reflex to light, tactual placing response and visual pursuit of a moving object.

Mann et al.: Analysis of video interviews with suspects was made by two observers. They coded the following behaviours – gaze aversion, blinks, head movements – nods, shakes and other head movements, self manipulations (scratching of head / wrist), illustrators (hand / arm movements to supplement what was being said), hand / finger movements, pauses, speech disturbances.

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 mark	9

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(c) What problems may psychologists have when they investigate cognitive processes? [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:
Studies are often done in the lab environment so lack ecological validity
Can be upsetting for participants to have tests done that could highlight cognitive difficulties
May produce demand characteristics as done in an unnatural environment
May be difficult to get a representative sample
Difficult to study cognitive processes as these cannot be observed (may produce invalid findings)

Any other appropriate advantage

Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points	
No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Brief description of problem.	1
Detailed description of problem related to investigating cognitive processes. OR A weak description of problem related to investigating cognitive processes and applied to a study.	2
Description of problem related to investigating cognitive processes and applied to the study effectively.	3
Max mark	9

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

4 (a) Outline what is meant by the 'nature-nurture debate' in psychology. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Examples of behaviours that are due to learning / biology can achieve up to a maximum of 1 mark.

Example answer –
Nature is due to biology – 1 mark
Whether behaviour is due to biological influences or learning – 2 marks

Not labelled – 1 mark

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

Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test)
Bandura et al. (aggression)
Langlois et al. (infant facial preference)

(b) Describe how each of these studies supports <u>either</u> the nature <u>or</u> the nurture side of the debate. [9]

Baron-Cohen et al.: Nature. People with autism/Asperger Syndrome are born with this condition. Lack of advanced theory of mind occurs due to this genetic disorder.

Bandura et al.: Nurture. Children learn to be aggressive. This is shown in the study as the children directly imitated the behaviour of the model (e.g. punching the Bobo doll). Could be nature as there were clear gender differences and individual differences in aggression levels.

Langlois et al.: Nature. Children show a genetic preference for faces. In addition, infants also show a preference for attractive faces regardless of race and gender. This shows that experience is not a factor that influences preference.

Giving results of the study will help to achieve the top band. However, the result given must clearly back up the point about nature / nurture.

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 nature / nurture from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	1
Description of point about nature / nurture 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 nature / nurture from the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	3
Max mark	9

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(c) What advantages may psychologists have when they investigate the nature-nurture debate? [9]

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

Indicative content:

Provide useful explanations
Can provide simple explanations of behaviour which are easy to understand
If research is done in a lab has good control so more reliable and / or valid (if clearly linked to the nature / nurture debate)
If studies are done on young children / animals lack of demand characteristics / social desirability
Can show a cause and effect link

Or any other relevant advantage

Marks per point up to a MAXIMUM of three points	
No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Identification of advantage.	1
Description of advantage related to nature / nurture. **OR** A weak description of an advantage related to nature / nurture and applied to a study.	2
Description of advantage related to nature / nurture and applied to the study effectively.	3
Max mark	9

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014