UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 question paper for the guidance of teachers

9698 PSYCHOLOGY

9698/21 Paper 2 (Core Studies 2), maximum raw mark 50

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 October/November 2011 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 Describe <u>two</u> ethical issues raised in the Bandura, Ross and Ross study on aggression. [4]

For example: confidentiality, right to withdraw, informed consent, debrief, deception, etc.

1 mark for naming the guideline and providing a link to the study (e.g. the children were harmed) and 2 marks if it explains the guideline in the context of the study.

2 From the study by Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse on brain scans:

(a) Describe <u>two</u> features of the participants that were matched in this study. [2]

Age, gender and schizophrenia.

1 mark for each.

(b) If the participants had not been matched, what effect would this have had on the results? [2]

Less valid, results due to individual differences, less useful, not generalisable, etc.

1 mark for a brief explanation of the effect (e.g. it would be less valid) and 2 marks for expansion that is in the context of Raine's study.

3 From the study by Hraba and Grant on doll choice:

(a) Describe <u>one</u> finding from this study. [2]

- The black children showed greater racial preference for the black doll in the Hraba and Grant study compared with the Clark and Clark study.
- The black children said they wanted to play with the doll more in the Hraba and Grant study compared with the Clark and Clark study.
- The black children said they thought the black doll was a nice doll more in the Hraba and Grant study compared with the Clark and Clark study.
- The black children said they thought the white doll looked bad in the Hraba and Grant study but it was the black doll they thought looked bad in the Clark and Clark study.
- The black children selected the black doll as the one with a nice colour whereas it was the white doll that was selected by the black children in the Clark and Clark study.
- The black children were significantly more ethnocentric on the racial preference questions in the Hraba and Grant study compared with the Clark and Clark study.
- The Clarks found that black children preferred white dolls at all ages (3–7), although this decreased with age. Hraba and Grant found that a majority of the black children at all ages (3–8) preferred a black doll, and this preference increased with age.
- The Clarks found that the children of light skin colour showed the greatest preference for the white doll and the dark children the least. No such trend was found by Hraba and Grant.
- The white children showed a greater preference for the white doll compared with the black doll.
- Any other appropriate finding.

1 mark for the finding and 1 mark for the comparison.

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) Explain how the findings of this study relate to the nature/nurture debate on racial preference. [2]

The findings support the nurture side of the debate (1 mark).
The findings support the nurture side of the debate because the black children changed from preferring the white doll in 1939 to preferring the black doll in 1969 due to culture changes.

1 mark for stating which side of the debate the findings support and 1 mark for expansion.

4 From the study by Gould on intelligence testing:

(a) Describe <u>one</u> psychometric test used to assess the army recruits. [2]

Army alpha, army beta and spoken (all 1-mark answers).
The army alpha test was a written exam (2-mark answer).

1 mark for a brief description and 2 marks for a clear description.

(b) Outline <u>one</u> problem with using psychometric tests in this study. [2]

Validity, lack of depth of the results, reductionist, etc.

1 mark for a brief description of the problem (e.g. lacks validity). 2 marks for a clear description of the problem (e.g. lacks validity because the tests were testing American cultural knowledge and not IQ).

5 From the study by Rosenhan on being sane in insane places:

(a) Outline <u>one</u> explanation for the reaction of the hospital staff to the pseudopatients. [2]

Type 2 error, patients are seen as invisible/less important by the staff, better safe than sorry (all 1-mark answers).
Type 2 error where the psychiatrist judges a healthy person to be sick (2-mark answer).

1 mark for a brief outline and 2 marks for expansion.

(b) Describe <u>one</u> difficulty when studying individual differences. [2]

Any one from:
finding a valid measurement, ethnocentrism, ethics, etc.
This does not have to be in the context of Rosenhan.

One mark for a brief description and one mark for expansion.

Partial/full answer

0 marks	No answer **or** incorrect answer.
1 mark	Partially correct answer **or** correct but incomplete, lacking sufficient detail or explanation to demonstrate clear understanding.
2 marks	Correct answer with sufficient detail/explanation to demonstrate clear understanding.

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Section B

6 Cognitive psychology investigates how our brain processes information.

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

Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith (autism)
Deregowski (picture perception)
Gardner and Gardner (project Washoe)
Loftus and Palmer (eyewitness testimony)

(a) Describe what each study tells us about cognitive processes. [10]

Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies. One point from each study.
(Any appropriate answer receives credit.)

Indicative content:
Baron-Cohen: Whether the autistic, Down's and 'normal' children used in the study have a theory of mind. This is the understanding that other people's thoughts and beliefs are different from our own. Baron-Cohen used the 'Sally-Anne' task to test this cognitive process.
Deregowski: Depth perception is developed through cultural experiences/nurture. Participants were tested using the picture of the man, antelope and elephant, trident illusion, and split-style drawings to assess their depth perception.
Gardner and Gardner: Investigated the ability of a chimpanzee to learn ASL. Washoe was tested both in lab conditions as well as in the 'field', which was the Gardners' home in Nevada, USA. They used the techniques of imitation and operant conditioning to teach Washoe. They had very strict criteria to determine if Washoe had acquired a sign.
Loftus and Palmer: Tested the effect that leading questions can have on memory. Loftus and Palmer did two experiments. The first involved participants watching short film clips and answering the critical question, 'How fast were the cars going when they ******** into each other?' In the second experiment, participants were asked, 'How fast were the cars going when they hit/smashed into each other?' and then asked the question, 'Was there any broken glass?'

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

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 cognitive processes from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about the cognitive processes from the study. (Comment without comprehension.) A clear description that may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about the psychometric tests used in the study. A clear description that is in sufficient detail.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) What are the strengths and weaknesses of investigating cognitive processes? [10]

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

Indicative content:
Strengths:
Understanding cognitive processes can further our knowledge of how the mind works.
It can be useful to help people with cognitive deficits.
Can help teachers to help students develop their cognitive processes.
Weakness:
Ethics of investigating mental processes, restricted sample which lacks generalisability to the public about their cognitive processes, reductionist explanation of cognitive processes, practical problems like poor concentration span/language skills of participants, demand characteristics of participants, or any other relevant problem.

1 mark Participants may have poor concentration skills.
2 marks Participants may have poor concentration skills, which means their cognitive processes cannot be studied in a valid way.
3 marks Participants may have poor concentration skills, which means their cognitive processes cannot be studied in a valid way. For example, the chimpanzee in the Gardners' study couldn't concentrate for very long, which may have inhibited his language skills.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

No answer or incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of strength/weakness not related to investigating cognitive processes.	[1]
Description of strength/weakness related to investigating cognitive processes **or** a weak description of a problem related to investigating cognitive processes and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of strength/weakness related to investigating cognitive processes and applied to the study effectively.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(c) 'The human mind is similar to a computer.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer. [10]

Emphasis on point. Answers supported with named (or other) studies/evidence.

One or two general statements which may be inaccurate, incomplete or muddled.	[1–2]
General statements are made which are focused on the question but are basic, lacking in detail and have no supporting evidence. For four marks, there may be general statements with anecdotal evidence or vague reference to supporting psychological evidence.	[3–4]
A number of points are made which are focused on the question and are generally accurate. There is some supporting psychological evidence but there is little detail and no attempt to justify the points. **OR** as for 7–8 marks but with only two points.	[5–6]
Four points (best four) are made which are focused on the question and are accurate. There is supporting psychological evidence with an attempt to justify the points. There is increased detail but the range of arguments is limited and there may be an imbalance. **OR** as for 9–10 marks but with only three points.	[7–8]
A range of different points (best four) is made which are accurate and show understanding. Each point has appropriate supporting psychological evidence. The arguments are well expressed, well considered, are balanced (i.e. expressing both sides of the argument), and reflect understanding which extends beyond specific studies. There may well be a consideration of the implications and effects.	[9–10]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

7 Psychological studies should be like everyday life in order that conclusions can be reached about human behaviour.

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

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation)
Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin (subway Samaritans)
Tajfel (intergroup categorisation)
Schachter and Singer (emotion)

(a) Describe what each of these studies tells us about everyday life. [10]

Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies. One point from each study. (Any appropriate answer receives credit.)

Indicative content:
Zimbardo: Pathological prisoners' syndrome, pathology of power, atrocities in prisoner of war camps/concentration camps/Guantanamo Bay, etc.
Piliavin: Cost/benefit analysis, why people help.
Tajfel: How little it takes to discriminate, the power of the group.
Schachter and Singer: Emotions are determined by the two-factor theory of emotion.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

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 everyday life. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about everyday life in the study. (Comment without comprehension.) A clear description but may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about everyday life bias in the study. A clear description that is detailed.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) What are the strengths and weaknesses of studying behaviour in everyday life? [10]

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

Indicative content:
Strengths:
Very realistic so high ecological validity, can generalise to everyday situations, more ethical as in a public place, more useful as realistic.
Weaknesses:
Ethical problems in creating a realistic environment, difficult to make a study totally realistic, difficult to control variables if realistic, difficult to wait for a sample to come to a realistic situation, difficult to study certain behaviours as these may not occur naturally, etc.

1 mark There may be ethical problems in creating a realistic environment.
2 marks There may be ethical problems in creating a realistic environment as in order to make something believable and study natural behaviour it is not possible to obtain consent from a participant.
3 marks There may be ethical problems in creating a realistic environment as in order to make something believable and study natural behaviour it is not possible to obtain consent from a participant. In the Piliavin study, no consent was obtained so the participants responded naturally to the victim collapsing.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

Incorrect strength/weakness identified.	[0]
Identification of strength/weakness related to studying everyday life.	[1]
Description of strength/weakness related to studying everyday life **or** a weak description of a strength/weakness related to studying everyday life and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of strength/weakness related to studying everyday life and applied effectively to study.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(c) To what extent is it possible to study someone in their natural environment? Give reasons for your answer. [10]

Emphasis on point. Answers supported with named (or other) studies/evidence.

One or two general statements which may be inaccurate, incomplete or muddled.	[1–2]
General statements are made which are focused on the question but are basic, lacking in detail and have no supporting evidence. For four marks, there may be general statements with anecdotal evidence or vague reference to supporting psychological evidence.	[3–4]
A number of points are made which are focused on the question and are generally accurate. There is some supporting psychological evidence but there is little detail and no attempt to justify the points. **OR** as for 7–8 marks but with only two points.	[5–6]
Four points (best four) are made which are focused on the question and are accurate. There is supporting psychological evidence with an attempt to justify the points. There is increased detail but the range of arguments is limited and there may be an imbalance. **OR** as for 9–10 marks but with only 3 points.	[7–8]
A range of different points (best four) is made which are accurate and show understanding. Each point has appropriate supporting psychological evidence. The arguments are well expressed, well considered, are balanced (i.e. expressing both sides of the argument), and reflect understanding which extends beyond specific studies. There may well be a consideration of the implications and effects.	[9–10]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

8 It is important for psychological studies to be useful to help improve the lives of people in society.

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

Freud (little Hans)
Samuel and Bryant (conservation)
Hodges and Tizard (social relationships)
Milgram (obedience)

(a) Describe how each of these studies is useful in helping to improve the lives of people in society. [10]

Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies. One point from each study. (Any appropriate answer receives credit.)

Indicative content:
Freud: Helps parents to understand their children better, helps to deal with phobias, showed the effectiveness of psychoanalysis, opened up society about sexuality of children.
Samuel and Bryant: Helpful to identify children with special needs, useful to parents to understand their children better, useful to teachers to know how/what to teach children at each age, useful to governments to create an effective national curriculum.
Hodges and Tizard: Helpful to anyone who adopts/fosters/restores a child from an institution to understand better and help the child, points out the success of adoption, children should not be sent to institutions, parents encouraged to be with their children as long as possible while they are in hospital, parenting classes for restored parents.
Milgram: Helpful to police and teachers to know how to control people better, helpful for individuals to be aware of their tendency to obey and to stand up for themselves if asked to do something immoral, explains dictatorships.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

No answer or incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about the usefulness of the study. (Comment without comprehension.) A clear description but may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about the usefulness of the study. A clear description that is detailed.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) What are the problems that psychologists may have when trying to create useful studies? [10]

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

Indicative content:
Ethics of doing realistic and therefore useful research, restricted samples that make research less useful, reductionist explanations that limit usefulness, ecological validity that limits usefulness, practical problems that make studies difficult to carry out, demand characteristics that reduce validity, or any other relevant problem.

1 mark If a study is unrealistic it is less useful.
2 marks If a study is unrealistic it is less useful and you cannot apply these results to help people in everyday life.
3 marks If a study is unrealistic it is less useful and you cannot apply these results to help people in everyday life. For example, the Loftus and Palmer study is highly unrealistic as participants just watched video clips, which means it might not be useful in understanding eyewitness testimony in the courts.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

Incorrect problem identified.	[0]
Identification of problem related to creating useful studies.	[1]
Description of problem related to creating useful studies **or** a weak description of a problem related to creating useful studies and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of problem related to creating useful studies and applied effectively to study.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(c) 'All psychological research is useful.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer. [10]

Emphasis on point. Answers supported with named (or other) studies/evidence.

One or two general statements, which may be inaccurate, incomplete or muddled.	[1–2]
General statements are made which are focused on the question but are basic, lacking in detail and have no supporting evidence. For four marks, there may be general statements with anecdotal evidence or vague reference to supporting psychological evidence.	[3–4]
A number of points are made which are focused on the question and are generally accurate. There is some supporting psychological evidence but there is little detail and no attempt to justify the points. **OR** as for 7–8 marks but with only two points.	[5–6]
Four points (best four) are made which are focused on the question and are accurate. There is supporting psychological evidence with an attempt to justify the points. There is increased detail but the range of arguments is limited and there may be an imbalance. **OR** as for 9–10 marks but with only three points.	[7–8]
A range of different points (best four) is made which are accurate and show understanding. Each point has appropriate supporting psychological evidence. The arguments are well expressed, well considered, are balanced (i.e. expressing both sides of the argument), and reflect understanding which extends beyond specific studies. There may well be a consideration of the implications and effects.	[9–10]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011