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

9698/22 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 In the study by Schachter and Singer on emotion, participants received a reward for taking part.

(a) What was this reward? [2]

1 mark for a brief answer (e.g. participants were offered marks in their exam) and 2 marks if it is well explained (e.g. participants were offered 2 extra marks for every hour they participated in the experiment).

(b) Describe <u>one</u> effect this reward had on the <u>ethics</u> of the study. [2]

Likely 2-mark answers:
Participants are not giving their consent freely as there is pressure to take part.
Participants may feel they have to continue for the whole study in order to get their extra marks.
Participants may feel distressed at the thought of having to continue as they really need these extra marks.

1 mark for a brief answer (e.g. reduces the ability to withdraw) and 2 marks if it is well explained.

2 From the study by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony:

(a) Describe <u>one</u> feature of the procedure that was standardised. [2]

Likely answers will focus on the film watched, questions asked, order of information presented to the participants (e.g. watched film first and were then asked questions), all sent away for one week, or any other correct answer.

1 mark for a brief description (e.g. everyone saw the same film) and 2 marks for a clear description (e.g. all of the participants saw the same films of the car accident).

(b) Describe how this standardisation of the procedure affects the reliability of this study. [2]

1 mark for stating that it improves the reliability of the study. 2 marks for explaining why. E.g. it is possible to replicate the study/carry out the study in the same way on all participants due to the standardised procedure.

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

3 Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith studied autism.

(a) Outline <u>two</u> findings from this study. [2]

Likely answers could focus on any result from the questions asked: reality, belief, naming and memory.

	Autistic	Down's Syndrome	'Normal'
Naming question	100	100	100
Reality question	100	100	100
Memory question	100	100	100
Belief question	20	86	85

1 mark for each correct finding (numerical results not necessary, but if given must be correct).

(b) Describe <u>one</u> problem the autistic participants might have in everyday life. [2]

1 mark for a brief description (e.g. autistic people have problems socially) and 2 marks for a clear description (e.g. autistic people have social difficulties because of their lack of theory of mind).

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

(a) Describe <u>one</u> possible reason why staff admitted the pseudopatients to the hospital. [2]

Likely 2-mark answers:
The staff may have made this mistake because they would rather be safe than sorry. It could be dangerous to send away an insane person.
The staff made a type 2 error and diagnosed a healthy person as sick.
The symptom, hearing voices, is not a normal behaviour and the staff felt they should admit the person.

1 mark for a brief description (they showed signs of being schizophrenic) and 2 marks for a clear description.

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) Outline <u>one</u> way this study can be considered useful. [2]

Likely 1-mark answers:
Uncovered problems in psychiatric hospitals.
Psychiatrists need to spend more time with patients.
Staff need to treat patients better.
Staff should not label all behaviour as insane.

Likely 2-mark answers:
Uncovered problems in psychiatric hospitals and many were then shut down.
Staff need to treat patients better and try to help raise their self-esteem by paying attention to them.
Psychiatrists need to spend more time with patients as they only spent on average 7 minutes per day with each patient.
Staff should not label all behaviour as insane as this could cause the patients to think nothing they do is right.

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

5 From the study by Tajfel on intergroup categorisation:

(a) Outline <u>two</u> features of the sample. [2]

Boys, 14–15 years old, all from same secondary school, from a secondary modern school, from Bristol.

1 mark for each feature.

(b) Describe <u>one</u> difficulty in generalising from this sample. [2]

1 mark for a brief/detailed difficulty (e.g. it is not representative) and 2 marks for a clear difficulty in the context of Tajfel. (It is not representative as it was just boys, who are very competitive.)

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 The nature/nurture debate has presented a challenge for psychologists. Nature is aspects of our behaviour, personality and biology that we are born with whereas nurture is what we have learned.

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

Gould (intelligence testing)
Hraba and Grant (doll choice)
Deregowski (picture perception)
Bandura, Ross and Ross (aggression)

(a) Describe whether each study supports the nature or nurture side of the debate. [10]

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

Indicative content:
Bandura, Ross and Ross: Children imitated aggression, so supports the nurture view/boys more aggressive than girls could support the nature view also.
Deregowski: Pictures did not perform as a lingua franca, so supports the nurture view as different cultures interpret/perceive pictures in different ways.
Gould: IQ is due to nature as there was a difference between the different races that took the tests or IQ is due to nurture because the less time the army recruit had spent in America the less well he performed on the test. Also, participants who were less well educated did poorly, which suggests learning.
Hraba and Grant: Supports the nurture debate as the children in the study chose the black doll due to their upbringing. Because of the civil rights movement, black people had greater pride in their race.

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 the nature/nurture debate. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about the nature/nurture debate 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 nature/nurture debate from 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 the nature/nurture debate? **[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:
Weaknesses:
Separating the effects of nature/nurture is difficult.
Hard to control for past experiences.
Could be unethical to get participants to learn something distressing.
Could be difficult to get a representative sample.
Strengths:
If we know something is due to nurture, we can help people.
It could highlight genetic disorders.

1 mark When psychologists are studying the nature/nurture debate, it is difficult to get a representative sample.
2 marks When psychologists are studying the nature/nurture debate, it is difficult to get a representative sample, as participants often come from one particular place that could influence their nurturing.
3 marks When psychologists are studying the nature/nurture debate, it is difficult to get a representative sample, as participants often come from one particular place that could influence their nurturing. For example, the children in the Bandura study are all the children of university staff and we cannot generalise to other types of parents.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

No answer **or** incorrect answer.	[0]
Identification of strength/weakness related to the study.	[1]
Description of strength/weakness related to investigating the nature/nurture debate **or** a weak description of a strength/weakness related to investigating the nature/nurture debate and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of strength/weakness related to investigating the nature/nurture debate and applied to the study effectively.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(c) 'It will never be possible to fully resolve the nature/nurture debate.' 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 Longitudinal research takes place over a long period of time: weeks, months or sometimes years.

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

Thigpen and Cleckley (multiple personality disorder)
Hodges and Tizard (social relationships)
Freud (little Hans)
Gardner and Gardner (project Washoe)

(a) Describe how the longitudinal method was used in each of these studies. [10]

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

Indicative content:
Thigpen and Cleckley: This study took place over 100+ hours over 14 months. It was intensive therapy sessions with Eve to help her learn to cope with her multiple personality disorder (MPD) and for the psychiatrists to understand her better.
Hodges and Tizard: This study went from when the participants were 2 (or 8) until they were 16 years old. The psychologists interviewed the teachers, parents and young person to understand better the effect of early institutionalisation on behaviour/emotions later in life.
Freud: The study takes place from when Hans is 3 until he is 5. The father talks to Hans about his fantasies, phobias etc. and then writes to Freud about these conversations. Freud analyses their conversations with a view to helping Hans overcome the Oedipus complex.
Gardner and Gardner: The study takes place over 32 months or from 8–14 months until Washoe is 4/5. The Gardners and their helpers spend hours every day with Washoe, teaching her sign language as well as encouraging other human-like behaviour. They also record all of her signing.

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 use of the longitudinal method. The description may be very brief or muddled.	[1]
Description of point about the use of the longitudinal method in the study. (Comment without comprehension.) A clear description but may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about the use of the longitudinal method 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 the longitudinal method? [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:
Data collected is in-depth and detailed.
Researcher gets to know and understand the participants very well.
Can witness change over time in behaviour.
Weaknesses:
Takes a long time.
Often expensive to complete.
Psychological theories change over time and by the time the results are published psychology has moved on.
Subject attrition.

1 mark One problem is subject attrition.
2 marks One problem is subject attrition as the participants drop out over time and this can make results less generalisable.
3 marks One problem is subject attrition as the participants drop out over time and this can make results less generalisable. For example, in the study by Hodges and Tizard many participants dropped out, particularly in the restored group where the results are less representative of the population.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

Incorrect strength **or** weakness identified.	[0]
Identification of strength/weakness related to using the longitudinal method.	[1]
Description of strength/weakness related to using the longitudinal method **or** a weak description of a strength/weakness related to using the longitudinal method and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of strength/weakness related to using the longitudinal method and applied effectively to a study.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(c) 'Longitudinal research is a waste of time and money.' 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

8 Ecological validity refers to how realistic research is in terms of the situation in which participants are placed. It also refers to the tasks the participants are asked to do.

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

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation)
Milgram (obedience)
Sperry (split brain)
Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreaming)

(a) Describe how the data was collected in each of these studies. [10]

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

Indicative content:
Zimbardo: Data from video and tape recordings, self report measures, etc.
Milgram: Data collected from observing the participants' behaviour as they gave the electric shocks to the learner and also counting how far the participants went up the electric shock generator.
Sperry: Data was collected from the split brain patients by having them carry out tactile, visual and olfactory tasks in the lab and noting down their reactions and the objects they selected.
Dement and Kleitman: Data was collected by waking the participants at various intervals during the night with a doorbell and asking them if they had been dreaming. If they had been dreaming, the participants were asked to record their dream into a tape recorder and estimate its length. They also did EEG and EOG readings throughout the night.

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 how the data was collected. (Comment without comprehension.) A clear description but may lack some detail.	[2]
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about how the data was collected in the study. A clear description that is detailed.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) What problems may psychologists have when they try to conduct ecologically valid research? [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 creating realistic environment.
Difficulty in controlling variables in a realistic environment.
Difficulty in accessing a representative sample.
Researcher bias in observations/interpretation of data.

1 mark Studies that are made to be realistic can be unethical.
2 marks Studies that are made to be realistic can be unethical as the participants may become distressed if the situation is too lifelike.
3 marks Studies that are made to be realistic can be unethical as the participants may become distressed if the situation is too lifelike. For example, the participants in the Milgram study truly believed they were giving shocks and became very anxious as some 'learners' appeared to have fits.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points:

Incorrect problem with the study.	[0]
Identification of problem related to conducting ecologically valid research.	[1]
Description of problem related to conducting ecologically valid research **or** a weak description of a problem related to conducting ecologically valid research and applied to a study.	[2]
Description of problem related to conducting ecologically valid research and applied effectively to study.	[3]

[max 10]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(c) To what extent is it possible to create a realistic study? 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