CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

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 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 October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Section A

1 Tajfel (intergroup categorisation) conducted a study during which the participants completed matrices to allocate points to either the in-group or the out-group. This could be considered to have low ecological validity and intergroup categorisation could be investigated in a more ecologically valid way.

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

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

Indicative content:
Validity/content validity – measuring what the experimenter intends to measure/whether the DV appears to measure what is intended.
Face validity – looks like it is measuring what it intends to measure.
Ecological validity – whether the study is true to life.
Construct validity – refers to the ability of a measurement tool (e.g., a survey, test, etc.) to actually measure the psychological concept being studied.
Concurrent validity – is demonstrated where a test correlates well with a measure that has previously been validated. Can be called predictive or criterion validity.
Population validity – which refers to the extent to which the findings can be generalised to other populations of people.
Internal validity – the IV in the study is what caused the DV and not other factors. Can be confident of cause and effect.
External validity – the extent to which the results can be generalised to other people/settings (do not credit twice if already given for either ecological validity or population validity).
Any other appropriate point.

Award a maximum of 2/5 marks for terminology on its own.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(b) Design an alternative study of intergroup categorisation with higher ecological validity and describe how it could be conducted. [10]

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

Major omissions include the what and how. Candidates must describe how the data would be collected from the participants and what this data will look like (e.g. types of self-report data collected and/or how the DV was collected).

Minor omissions include who and where.
It is possible to achieve 9 marks with a small minor omission (e.g. sampling method).

If the ecological validity is NOT higher then cap at 4. Exact replication of Tajfel is not creditworthy.

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 intergroup categorisation in methodological and ethical terms. [10]

Indicative content:

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

Appropriate points could include a discussion about:
Difficulty in accessing a large sample of participants.
Ecological validity of the DV/environment/etc.
Could be unethical to do a study on someone with a mental health problem.
Participants could lie/social desirability/demand characteristics.
Validity of data collection technique.
Reliability of data collection technique.
Ethics of method/environment/sampling technique/etc.
Difficulties in creating a realistic DV.

Any other appropriate point.
In order to achieve higher marks (5+) the candidate must link their points to their investigation described in part (b).

Candidates must discuss both methodological 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 methodological as well as ethical issues.	(7–8)
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points that must include both a point on methodological as well as ethical issues. A consideration of ecological validity must be given.	(9–10)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

2 Piliavin et al. conducted a field experiment to investigate helping behaviour in a subway.

(a) What is meant by 'ethnocentrism'? [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Examples of ethnocentrism can achieve up to a maximum of 1 mark.

Example answer:
Centred on your own ethnicity. – 1 mark
Judging another culture from the point of view of your own ethnic group. – 2 marks

Candidates may consider the ethnocentrism of the sample which can achieve full marks. They might discuss how the results might lack generalisability due to the participants being from one cultural group (e.g. New York city).

(b) Describe <u>one</u> finding from the study that shows that the participants were being ethnocentric. [3]

1–2 marks partial, 3 marks full (clearly explains **why** the finding is ethnocentric).

Candidates could consider same race helping and also same gender helping.

Examples:

Possible response:
Men helped more. – 1 mark
Men helped the victim more often than women. – 2 marks
Men helped the victim more often than women because the women did not consider it their place to help. – 3 marks

Black participants helped the black victim. – 1 mark
Black participants were more likely to help the black drunk victim. – 2 marks
Black participants were more likely to help the black drunk victim because they have empathised with the victim due to their similar ethnicity. – 3 marks

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(c) Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of research carried out in one country/culture using the Piliavin et al. study as an example. [10]

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

Weaknesses
Reductionist as it doesn't consider other explanations of behaviour.
Difficult to access a wide range of participants from many different cultures.
If sample from one culture/place cannot generalise results.
Environment is culturally specific.
Can be unethical to blame race/gender for behaviour.

Strengths
Useful to know if behaviour is due to ethnicity/race.
If sample is from a wide range of cultures is generalisable (more valid).
Improves the status of psychology to address this issue.
Less expensive.
Participants understand what they are being asked to do as it is culture specific.

Any other appropriate point.

No comment on the strengths and weaknesses of one country/culture.	(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 one country/culture 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) Discuss the extent to which the Piliavin et al. study is reliable. [10]

Appropriate comments could include linking to reliability include:

Sample used (difficult to replicate with the same/similar type of people).
Difficult to do the incident in exactly the same way every time.
Controls used (e.g. timing of incident, clothing of victim) the same for each condition so reliable.
Difficulty in recording data in the same way each time (view could be obstructed).
Quantitative data is easier to record in the same way.
Event sampling is easier to record in the same way each time.

Any other appropriate comment.

Required to discuss both sides of the issue to achieve 7+ marks.

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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

Section B

3 (a) Outline <u>one</u> ethical issue. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Informed consent. – 1 mark
Informed consent is asking for the permission from the participants to take part in the study. – 2 marks

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

Schachter and Singer (emotion)
Loftus and Pickrell (false memories)
Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation)

(b) Describe an ethical issue raised in each of these studies. [9]

Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit). It can be either an issue that was addressed or not in the study:

Schachter and Singer: Informed consent not gained, physical and psychological harm to participants, debrief given, right to withdraw was offered, deception.

Loftus and Pickrell: Informed consent not gained, psychological harm when participants find out about the lie, debrief given, confidential data.

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: Debrief given, informed consent gained (or not gained – could be argued both ways), psychological harm, lack of confidentiality due to video evidence, right to withdraw given (or not), deception to do with arrest of prisoners.

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 ethics from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	(1)
Description of point about ethics 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 ethics 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 make studies ethical? [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.
Raises status of psychology.
More participants want to take part in future as they know they will be protected.
Protects rights of participants.
Ethical studies are often in the lab (good points of lab studies can be brought in if related to ethics).
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 ethics OR a weak description of an advantage related to ethics and applied to a study.	(2)
Description of advantage related to ethics and applied to the study effectively.	(3)
Max mark	(9)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

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

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

A snapshot study is quick and takes place over a short period of time.

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

Billington et al. (empathising and systemising)
Langlois et al. (infant facial preference)
Bandura et al. (aggression)

(b) Describe how the snapshot method was used in each of these studies. [9]

Billington et al.: Took place over a short period of time as participants just need to complete the questionnaires (eyes test, SQ/EQ).

Langlois et al.: Quick study as the babies just sat on the mum's lap and looked at pictures and were timed on how long they gazed at the picture.

Bandura et al.: Study took less than a couple of hours. Children went into the three experimental rooms to either view the model or be observed.

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 the snapshot method from the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	(1)
Description of point about snapshot method 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 snapshot method 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 use the snapshot method? [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:

Does not show change over time.
Often lab studies as these are quick (any problems with lab studies are acceptable if linked to snapshot study).
May not be time to give a full debrief.
Cannot collect detailed data.
Often reductionist as data is simplistic.
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 snapshot method OR a weak description of a problem related to snapshot method and applied to a study.	(2)
Description of problem related to snapshot method and applied to the study effectively.	(3)
Max mark	(9)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014