CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

9698 PSYCHOLOGY

9698/23 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 Mann et al. (lying) conducted an experiment in which observers analysed video tapes of police interviews. An alternative way to collect data would be to use a questionnaire.

(a) Describe different types of experiments in psychology. [5]

Any five correct points.
1 mark for each point up to a maximum of five points.
Marks can be awarded for both identifying the type of experiment and giving a definition.
No answer or incorrect answer, 0 marks.
If only one type of experiment is described give a maximum of 3 marks.

Indicative content:
Laboratory experiments –
have an IV and DV and
take place in a controlled environment.
Field experiments –
have an IV and DV and
take place in the natural environment.
Quasi/natural experiment –
where the IV is naturally occurring.
True experiment –
where the IV is manipulated by the experimenter.
Experimental design can be independent measures/repeated measures/matched pairs.
The IV is the manipulated variable.

Any other appropriate point.

(b) Design a questionnaire to investigate lying by suspects and describe how it could be used. [10]

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

Major omissions include the what and how. Candidates must describe the behaviours that are being measured (e.g. questions asked) and how (types of questions).

Minor omissions include who and where.

It is possible to achieve 9 marks with a small minor omission (e.g. the 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 the methodology used in this alternative way of studying lying by suspects. Do not consider ethical terms. [10]

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:
Ecological validity of a field study.
Generalisability of the sample.
Qualitative/quantitative data collected.
Researcher bias.
Social desirability/demand characteristics present or not depending on if the participants know they are in a study.
Reliability.
Validity.

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

Do not credit any discussion of ethical issues.

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.	(7–8)
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation. Two or more points. A consideration of field study must be given.	(9–10)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

2 Dement and Kleitman conducted a laboratory experiment to investigate the link between rapid eye movement (REM) and dreaming.

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

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Examples of qualitative data can achieve up to a maximum of 1 mark.

Descriptive/in-depth/detailed data of participants behaviour, thoughts and feelings.

(b) Describe <u>one</u> piece of qualitative data from the study. [3]

1–2 marks partial, 3 marks full.

Any description of a dream is acceptable.

Possible response:
A dream. – 1 mark
Two people throwing tomatoes at each other. – 2 marks
A participant reported dreaming about two people throwing tomatoes at each other. – 3 marks.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(c) Compare and contrast qualitative and quantitative data using the Dement and Kleitman study as an example. [10]

Candidates may describe/evaluate quantitative/qualitative data with no comparison point. These candidates can achieve up to 4 marks maximum.

Appropriate comparison points will be varied. These could include:

Ability to show clear comparisons/contrasts (e.g. number of dreams in REM vs non REM).
Detail (content of dream).
Ability to use statistical tests (e.g. dream length).
Validity (e.g. more depth in qualitative data of dreams, but is subjective).
Reductionism versus holism (qualitative data is holistic – dream content, whereas quantitative is reductionist – table of results of REM and dreaming).
Usefulness – both types are useful for the different reasons mentioned above. Qualitative for its depth and quantitative for its statistics.

Any other appropriate point.

Maximum of 6 marks if candidate gives just comparisons **or** contrasts.

The answer does not give any creditworthy material.	(0)
Comment on a comparison/contrast issue which is muddled and weak **OR** brief descriptions/evaluation of qualitative/quantitative data.	(1–2)
Comment on comparison/contrast issues which is weak **OR** a clear and fairly detailed description/evaluation of qualitative/quantitative data.	(3–4)
Comments on comparison/contrast issue(s) which are simplistic with few examples. Can include one very detailed point.	(5–6)
Consideration of comparison and contrast issues which are fairly detailed with examples from research.	(7–8)
Consideration of comparison and contrast issues which are detailed and directly linked to relevant examples from research.	(9–10)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

(d) Discuss the extent to which the study by Dement and Kleitman is reductionist. [10]

Appropriate points could include a discussion about:

Reductionism/holism and the factors in the study that make it complex (four factors investigated) and/or simple (just investigating the link between REM and dreaming and not the reason for dreaming).
The lack of ecological validity makes the study more reductionist and therefore the conclusions become based on simple evidence.
As the study is scientific it makes it more reductionist which makes the conclusions simplistic.
Generalisability – could be argued either way as the sample had males and females but unrepresentative.
Demand characteristics make the study more reductionist and the conclusions invalid.

Any other appropriate point.

No comment on reductionism.	(0)
Comment on reductionism is muddled and weak.	(1–2)
Comment on reductionism which is not specific to the investigation **OR** very brief evaluation which is specific to the study.	(3–4)
Consideration of reductionism which is simplistic but specific to investigation.	(5–6)
Consideration of reductionism which is good but brief and specific to investigation.	(7–8)
Consideration of reductionism which is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation.	(9–10)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

Section B

3 (a) Outline why children are used in psychological research. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Indicative content:
To study changes in behaviour over time. – 1 mark
To study changes in behaviour over time to show development. – 2 marks

Could also consider:
Developmental stages, nature-nurture debate, usefulness to schools, etc.

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

Langlois et al. (infant facial preference)
Nelson (children's morals)
Tajfel (intergroup categorisation)

(b) Describe how the data were collected 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:

Langlois et al.: Babies wore glasses and a light/buzzing noise was used to attract the infants' attention to the screen, were timed on how long they gazed at the colour slides of the adult women and adult men. Their visual fixations were recorded on a video monitor.

Nelson: In both studies the children were interviewed individually by the experimenter. They were asked if the little boy was good/bad/just okay. They then indicated how good or bad the little boy was by pointing to one of the 7 faces.

Tajfel: Quantitative data. The boys were given matrices to award points to the in- and out-group. These points were totalled.

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 use children in psychological research? [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:
Children have poor concentration.
Cannot do very much when very young.
Language/communication problems.
Difficulty understanding the instructions in the study.
Demand characteristics/social desirability.
More vulnerable so more ethical issues.
Difficult to get children as parents may not wish to volunteer their child.

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 investigating children **OR** a weak description of a problem related to investigating children and applied to a study.	(2)
Description of problem related to investigating children and applied to the study effectively.	(3)
Max mark	(9)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

4 (a) Outline what is meant by the 'application of psychology to everyday life'. [2]

1 mark partial, 2 marks full.

Usefulness. – (partial) 1 mark
This is whether research is useful and can improve the lives of people in their day to day lives. – (full) 2 marks

Also allow ecological validity/combination of the two.

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

Bandura et al. (aggression)
Loftus and Pickrell (false memories)
Freud (little Hans)

(b) Describe how each of these studies is useful. [9]

Bandura et al.: Media, parents, teachers, anyone interested in the wellbeing of children, therapists in prisons to understand why inmates are violent, etc.

Loftus and Pickrell: Police, courts, doctors helping people with amnesia, etc.

Freud: Parents, doctors, therapists, adults interested in their own gender development, etc.

Full marks for how the study would be used with a specific example.

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 usefulness of the study. The description may be very brief or muddled.	(1)
Description of point about usefulness of 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 usefulness of 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 try to make studies useful? [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:
Studies are often realistic so they can be useful.
Raises the status of psychology to have useful research.
More people will want to participate in studies they view as useful.
If participants know they in the study it will be ethical.
Or any other relevant problem.

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 usefulness **OR** a weak description of an advantage related to usefulness and applied to a study.	(2)
Description of advantage related to usefulness and applied to the study effectively.	(3)
Max mark	(9)

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014