

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9773 PSYCHOLOGY

9773/01

Paper 1 (Key Studies and Theories), maximum raw mark 60

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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

- 1 From the key study by Loftus and Palmer, suggest one reason why participants who heard the word ‘smashed’ were more likely to recall having seen broken glass than participants who did not hear this word. [2]

From the original study

Loftus and Palmer propose that two kinds of information go into one’s memory for some complex occurrence. The first is information gleaned during the perception of the original event; the second is external information supplied after the fact. Over time, information from these two sources may be integrated in such a way that we are unable to tell from which source some specific detail is recalled. All we have is one “memory.” Discussing the present experiments in these terms, we propose that the subject first forms some representation of the accident he has witnessed. The experimenter then, while asking, “About how fast were the cars going when they smashed into each other?” supplies a piece of external information, namely, that the cars did indeed smash into each other. When these two pieces of information are integrated, the subject has a memory of an accident that was more severe than in fact it was. Since broken glass is commensurate with a severe accident, the subject is more likely to think that broken glass was present.

1 mark – brief or unclear reason

2 marks – clear explanation of one reason (from above)

- 2 From the study by Samuel and Bryant on cognitive development:

- (a) Identify two variables that increase the chance of a child giving the correct answer in the conservation experiments. [2]

Likely answers include age of child, type of task (mass, volume, number) and condition (Traditional two question as used by Piaget, the one judgement condition and the fixed array condition)

1 mark for each correctly identified variable x2 = 2

- (b) Explain why one of these variables increases the chance of a child giving a correct answer. [2]

Candidates should select one of the variables and explain the effect this had. For example children given the one judgement condition were not put in a position where they thought that they had given the incorrect answer previously and so were able to conserve.

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear answer explaining the effect of one variable

- 3 Outline one problem with the way that the sample of Milgram’s study was selected. [2]

Most likely answer will focus on the fact that Milgram advertised for his participants in a newspaper local to the New Haven area around Yale University. This may be seen as a problem because volunteers may have characteristics different from non-volunteers (and these may be particularly pertinent in social influence research) or simply because the target population was restricted to readers of the newspaper. It would also be appropriate to focus on the misleading information provided in the newspaper ‘a study of memory and learning’ and the unethical nature of this deception. Any other appropriate information to be credited.

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear outline of appropriate problem

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

- 4 From the key study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo, outline two pieces of evidence that support the conclusion that the participants believed in the reality of the situation that they were in. [4]**

Answers in relation to both prisoners and guards are acceptable although it is most likely that candidates will focus on the prisoners in answering this question. Likely answers include the stress symptoms shown by the prisoners, the fact that they referred to themselves by their numbers and the formal requests for parole. It would also be acceptable (although unlikely) for a candidate to discuss Zimbardo's lack of scientific objectivity and role confusion.

For each piece of evidence

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear outline of an appropriate piece of evidence

- 5 Outline one reason why it is important to consider the location used in the Piliavin et al. study when explaining the results. [2]**

The location was a non-stop train which was on a short journey between stations. Participants were therefore unable to leave the scene. This factor may well explain the high level of helping found (or at least cannot be discounted) and therefore results in different locations are likely to be different.

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear outline of one reason why location is important to consider.

- 6 Describe one strength and one weakness with the way that Bandura et al. collected the data in the key study on learning aggression. [4]**

There are a large number of possible answers that can be given here. Strengths might include the control of variables, the use of one way mirrors for the observation, the inter rater reliability scores, the teacher rated baseline measures etc. Weaknesses might include ethical issues, size of sample and demand characteristics (children thinking they were meant to copy). Any appropriate answer may be credited.

For strength

1 mark – brief or unclear answer / strength identified but not contextualised

2 marks – clear answer / strength identified and contextualised.

For weakness

1 mark – brief or unclear answer / weakness identified but not contextualised

2 marks – clear answer / weakness identified and contextualised.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

7 Outline the aim of the further research on psychosexual development conducted by Anderson and Green. [2]

To test whether it was possible to deliberately (using executive control processes) suppress (or repress) memories.

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear outline of the aim of the further research by Anderson and Green.

8 Briefly discuss problems of defining abnormality. [4]

Candidates may opt for depth or breadth in their answer, but must refer to more than one problem in their answer for full marks. Likely problems include notions of statistical abnormality, cultural, social and historical differences/biases, problems in defining normality/mental health. Reference to Rosenhan is creditworthy if made explicit.

1–2 marks – either one problem discussed increasingly well or brief identification (rather than discussion) of problems.

3–4 marks – more than one problem discussed increasingly well.

9 Suggest one problem with the further research into gambling conducted by Griffiths. [2]

The most likely answer is that this was a case study and therefore does not produce results that can be easily generalised to others. Any other acceptable answer may be credited.

1 mark – brief or unclear answer / problem not contextualised.

2 marks – clear answer / problem contextualised.

10 Describe how facial symmetry was manipulated in the first study conducted by Rhodes et al. [2]

From the study: In Experiment 1, we varied the level of symmetry in individual faces and examined the effect on attractiveness. There were four versions of each face. One of these was a perfectly symmetric version created by blending the normal and mirror images of the face. The others were (1) a high-symmetry version, created by reducing the differences between the original face and its perfectly symmetric version by 50%, (2) the original face showing a normal level of symmetry, and (3) a low symmetry version, created by increasing the differences between the original face and its perfectly symmetric version by 50%..

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear outline

11 From the key study by Wang et al. on stress, explain how an fMRI scan measures brain activity. [2]

Functional magnetic resonance imaging, or fMRI, is a technique for measuring brain activity. It works by detecting the changes in blood oxygenation and flow that occur in response to neural activity – when a brain area is more active it consumes more oxygen and to meet this increased demand blood flow increases to the active area. fMRI can be used to produce activation maps showing which parts of the brain are involved in a particular mental process.

1 mark – brief or unclear answer

2 marks – clear answer giving at least two pieces of information.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

12 Give **two** of the outcome measures (dependent variables) used in the further research by Gale and Martyn on sleep and dreaming. [2]

Gale and Martyn identify the main outcome measures in the abstract. These are as follows: Self-reported income, access to a car, standard of accommodation, performance on a test of cognitive function, state of health and mortality during 23 years of follow up.

1 mark for each outcome measure correctly identified x 2 = 2.

Section B

13 (a) Describe research into autism. [10]

From specification: Overview: The main characteristics of autism and Asperger’s syndrome will be explored in this section with an emphasis on why lack of ‘theory of mind’ is a core deficit of autism. The key study by Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste and Plumb (2001) has been selected to demonstrate the use of the ‘eyes test’ as an advanced way of testing the theory of mind in adults. The study by Golan, Baron-Cohen, Hill and Rutherford (2006) is offering an alternative way of assessing these empathising deficits in autistic spectrum conditions.

<p>Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	[8–10]
<p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	[6–7]
<p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	[4–5]
<p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	[1–3]
No answer or irrelevant answer.	[0]

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

(b) Evaluate research into autism.

[12]

Candidates may use a variety of evaluation issues in their response (most likely will be issues relating to experimental design, ethics, the reliability and validity of conclusions, usefulness and applications).

<p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	[10–12]
<p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p>	[8–9]
<p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	[6–7]
<p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p>	[4–5]
<p>Discussion is basic. Some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Points are not always organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Some or no use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is discernible or not present. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is rare or not present. Evaluation has meagre detail and understanding may not be evident.</p>	[1–3]
No answer or irrelevant answer.	[0]

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

- (c) Explain how you would conduct a study which would extend our understanding of autism. [6]**

The alternative could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the specification or it could be based on that and/or any research from the ‘explore more’ section or it could be based on any relevant research surrounding this area that the candidate has explored. It could even be suggestions that the candidates themselves make based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.

Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive.	[5–6]
Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good.	[3–4]
Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic.	[1–2]
No answer or irrelevant answer.	[0]

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

14 (a) Describe research into body dysmorphic disorder (BDD).

[10]

From specification: Overview: Body dysmorphic disorder is a preoccupation with an imagined defect in physical appearance.

The key study by Veale and Riley (2000) focuses on a major preoccupation of those with BDD, that of mirror gazing. The further research by Phillips et al. investigated the demographics, phenomenology, course, associated psychopathology, family history, and response to treatment in a series of 30 patients with the disorder.

<p>Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	[8–10]
<p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has adequate structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	[6–7]
<p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	[4–5]
<p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident. The answer has minimal structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	[1–3]
<p>No answer or irrelevant answer.</p>	[0]

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

(b) Evaluate research into body dysmorphic disorder (BDD).

[12]

Candidates may use a variety of evaluation issues in their response (most likely will be issues relating to experimental design, ethics, the reliability and validity of conclusions, usefulness and applications).

<p>Discussion is comprehensive. Range of points is balanced. Points are competently organised. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	[10–12]
<p>Discussion is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p>	[8–9]
<p>Discussion is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	[6–7]
<p>Discussion is sufficient. Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge. Partial use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is acceptable. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p>	[4–5]
<p>Discussion is basic. Some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Points are not always organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Some or no use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is discernible or not present. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is rare or not present. Evaluation has meagre detail and understanding may not be evident.</p>	[1–3]
No answer or irrelevant answer.	[0]

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	01

- (c) Explain how you would conduct a study which would extend our understanding of body dysmorphic disorder. [6]

The alternative could be based entirely on the ‘further research’ identified on the specification or it could be based on that and/or any research from the ‘explore more’ section or it could be based on any relevant research surrounding this area that the candidate has explored. It could even be suggestions that the candidates themselves make based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.

Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is impressive.	[5–6]
Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is good.	[3–4]
Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative of the wider topic area is basic.	[1–2]
No answer or irrelevant answer.	[0]