

**MARK SCHEME for the November 2005 question paper**

**9698 PSYCHOLOGY**

**9698/02**

**Paper 2**

**maximum raw mark 50**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

The minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the *Report on the Examination* for this session.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2005 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Section A

Question	Description	Mark	
1 (a)	Guidelines broken include: protection, withdrawal, informed consent Guidelines not broken: deception, debriefing, general consent	2	
(b)	Difficult because validity may be compromised if deception is not used – explanation for 2 marks	2	4
2	The study could support the idea that conservation is 'nature' since children seem to develop through the stages suggested by Piaget at the same rate i.e. younger children made more mistakes. This supports the idea of maturation. Any point well argued with reference to the study = 4 marks. Point without explanation 2 marks.	4	4
3 (a)	Reference to one-way mirror, observation checklist, interval schedule etc. Either 2 features identified or one described in detail for 2 marks	2	
(b)	Any two from: use of observation checklist, use of several observers to check inter-observer reliability, use of same observers	2	4
4 (a)	Description of doll choice/questions. 1 mark each	2	
(b)	Using dolls to measure complex psychological thoughts and beliefs is reductionist i.e. lacks detailed explanation from participants, also quantitative data, also breaking down racial issues	2	4
5 (a)	Any one from: 65% obedience, severe reactions from participants, participants believed experiment to be real, many said they benefited from the study, no long term psychological damage	2	
(b)	Demand characteristics, low mundane realism, unique psychological situation, and lack of social support in experiment	2	4

Max 20

Partial/full answer

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

Q	Description	Mark
6 (a)	<b>Outline how the situation in each of these studies influenced behaviour and experience.</b> <b>Gardner and Gardner (Project Washoe)</b> <b>Deregowski (perception)</b> <b>Tajfel (intergroup discrimination)</b> <b>Rosenhan (sane in insane places)</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies. One point from each study.</i> <b>Indicative Content: Gardner and Gardner</b> – the answer could focus on the way Washoe was made to live like a human whereas in the chimps' natural environment they do not wear clothes etc OR the way in which the researchers interpreted Washoe's behaviour was influenced by the situation and what they expected to see. <b>Deregowski</b> – the study suggested that picture perception is not a cultural universal. Also that the materials used can hinder a person's ability to perceive depth cues i.e. if the material is familiar or not. There is also some evidence for the depth cues are learnt but that depth perception may be innate. <b>Tajfel</b> – the explanation offered for the discrimination shown suggested that it was the categorisation of the subjects that creates intergroup discrimination. <b>Rosenhan</b> – the pseudo patients' behaviour was interpreted by the psychiatrists as abnormal due to the situation and context of the psychiatric hospital where patients are expected to suffer from mental disorders.	
	<b>For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points</b>	
	For each point up to a maximum of four studies	
	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 situation	1
	Description of point about situation (comment without comprehension)	2
	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about situations	3
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>
(b)	<b>What problems may psychologists have when they study the effects of situations on behaviour and experience?</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.</i> <b>Indicative Content:</b> Limitations: the role of dispositional factors is not acknowledged, the responsibility of the individual for behaviour is played down (deterministic), explanations are sometimes too simplistic to explain complex behaviours (reductionism).	
	<b>For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points</b>	
	Problem with study itself NOT related to situational explanations of behaviour	0
	Identification of problem related to situational explanations of behaviour	1
	Description of problem related to situational explanations of behaviour	2
	Description of problem related to situational explanations of behaviour and applied effectively to study	3
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>
(c)	<b>Can all behaviour be explained in terms of the situation we are in? Give reasons for your suggestions.</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on point. Answers supported with named study (or other) studies/evidence.</i>	
	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, and reflect understanding which extends beyond specific studies. There may well be a consideration of the implications and effects.	9-10
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>

Q	Description	
7 (a)	<b>Outline how psychometric tests were used in each of these studies.</b> Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith (autism) Hodges and Tizard (social relationships) Gould (IQ testing) Thigpen and Cleckley (multiple personality disorder)	
	<i>Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies. One point from each study.</i> <b>Indicative Content:</b> Baron-Cohen – IQ testing to match groups. Hodges and Tizard – Psychometric tests were used to measure the quality of social relationships (Rutter A and B scale). Gould – IQ tests used to measure intelligence of military recruits. Thigpen and Cleckley – used IQ and memory tests to identify differences between Eve White and Eve Black, Sally Anne Inkblot test. 1 mark.	
	<b>For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points</b>	
	For each point up to a maximum of four studies	
	No answer or incorrect answer	0
	Identification of point relevant to question but not related to study or comment from study but no description of psychometric test.	1
	Description of point about psychometric test. (Comment without comprehension)	2
	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) psychometric test	3
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>
(b)	<b>What are the strengths and weaknesses of using psychometric tests to describe human behaviour and experience?</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.</i> <b>Indicative Content: strengths:</b> quantitative results make it easier to compare people, quantitative data requires less interpretation, well constructed tests can be valid and reliable. <b>Weaknesses:</b> many tests are biased e.g. ethnocentric IQ testing, participants can lie on tests which decreases the validity, some testing can lead to discrimination e.g. scientific racism from IQ testing, reductionist explanations of behaviour lacks detailed explanation.	
	<b>For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points</b>	
	Strength/weakness of study itself NOT related to use of psychological/psychometric tests	0
	Strength/weakness of using psychological/psychometric tests to describe human behaviour and experience	1
	Description of strength/weakness of using psychological/psychometric tests to describe human behaviour and experience	2
	Description of strength/weakness of using psychological/psychometric tests to describe human behaviour and experience applied effectively to study	3
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>
(c)	<b>To what extent do you agree with the statement 'psychometric tests provide a ruler with which to measure the mind'? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on point. Answers supported with named study (or other) studies/evidence.</i>	
	One or two general statements that 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, and reflect understanding which extends beyond specific studies. There may well be a consideration of the implications and effects.	9-10
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>

Q	Description	Mark
8 (a)	<b>What do these studies tell us about human behaviour and experience?</b>	
	<b>Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreaming)</b>	
	<b>Loftus and Palmer (eyewitness testimony)</b>	
	<b>Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse (brain scans)</b>	
	<b>Schachter and Singer (emotion)</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies. One point from each study.</i>	
	<b>Indicative Content:</b> <b>Schachter and Singer</b> – examined the relationship between the experience of emotion and physiological changes in the body. <b>Dement and Kleitman</b> - the connection between REM and dreaming. <b>Loftus and Palmer</b> – eyewitness testimony is not accurate and is prone to distortion. <b>Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse</b> – looked for brain abnormalities in murderers in an attempt to explain their behaviour.	
	<b>For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points</b>	
	For each point up to a maximum of four studies	
	No answer or incorrect answer	<b>0</b>
	Identification of point relevant to the question but not related to study or comment from study but no point about physiological approach	<b>1</b>
	Description of point about the physiological approach (comment without comprehension)	<b>2</b>
	As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) and detailed reference to study	<b>3</b>
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>
(b)	<b>What problems may psychologists have when they describe human behaviour and experience using numbers?</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each problem does not need a different study; can use same study.</i>	
	<b>Indicative Content:</b> problems include: validity- quantitative measurements may not be linked to behaviour, may be reductionist/lack detail, equipment may not be reliable or sufficiently advanced.	
	<b>For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points</b>	
	Problem with study itself NOT related to investigating	<b>0</b>
	Identification of problem related to investigating	<b>1</b>
	Description of problem related to investigating	<b>2</b>
	Description of problem related to investigating and applied effectively to study	<b>3</b>
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>
(c)	<b>Should all studies in psychology use a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative approaches? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
	<i>Emphasis on point. Answers supported with named study (or other) studies/evidence.</i>	
	One or two general statements, which may be inaccurate, incomplete or muddled.	<b>1-2</b>
	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.	<b>3-4</b>
	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.	<b>5-6</b>
	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.	<b>7-8</b>
	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, and reflect understanding which extends beyond specific studies. There may well be a consideration of the implications and effects.	<b>9-10</b>
	<b>Max mark</b>	<b>10</b>