

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series**

### **9773 PSYCHOLOGY**

**9773/02**

Paper 2 (Methods, Issues and Applications),  
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<sup>®</sup>, 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	02

### Methodology

- 1 (a) Describe the independent variable and the dependent variable in experiment 2 by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony. [4]

The independent variable is the leading verb (or not) presented to participants one week before the test question is asked. There are three conditions: smashed, hit and a control condition with no leading verb.

The dependent variable is the verbal response of participants which can be either 'Yes' or 'No'.

2 marks for accurate identification of all the three conditions of the IV and 2 marks for the identification of the way the DV was measured.

- (b) Describe the experimental design of this study and how it was used in experiments 1 and 2. Outline how an alternative experimental design could be used in this study. [8]

The independent measures design has been used in both experiments. In experiment 1 45 students were divided into groups of 9. Each group was asked a different critical question in regards to the speed of the vehicles involved in the collision. Nine subjects were asked, "About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?" Equal numbers of the remaining subjects were interrogated with the verbs *smashed*, *collided*, *bumped*, and *contacted* in place of hit.

The independent measures design was also employed in experiment 2. One hundred and fifty students were divided into three groups. Fifty subjects were asked, "About how fast were the cars going when they smashed into each other?" Fifty subjects were asked, "About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?" Fifty subjects were not interrogated about vehicular speed.

Please note that description of both experimental designs is required for 4 marks.

Alternative experimental designs can include:

Matched pairs design – participants could have been matched in terms of their driving experience, age, gender, spatial awareness.

Repeated measures design – the same participants could have been used but the videos shown could differ in each condition.

Please note that a description of the way participants will be allocated in the conditions of the experiment is necessary for 4 marks. This description needs to be fully contextualised.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

**(c) Using examples from research, debate the use of controls when investigating eyewitness testimony. [8]**

Strengths and weaknesses need to be closely related to the area of memory. Strengths and weaknesses need to be fully explained and not merely identified. At least one strength and one weakness are required for full marks.

Strengths can include:

- Can help to identify cause and effect.
- Can allow for a study to be fully replicated.
- Can help increase validity.

Weaknesses can include:

- Low ecological validity
- Possible demand characteristics
- Possible experimenter bias

NOTE: any appropriate evaluation point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

Research examples can be taken from key studies, from further research or from the ‘explore more’. Research can be taken from a Paper 3 option. The choice of research will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course. Possible research can include the study by Loftus and Palmer, Wells, G. L. and Bradfield and Bartlett.

<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is comprehensive.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is impressive.  Selection and range of arguments is balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.  Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.  Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.  Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.  Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is extensive.</p>	<b>[7–8]</b>
<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is very good.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed.  Selection and range of arguments is balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.  Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.  Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.  Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is competent.</p>	<b>[5–6]</b>

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is good.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is reasonable.  Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.  Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident.  Evaluation has some detail and quality of written communication is good.  Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is good.</p>	<b>[3–4]</b>
<p>Debate (positive and negative points) is reasonable.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is adequate.  Selection and range of arguments is often imbalanced with attempted organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.  Some use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible.  Evaluation has little detail and quality of written communication is adequate.  Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is sufficient.</p>	<b>[1–2]</b>
No or irrelevant answer	<b>0</b>

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

### Issues, Approaches and Perspectives

- 2 (a) Using examples from research, describe two reasons why psychological research is often ethnocentric. [6]**

Possible reasons can include:

DSM – The characteristics of mental health conditions were devised in America and might not be applied to all cultures.

Oedipus complex – family is not constructed in the same way across different cultures and gender roles differ.

Culturally biased samples – usually contacted in Western societies and results cannot always be generalized to other cultures.

Participants are locally sourced.

NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

Research examples can be taken from key studies, from further research or from the ‘explore more’. Research can be taken from a Paper 3 option. The choice of research will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course.

Description of two reasons is accurate, includes most aspects and has elaboration. The candidate clearly understands what they have written. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.	<b>[5–6]</b>
Description of two reasons is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	<b>[3–4]</b>
Description of two reasons is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	<b>[1–2]</b>
No or irrelevant answer	<b>0</b>

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

**(b) Compare the physiological approach with the individual differences approach when explaining insomnia. [6]**

The physiological approach can explain insomnia to derive from physiological factors. These can include, chemical imbalance, hormonal imbalance, disturbances in circadian rhythm, medical conditions, pain and overconsumption of caffeine amongst others.

The individual differences approach can explain insomnia to derive from life events, mental health problems, anxiety.

The question requires not only knowledge of the physiological approach and the individual differences approach but also the ability to compare. Further than this, it requires candidates to apply their knowledge of the approaches to explain insomnia.

Comparisons are appropriate. Description of comparisons is accurate and detailed. Relation of insomnia to the comparisons is explicit. Understanding is full.	<b>[5–6]</b>
Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of insomnia to the comparisons is evident. Understanding is good.	<b>[3–4]</b>
Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is evident with some detail. Relationship of insomnia to comparisons is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	<b>[1–2]</b>
No or irrelevant answer	<b>0</b>

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

**(c) Using examples from research, outline the strengths of the physiological approach in psychology. [8]**

Any relevant research will be credited. Research can be taken from key studies, from further research or from 'explore more'. Research can be taken from a Paper 3 option. The choice of research will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course.

Strengths can include:

- Makes psychology more scientific through the use of rigorous methods of investigation.
- Use objective measures to gather data that give more accurate measurements.
- Highly reliable through the use of objective measures.
- It has practical applications, i.e. treatments.

Strengths are 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. Apposite examples are used throughout. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	<b>[7–8]</b>
Strengths are mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. Appropriate examples are used throughout. The answer has structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	<b>[5–6]</b>
Strengths are basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	<b>[3–4]</b>
Problems and use of psychological terminology is evident. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. Examples are used occasionally. The answer has discernible structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.	<b>[1–2]</b>

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

### Applications

**3 (a) Describe psychological evidence and/or theories that could be relevant to the issues raised in the source. [10]**

Candidates can use any appropriate evidence from any other key theory and study or from any key application and ‘the explore more’ section.

Possible studies/theories include:

- Explanations of gambling
- Features of addiction
- Anxious/ambivalent – Hazan and Shaver
- BDD – Veale, D. and Riley
- Oral fixation – Freud’s psychosexual stages of development

<p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. 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>	<b>[10–8]</b>
<p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	<b>[5–7]</b>
<p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	<b>[4–3]</b>
<p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible. The theories/studies described cover a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient. The answer has a little structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	<b>[1–2]</b>
No or irrelevant answer.	<b>0</b>



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9773	02

- (b) Explain the issues raised in the source using the evidence and/or theories you described in part (a). [10]

Candidates are required to apply their knowledge of the studies and/or theories described in part (a) to explain the events raised in the source. At least two events need to be explained with the evidence explicitly applied to the source.

<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) described in part (a) is accurate, coherent and detailed.  Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.  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.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is explicit.</p>	<b>[10–8]</b>
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is very good.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.  Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.  Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.  The answer has some structure and organisation.  Quality of written communication is good.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident.</p>	<b>[5–7]</b>
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.  Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.  Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.  The answer has some structure and organisation.  Quality of written communication is good.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident in parts.</p>	<b>[4–3]</b>
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is basic.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence but is brief.  Use of terms and use of psychological terminology is discernible.  Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.  The answer has a little structure and/or organisation.  Quality of written communication is adequate.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is implicit.</p>	<b>[1–2]</b>
No or irrelevant answer.	<b>0</b>