UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
General Certificate of Education
Advanced Subsidiary Level and Advanced Level

PSYCHOLOGY **9698/02**

Paper 2 Core Studies 2 **For Examination from 2012**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 70

This document consists of **9** printed pages and **1** blank page.

© UCLES 2010

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE International Examinations

[Turn over

Section A (50 marks)

Answer **all** questions.

1 Veale and Riley (mirror gazing) used a questionnaire to investigate the beliefs and behaviours of patients with BDD in front of mirrors. An alternative way to investigate this problem would be to conduct a field experiment in which participants who have or do not have BDD were observed out shopping to see how frequently they looked at themselves in plate glass windows and in mirrors in shops.

(a) Describe the field experiment as a research method. [5]

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

Indicative content:
- manipulation of IV
- measuring of DV
- assessment of causal relationship
- some control of the environment/variables
- conducted in participants' normal setting for the behaviour

(b) Describe how this alternative study could be conducted. [10]

Alternative study is not a field experiment or is incomprehensible	0
Alternative study is muddled and impossible to conduct	1–2
Alternative study is muddled but possible although may be unethical	3–4
Alternative study is clear and possible although may be unethical	5–6
Alternative study is described in some detail although may be unethical	7–8
Alternative study is described in sufficient detail to be replicable and would be ethical	9–10

(c) Evaluate this alternative approach to studying this problem in psychology in practical and ethical terms. [10]

No discernable evaluation	0
Evaluation is muddled and weak	1–2
Evaluation is simplistic and not specific to the investigation	3–4
Evaluation is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation)	5–6
Evaluation is good and specific to the investigation	7–8
Evaluation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation	9–10

© UCLES 2010

Indicative content:
- causality can be determined
- Ps in normal environment so fewer demand characteristics
- task is likely to be less artificial than lab experiment so higher mundane realism
- Ps in normal environment so likely to be higher ecological validity
- control may be difficult reducing validity
- natural environment is no guarantee of generalisability
- raise ethical issues if participants are unaware they are in a study

2 Demattè, Őosterbauer and Spence (smells and facial attractiveness) investigated the effect of olfactory cues on attractiveness of male faces to females participants. They asked the participants many relevant questions prior to the experiment but did not ask about their sexual orientation.

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

1 mark partial
2 marks full

A generalisation is an assumption that everyone is the same – 1 mark (partial)

Generalisations are conclusions that can be drawn about the population from the findings of a representative sample – 2 marks (full)

(b) To what extent are the findings of Demattè, Őosterbauer and Spence generalisible? [3]

No discernable comment on generalisation	0
Consideration of generalisation is simplistic and/or not specific to the investigation	1-2
Consideration of generalisation is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation	3

Indicative content:
Yes:
- The participants were checked for normal vision and olfaction, so were typical

No:
- only based on female views of male faces so might not apply to other perspectives on facial attractiveness
- it was assumed that the female participants were also heterosexual
- although they piloted the odours for attractiveness, there may be individual differences
- there may be cultural differences due to the procedure e.g. geraniums are typically English flowers and may not be attractive if they are unfamiliar
- the participants were not asked about their menstrual cycle although this can affect attractiveness of male odour
- only 16 participants aged 20-34 were used

(c) 'Halo dumping' was one possible threat to validity considered by Demattè, Őosterbauer and Spence. Discuss the validity of this study. [10]

No discernable comment on validity	0
Consideration of validity is muddled and weak	1–2
Consideration of validity is simplistic and not specific to the investigation	3–4
Consideration of validity is simplistic but specific to the investigation (may include general evaluation)	5–6
Consideration of validity is good and specific to the investigation	7–8
Consideration of validity is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation	9–10

Answers do not have to focus exclusively (or even at all) on halo dumping, although if they do the full range of marks should be accessible.

Indicative content:
Valid:

- a link could be established between the face and the smell because the technique used presented them as a unitary stimulus and cross-modal interactions were checked
- by making presentations of the odours brief they avoided any influence on the odours on mood interfering with face preferences
- trials were andomized (and successive presentation of one odour avoided) so the effects could be attributed to the smells, not practice or fatigue effects

Not valid:

- the unpleasant smells may have distracted the participants' attention causing them to find the faces less attractive rather than affecting perception *per se*.
- the participants might have been halo dumpling i.e. expressing their like or dislike of the odour on the attractiveness scale
- this is possible as they only had one scale to use, so couldn't separate their evaluations

Though this is unlikely as:

- halo dumping mainly occurs with flavour perception where smell and taste are both important
- smell and vision are not confused in the same way
- the odour was detected at the beginning of the trail, attractiveness was rated at the end
- attractiveness is an unambiguous characteristic of human faces

© UCLES 2010

(d) Discuss the practical and ethical issues raised by the briefing questions in this study. [10]

No discernable comment on practical or ethical issues	0
Consideration of practical and/or ethical issues is muddled and weak	1–2
Consideration is *either* limited to practical or ethical issues *or* is not specific to the investigation	3–4
Either consideration of practical and ethical issues is simplistic but specific to the investigation *or* either practical or ethical issues are discussed well and are specific to the investigation	5–6
Consideration of both practical and ethical issues is good and specific to the investigation	7–8
Consideration of both practical and ethical issues is detailed and directly relevant to the investigation	9–10

Any practical or ethical issues could be relevant and candidates may approach the question by looking at those issues *not* tackled in the briefing.

Section B (20 marks)

3 (a) Outline what is meant by the nature/nurture debate in psychology. [2]

No answer or incorrect answer	0
Basic or muddled outline or outline has only one component	1
Clear and accurate outline including both components	2

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

Nelson (children's morals)
Langlois, Ritter, Roggman and Vaughn (attractive faces)
Held and Hein (kitten carousel)

(b) Describe whether each of these studies supports the nature or nurture view. [9]

Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies.
One point from each study.
Either side of debate acceptable if well argued.

Indicative content:
Nelson:
- younger children were less sophisticated in their judgements of morality (they linked motive and outcome) than older children, supporting nature although the differences were not great and the younger children in the verbal only condition identified motive as important

Langlois, Ritter, Roggman and Vaughn:
- babies show consistencies in facial preferences (for race, gender and age) supporting nature
- they may have an innate preference for average facial prototypes
- this could evolve if mean characteristics of a population were more successful/extremes represented (potentially harmful) mutations

Held and Hein:
- kittens were impaired by deprivation suggesting nurture
- visually guided paw placement / visual cliff / blink were impaired in the passive kittens

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 nature/nurture	1
Description of point about nature/nurture (comment without comprehension)	2
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about nature/nurture	3

Max mark 9

© UCLES 2010

(c) What problems may psychologists have when they investigate whether behaviour develops through nature or nurture? [9]

Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each study must be used at least once.

Indicative content:
- obtaining consent
- distress and other ethical issues
- measuring variables in babies
- obtaining sample, etc.

For each point up to a maximum of three points

Problem with study itself <u>not</u> related to nature/nurture debate	0
Identification of problem related to nature/nurture debate	1
Description of point about nature/nurture with example (comment without comprehension)	2
Description of point with example and analysis (comment with comprehension) about nature/nurture.	3

Max mark 9

4 (a) Outline what is meant by quantitative and qualitative data. [2]

No answer or incorrect answer	0
Basic or muddled outline <u>or</u> outline has only one component	1
Clear and accurate outline including both components	2

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

Freud (little Hans)
Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin (subway Samaritans)
Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreaming)

(b) Describe the quantitative and/or qualitative data in each of these studies. [9]

Emphasis on study. Answers must be related to named studies.
One point from each study.
Either side of debate acceptable if well argued.

Indicative content:
Freud:
Only qualitative data was gathered in this study. This consisted of the self reports made by little Hans and recorded by his father. It also includes answers by little Hans to questions posed by his father. There are other anecdotes, like the episode with the maid.

Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin:
This observational study gathered mainly qualitative data using response categories, such as the speed of helping, the frequency of helping, the colour and sex of the helpers. The two observers recorded different things. A few anecdotal comments were noted by the observers, which is qualitative data.

Dement and Kleitman:
Both qualitative and quantitative data was gathered in this study and the final data includes both types. Quantitative data was known from the EEG, such as when a participant entered REM or NREM sleep and for how long a participant had been in a particular stage. Also known was the direction of eye movements. The qualitative data was the recall of a dream (or not), the estimated duration (5 or 15 mins) and the content (such as throwing tomatoes).

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 qualitative/quantitative	1
Description of point about qualitative/quantitative (comment without comprehension)	2
As above but with analysis (comment with comprehension) about qualitative/quantitative	3

Max mark 9

© UCLES 2010

(c) What problems may psychologists have when their research has only quantitative or qualitative data? [9]

Emphasis on problem. Answers supported with named (or other) studies. Each study must be used at least once.

Indicative content:
- no explanation as to why a participant behaved in a particular way
- no knowledge that the participant is truthful
- with no inter-rater reliability one observer may bias the results
- no 'hard' evidence to support a subjective self report.

For each point up to a maximum of three points

Problem with study itself not related to qualitative/quantitative debate	0
Identification of problem related to qualitative/quantitative debate	1
Description of point about qualitative/quantitative with example (comment without comprehension)	2
Description of point with example and analysis (comment with comprehension) about qualitative/quantitative.	3

Max mark 9

BLANK PAGE