



PSYCHOLOGY

9773/02

Paper 2 Methods, Issues and Applications

May/June 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Describe <u>two</u> qualitative findings from the study of Milgram on obedience to authority.</p> <p>Responses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjects were observed to sweat, tremble, stutter, bite their lips, groan, and dig their fingernails into their flesh. These were characteristic rather than exceptional responses to the experiment. • Regular occurrence of nervous laughing fits. The laughter seemed entirely out of place, even bizarre. • Full-blown, uncontrollable seizures were observed for 3 subjects. On one occasion the seizure was so violently convulsive that it was necessary to call a halt to the experiment. • Comments of defiant participants as transcribed from the tape recordings: [0124] I think he's trying to communicate, he's knocking. . . . Well it's not fair to shock the guy. . . these are terrific volts. I don't think this is very humane. . . . Oh, I can't go on with this; no, this isn't right. It's a hell of an experiment. The guy is suffering in there. No, I don't want to go on. This is crazy. [Subject refused to administer more shocks.] • [0123] He's banging in there. I'm gonna chicken out. I'd like to continue, but I can't do that to a man. . . . I'm sorry I can't do that to a man. I'll hurt his heart. You take your check. . . . No really, I couldn't do it. • Defiant participants were frequently in a highly agitated and even angered state. • Sometimes, verbal protest was at a minimum, and the subject simply got up from his chair in front of the shock generator, and indicated that he wished to leave the laboratory. • After the maximum shocks had been delivered by obedient participants, and the experimenter called a halt to the proceedings, many obedient subjects heaved sighs of relief, mopped their brows, rubbed their fingers over their eyes, or nervously fumbled cigarettes. Some shook their heads, apparently in regret. <p>NOTE: any appropriate finding can receive credit.</p> <p>1 mark for identification of a finding and 1 mark for elaboration.</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)(i)	<p>Outline <u>two</u> ways in which Milgram made the study ecologically valid.</p> <p>Ways employed to make the study more ecologically valid include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the shock generator were carefully handled to ensure an appearance of authenticity. The panel was engraved by precision industrial engravers, and all components were of high quality. • Each participant is given a sample shock on the shock generator, prior to beginning his run as teacher. The shock is applied to the wrist of the participant and has its source in a 45-volt battery wired into the generator. This further convinces the subject of the authenticity of the generator. • The teacher and learner were taken to an adjacent room and the learner was strapped into an "electric chair" apparatus. An electrode was attached to the learner's wrist, and electrode paste was applied "to avoid blisters and burns." In order to improve credibility the experimenter declared, in response to a question by the learner: "Although the shocks can be extremely painful, they cause no permanent tissue damage." • Participants drew slips of paper from a hat to determine who would be the teacher and who would be the learner in the experiment. The drawing was rigged so that the naive subject was always the teacher and the accomplice always the learner. • Participants are instructed to announce the voltage level before administering a shock. This serves to continually remind participants of the increasing intensity of shocks administered to the learner. <p>2 marks per way in which Milgram made the study ecologically valid. 1 mark for identification and 1 mark for elaboration.</p>	4
1(b)(ii)	<p>Explain how the ecological validity of the study could have been improved.</p> <p>The ecological validity could be improved further by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase proximity by having the teacher and the learner seated in the same room. • Allow the learner to provide vocal responses throughout instead of just pounding on the wall at 300 v. • Instruct the learner not to provide responses at an earlier stage than Shock Level 20 as participants may construe this as a sign that the learner was still willing to "play the game" and thus unharmed. • Carry out the study in a natural environment such as a prison or military environment. <p>2 marks for identification of how the ecological validity of the study could have been improved and 2 marks for explanation.</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p>Using examples from research, debate whether the breach of ethical guidelines is justified when investigating obedience to authority.</p> <p>Reasons as to why is justified to breach ethical guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychologists do not always know that ethical guidelines, such as psychological harm will be breached before the research has started. In Milgram's study 14 Yale seniors, were provided with a detailed description of the experimental situation and were asked to predict the behaviour of 100 hypothetical subjects. All respondents predicted that only an insignificant minority would go through to the end of the shock series (the mean was 1.2%). The question was also posed informally to Milgram's colleagues and the most general feeling was that few if any subjects would go beyond the designation Very Strong Shock. • Harm to the participants might not be as great as it might appear. Milgram carried out a follow-up survey a year after the study and 84% of participants were 'glad to have been in the experiment'. Participants were examined by a psychiatrist who confirmed that there was no signs of long term harm. • The scientific value of the study justifies the harm experienced by participants. • Treating participants with respect often involves allowing them to exercise their free will to make choices that might not always be best for them. <p>Reasons against breaching ethical guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychologists have a duty to maintain society's moral standards and protect participants from psychological harm. • Not adhering to ethical guidelines will bring Psychology into disrepute that could result in less funding but also making it harder to recruit participants. • Unethical research might encourage destructive behaviours or unacceptable views. <p>NOTE: any appropriate evaluation point can receive credit.</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p>Debate (balance of 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>	7–8
	<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>	5–6
	<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>	3–4
	<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>	1–2
	No or irrelevant answer.	0

Question	Answer	Marks								
2(a)	<p>Using examples from research, describe <u>two</u> assumptions of the individual differences approach in psychology.</p> <p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour should be explained by focusing on the differences between individuals such as their personality, gender, intelligence. • We cannot make generalisations as to why people behave in certain ways, since each individual is different. • Individuals differ in their behaviour and personal characteristics so not everyone can be considered ‘the average person’. • All human characteristics can be measured and quantified. • Individual differences are useful for explaining and predicting behaviour and performance. <table border="1" data-bbox="316 768 1310 1294"> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 768 1230 965">Description of the two assumptions 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.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 768 1310 965">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 965 1230 1099">Description of the two assumptions is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 965 1310 1099">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1099 1230 1234">Description of the two assumptions is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1099 1310 1234">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1234 1230 1294">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1234 1310 1294">0</td> </tr> </table> <p>If only one assumption is described then up to 3 marks can be awarded.</p>	Description of the two assumptions 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.	5–6	Description of the two assumptions is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	3–4	Description of the two assumptions is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	6
Description of the two assumptions 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.	5–6									
Description of the two assumptions is accurate, has some elaboration, and some understanding. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	3–4									
Description of the two assumptions is basic with little or no elaboration, with little understanding. Reasonable use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.	1–2									
No or irrelevant answer.	0									

Question	Answer	Marks								
2(b)	<p>Contrast the individual differences approach with the behaviourist perspective when explaining shopping addiction.</p> <p>The question requires not only knowledge of the two psychological areas but also the ability to compare. Further than this, it requires candidates to apply their knowledge to shopping addiction.</p> <p>Possible points in relation to the individual differences approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shopping addiction is due to an individual’s personality, such as high levels of neuroticism, impulsivity or low self-esteem. • Adolescents are more likely to develop a shopping addiction than adults. • Females could be more likely to display this addiction than males. • Levels of stress might contribute in the development of shopping addiction. <p>Possible points in relation to the behaviourist perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shopping addiction is learnt through classical conditioning, for example an association between shopping and excitement. • Shopping addiction is learnt through operant conditioning, for example positive reinforcement such as through the admiration of others when displaying the acquired goods. Also, the punishment of withdrawal symptoms when not shopping. • It could be learnt through observation and imitation of role models. For example, by observing and imitating a parent or our peers. <table border="1" data-bbox="316 1205 1315 1729"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1205 1235 1368">Comparisons are appropriate. Description of comparisons is accurate and detailed. Explanation of shopping addiction to the comparisons is explicit. Understanding is full.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1205 1315 1368">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1368 1235 1503">Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is generally accurate with good detail. Explanation of shopping addiction to the comparisons is evident. Understanding is good.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1368 1315 1503">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1503 1235 1666">Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is evident with some detail. Explanation of shopping addiction to comparisons is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1503 1315 1666">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1666 1235 1729">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1235 1666 1315 1729">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Comparisons are appropriate. Description of comparisons is accurate and detailed. Explanation of shopping addiction to the comparisons is explicit. Understanding is full.	5–6	Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is generally accurate with good detail. Explanation of shopping addiction to the comparisons is evident. Understanding is good.	3–4	Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is evident with some detail. Explanation of shopping addiction to comparisons is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	6
Comparisons are appropriate. Description of comparisons is accurate and detailed. Explanation of shopping addiction to the comparisons is explicit. Understanding is full.	5–6									
Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is generally accurate with good detail. Explanation of shopping addiction to the comparisons is evident. Understanding is good.	3–4									
Comparisons are attempted. Description of comparisons is evident with some detail. Explanation of shopping addiction to comparisons is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident.	1–2									
No or irrelevant answer.	0									

Question	Answer	Marks
2(c)	<p>Using examples from research, outline the limitations of the individual differences approach in psychology.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Possible limitations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Techniques used are not fully objective and therefore open to bias. • It creates divisions between people because individuals are identified as being 'different'. • It is difficult to define and measure individual qualities such as personality, intelligence. • Ethical concerns may be raised. • Practical applications cannot be useful for the majority since it focuses on what makes people different, therefore lacks generalisability. • It can create labels as it separates normal from abnormal. 	8
<p>Limitations 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.</p>		7–8
<p>Limitations 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.</p>		5–6
<p>Limitations 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.</p>		3–4

Question	Answer		Marks
2(c)	Limitations 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.	1–2	
	No or irrelevant answer.	0	

Question	Answer		Marks
3(a)	<p>Describe psychological evidence and/or theories that could be relevant to the issues raised in the source.</p> <p>Candidates can use any appropriate evidence from any other key theory and study or from any key application and ‘the explore more’ section.</p> <p>Possible studies/theories include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study by Piliavin et al. on bystander behaviour. • The theories of cost-benefit analysis, diffusion of responsibility and pluralistic ignorance. • The study by Freud on Little Hans. Psychosexual stages of development and the Oedipus complex. • Psychoanalytic theory of repression and Barlett’s theory of reconstructive memory. • Social learning theory and the study by Bandura on learning aggression. • The study by Hazan and Shaver on romantic love as an attachment. • Operant conditioning and positive reinforcement. 		10

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

Question	Answer	Marks										
3(b)	<p>Explain the issues raised in the source using the evidence and/or theories you described in part (a).</p> <p>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> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 510 1310 2049"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 510 1214 913"> 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. </td> <td data-bbox="1214 510 1310 913">8–10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 913 1214 1283"> 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. </td> <td data-bbox="1214 913 1310 1283">7–5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1283 1214 1653"> 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. </td> <td data-bbox="1214 1283 1310 1653">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1653 1214 1989"> 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. </td> <td data-bbox="1214 1653 1310 1989">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1989 1214 2049">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1214 1989 1310 2049">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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.	8–10	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.	7–5	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.	3–4	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.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	10
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.	8–10											
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.	7–5											
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.	3–4											
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.	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											