

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 2</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

## Section A

- 1 From the study by Baron-Cohen et al, outline one problem with the revised eyes test and suggest how this might be resolved in further research. [4]**

The authors comment that 'even with the new modifications, the stimuli are static, whereas the real world never is. Further studies might usefully employ dynamic stimuli of eye expressions.'

Outline of problem:

1 mark – brief identification (e.g. static stimuli)

2 marks – identification of problem with brief outline of why this is a problem (e.g. real world is not static)

Suggestion:

1 mark – brief suggestion lacking detail or clarity

2 marks – clear suggestion explained how this might resolve the problem

- 2 How do McGarrigle and Donaldson explain the results of their study on conservation? [2]**

The authors explain their results as providing evidence that characteristics of the experimenter's behaviour, in particular his actions towards the task materials, can influence children's interpretations of utterances. In other words when children realise that the transformation is an accidental one they are able to ignore this.

1 mark – brief explanation

2 marks – full explanation with reference to results

- 3 Milgram claimed that his research into obedience to authority yielded two surprising findings. Identify these findings and suggest how one of these findings might be explained. [4]**

Milgram uses the phrase 'two surprising findings' at the start of his discussion. He identifies these as the 'sheer strength of obedient tendencies' and the 'extraordinary tension generated by the procedures'. He also comments that the first finding is surprising, both in relation to the original predictions made about the likely levels of obedience and in terms of the reactions of those observing the participants through one-way mirrors. Milgram suggests twelve different factors that may explain the findings and candidates may use any of these in their answer.

Outline of findings:

1 mark for each 'surprising finding'

Explanation of one of these findings:

1 mark – partial

2 marks – full answer

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 3</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

- 4 Explain why Haney, Banks and Zimbardo did not simply observe behaviour within a real prison environment. [2]**

The study was designed to test the situational / dispositional hypothesis rather than to study behaviour in prison. Using a sample of real prisoners would not allow this hypothesis to be tested.

1 mark – partially correct answer

2 marks – accurate and well-explained answer

- 5 What do Fischer et al argue is the difference between situations in which bystanders help and do not help? [2]**

Fischer et al argue that the bystander effect is not found in more dangerous situations as they are faster and more clearly recognised as emergencies and there are significantly higher costs for not helping.

1 mark – partially correct answer

2 marks – accurate and well detailed answer

- 6 Identify two response measures of imitation that were obtained in the study by Bandura et al on aggression. [2]**

Three response measures of imitation were taken in Stage 3 of the experiment. These were:

Imitation of physical aggression

Imitative verbal aggression

Imitative non-aggressive verbal responses.

(accept reference to partial imitation)

1 mark for each correctly identified response measure

- 7 Briefly discuss two differences between the way data was collected in Study 1 and Study 2 in the research on romantic love by Hazan and Shaver. [4]**

Study 1 was a 'love quiz' published in a local newspaper. It used a self-selected sample of the general public. It was a single item measure of the three attachment styles proposed by Ainsworth.

Study 2 was conducted with a college student group (not self-selected). It focussed on the 'self-side' of subjects' mental models (which was not covered in Study 1). It also included brief measures of state and trait loneliness (also not covered in Study 1).

2 marks for each difference

1 mark – partial

2 marks – full answer

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 4</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

- 8 Outline two pieces of evidence that were used by Freud to support the idea that little Hans was going through the Oedipus Complex. [4]**

Any of the following would be appropriate

| <b>Evidence / Behaviour</b>   | <b>Interpretation</b>  |
|---|--|
| Desire to get into bed with mother                                      | Evidence for Oedipus Complex (desire for mother)   |
| Fear of white horses  | Symbolic of fear of his father (evidence for castration anxiety seen during phallic stage of development)                |
| Fantasy about giraffes  | Evidence for Oedipus Complex (fantasy of taking mother away from father)   |
| Fantasy about being his own father                                      | Evidence for Oedipus Complex (desire to replace father in mother's affection and start of resolution of Oedipus complex) |
| Fantasy about plumber giving him 'a bigger widdler and a bigger behind' | Wanting to be like his father (evidence for possible resolution of Oedipus complex)                                      |

2 marks for each piece of evidence

1 mark – partial

2 marks – full

- 9 From the study by Parke and Griffiths on gambling, outline one theoretical explanation for the verbal aggression towards the staff. [2]**

The most likely answers are either excitation transfer (from machine to staff) or the frustration – aggression hypothesis (Dollard and Miller, 1939), suggesting that emotional aggression is generated when there is a barrier to expected goal attainment. Any other appropriate theoretical explanation could be credited.

1 mark – partially correct answer

2 marks – full answer

- 10 How would evolutionary theory explain the relationship between facial symmetry and the perception of beauty according to Rhodes et al? [2]**

In general terms evolutionary theory would explain the relationship as a predictor of mate quality. They state that symmetry is adaptive as it suggests health / genetic qualities (and that many genetic abnormalities are associated with unsymmetrical facial features). They also say that average facial configurations are likely to be more attractive than extremes – this would be adaptive if stabilizing selection operates on facial traits or if averageness is associated with resistance to pathogens.

1 mark – partially correct or very brief answer

2 marks – one possible explanation well-described

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 5</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

**11 How did Wang et al create the two different stress conditions in their experiment? [2]**

By the use of a serial arithmetic task. In the high stress condition subjects had to subtract 13 from a 4 digit number and respond verbally. They were constantly prodded to respond faster and were required to start the task from the beginning if they made a mistake. In the low stress condition (performed first) they had to count backwards from 1000.

1 mark – brief identification of type of task used / outline of one condition

2 marks – identification of type of task / condition with some additional detail

**12 Do Gale and Martyn's findings support the maxim 'early to bed and early to rise'? Explain your answer. [2]**

No, they don't. There was no indication that larks were richer than those with other sleeping patterns. On the contrary, owls had the largest mean income and were more likely to have access to a car. There was no evidence that larks had superior cognitive functioning or health. Overall a longer time spent in bed may be associated with increased mortality rates.

1 mark – brief or partially correct explanation or 'no'

2 marks – explanation is clear

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 6</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

**13 (a) Describe the background to the key study by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony. [10]**

Answers could include general theories of memory (e.g. schema theory, multi model, episodic memory, etc) or may focus more specifically on theories / studies related to eye witness testimony such as weapon focus.

Any appropriate material can be credited.

Note: background material must be material published prior to the publication of the key study

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <p>Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</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 marks |
| <p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has adequate structure and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>  | 6–7 marks  |
| <p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer has some structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>  | 4–5 marks  |
| <p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories / studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>The answer has minimal structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>                                  | 1–3 marks  |
| No answer or irrelevant answer.   | 0 marks    |

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 7</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

**(b) Discuss the effectiveness of Loftus and Palmer's study.**

**[12]**

Any appropriate discussion point may receive credit.

Most likely:

The extent to which the research applies to real-life situations.

The usefulness of the research.

The extent to which it can be generalised.

The extent to which the findings have been replicated.

The reliability and validity of the measurements.

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

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 8</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

- (c) **Suggest an alternative study that could be conducted and explain how this would extend our understanding of eyewitness testimony.** [6]

The alternative could be based entirely on the 'further research' identified in the specification 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.

For example the candidate may suggest exploring other variables that might explain eyewitness testimony or may suggest other methodologies. Details of the Wells and Bradfield study could be included which looks at an application of EWT research to questioning witnesses. Candidates might also suggest conducting more field experiments, case studies of real events or observations of police questioning or cross – questioning in courtrooms.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight.<br>Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed.<br>Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is impressive.   | 5–6 marks |
| Suggestion is appropriate.<br>Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed.<br>Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is good.<br><br>Partial performance<br>Suggestion given with no explanation of how this would extend understanding = max 4 | 3–4 marks |
| Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance.<br>Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic.<br>Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is basic.   | 1–2 marks |
| No or inappropriate suggestion.  | 0 marks   |

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 9</b> | <b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b> | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>          | <b>9773</b>     | <b>01</b>    |

**14 (a) Describe the key study conducted by Rosenhan on diagnosing abnormality. [10]**

Candidates should outline the aim, procedure and main findings of the study.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <p>Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>Description of knowledge is accurate, coherent and detailed.</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 marks |
| <p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has adequate structure and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>  | 6–7 marks  |
| <p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer has some structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p>  | 4–5 marks  |
| <p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>The answer has minimal structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>                                  | 1–3 marks  |
| No answer or irrelevant answer.  | 0 marks    |

|         |                                |          |       |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
|         | Pre-U – May/June 2010          | 9773     | 01    |

**(b) Evaluate the key study conducted by Rosenhan on diagnosing abnormality. [12]**

Any of a number of evaluation issues may be used:

Strengths and weaknesses of method

Ethics

Usefulness

Representativeness of sample

Possible observer bias

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

|         |                                |          |       |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
|         | Pre-U – May/June 2010          | 9773     | 01    |

- (c) Suggest an alternative study that could be conducted and explain how this would extend our understanding of diagnosing abnormality. [6]

The further research required in this question could be based entirely on the 'further research' identified in the specification 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.

For example, candidates may suggest the investigation of other variables that may play a part in the diagnosing of abnormality or they may suggest the use of different methodologies.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight.<br>Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed.<br>Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is impressive.   | 5–6 marks |
| Suggestion is appropriate.<br>Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed.<br>Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is good.<br><br>Partial performance.<br>Suggestion given with no explanation of how this would extend understanding = max 4. | 3–4 marks |
| Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance.<br>Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic.<br>Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is basic.   | 1–2 marks |
| No or inappropriate suggestion.  | 0 marks   |