

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 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.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 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 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

### Section A

- 1 From the study by Wells and Bradfield, outline one way in which feedback to witnesses distorts their reports of the witnessing experience. [2]**

The authors state that the effect of feedback could be seen in a variety of measures taken in witnesses' retrospective reports. These included measures of certainty, the quality of view they had, the clarity of memory, the speed with which they identified the person, their willingness to testify and their level of trust in the eye-witness process.

NOTE: the actual perpetrator was not in the line-up so all witnesses made false identifications.

1 mark – brief identification of an appropriate variable e.g. speed or certainty.

2 marks – further details e.g. the witnesses receiving confirming feedback were more certain in their identification than those witnesses receiving disconfirming feedback.

- 2 The table below shows some of the results from the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation. Outline one conclusion that can be drawn from this table. [2]**

**Mean errors made in each condition (combined across materials)**

<b>Age (years)</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>One Judgement</b>	<b>Fixed Array</b>
5	9	7	7
6	6	4	6
7	3	3	5
8	2	1	6

Conclusions could be that children make fewer errors as they get older or that children make fewer errors in the one judgement condition compared with the other conditions.

1 mark – brief answer.

2 marks – clearly explained conclusion (rather than a restating of results).

- 3 Suggest two reasons why it might be difficult to generalise from the results of Milgram's study of obedience. [4]**

There are several possible reasons here and any appropriate suggestions should be given credit. For example, the all-male sample, the self-selective nature of the sample, the all-American sample, or the fact that the research is now almost 50 years old. Candidates may also comment on aspects of the research such as the fact that it was conducted in a prestigious laboratory.

1 mark – brief identification of reason only.

2 marks – some elaboration of reason (i.e. a brief explanation of why it is difficult to generalise from a self-selected sample).

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

- 4 Reicher and Haslam conclude that 'it is powerlessness and the failure of groups that makes tyranny possible'.**

**Suggest how this conclusion might be applied to the behaviour of the guards in the prison study conducted by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo. [2]**

Reicher and Haslam apply their findings to the original Stanford Prison Study (SPS) in the conclusion to their study. They claim that when the prisoners 'collapsed' as a group (after Zimbardo told them that they could not leave the study) they ceased to support each other as a group. This then created the conditions for 'tyranny to prevail'. Candidates need not have read this conclusion to make this connection and need not identify a specific time point in the SPS as Reicher and Haslam have done. Any answer connecting the powerlessness (depersonalisation, deindividuation etc) of the prisoners as somehow creating the conditions for the guards to achieve power should be given credit.

1 mark – limited but accurate detail e.g. the prisoners had no power but no clear connection between this and the behaviour of the guards.

2 marks – connection made between the powerlessness (depersonalisation, deindividuation etc) of the prisoners as somehow creating the conditions for the guards to achieve power.

- 5 Explain why the model rarely intervened in the cane condition in the study by Piliavin et al. on bystander intervention. [2]**

The model was to help if no one else had helped after a certain amount of time (early condition approximately 70 seconds and late condition approximately 150 seconds after collapse). However in 62 of the 65 cane conditions help was given before these time periods were up.

1 mark – brief answer.

2 marks – additional detail given/link made explicit to cane condition.

- 6 From the study by Bandura et al. on learning aggression, explain why it was necessary to include the 'aggression arousal' stage. [2]**

Bandura et al. explain this as necessary to make sure that the subjects were under some degree of instigation to aggression. (He explains that the arousal experience was included for two main reasons: firstly, he cites previous research that suggests that observation of aggressive behaviour exhibited by others tends to reduce the probability of aggression on the part of the observer. This would suggest that the subjects who had been exposed to aggressive behaviour would be under weaker instigation than the other groups. Secondly, he suggests that if subjects in the non-aggressive condition expressed little aggression in the face of appropriate instigation the presence of an inhibitory process would seem to be indicated.)

1 mark – brief attempt at explanation.

2 marks – clear explanation with reference to instigation of aggression (wording not necessary).

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

- 7 Hazan and Shaver based their research on the three categories of attachment originally proposed by Ainsworth. Briefly outline two of Ainsworth's categories. [4]**

The three categories originally proposed by Ainsworth were established in the 'strange situation' research in which the reactions of infants to absence/presence/return of mother/stranger were investigated. The three categories are as follows:

Anxious avoidant – characterised by indifference on the part of the child, who is largely unconcerned when mother is absent and ignores or actively avoids her when she returns. Distress tends to be caused by being alone rather than the absence of the mother, and the child can be easily comforted by a stranger. Both mother and stranger are treated in very similar ways.

Securely attached – infant secure and happy in mother's presence but distressed when mother leaves. Seeks immediate contact with mother on her return and can be easily comforted by mother. Distress is caused by absence of mother rather than being alone. Stranger can provide some comfort but she and mother are treated very differently. Mother provides 'safe base' for exploration.

Anxious resistant – infant can be distressed even in presence of mother and has difficulty using mother as 'safe base'. Very distressed when mother leaves and seeks immediate contact on return although also shows anger and resists contact. Behaviour demonstrates ambivalence. Infant will actively resist a stranger's efforts to contact/comfort.

2 marks for each category described as follows:

1 mark – brief description.

2 marks – increasing detail including name of category and some additional information.

- 8 (a) Outline one finding from Anderson and Green's study on unwanted memories. [2]**

Findings include: when people encounter cues that remind them of an unwanted memory and they consistently try to prevent awareness of this, later recall of the rejected memory becomes more difficult. This forgetting increases with the number of times the unwanted memory is avoided and incentives to remember are resisted.

1 mark – brief answer.

2 marks – increasing detail.

- (b) Explain whether this finding supports the Freudian concept of repression. [2]**

These findings provide a model for explaining repression in terms of executive processes not uniquely tied to trauma. It could be argued that this supports the existence of repression or it could be argued that the Freudian notion of trauma being necessary for repression may not be accurate. Either answer would be acceptable.

1 mark – brief answer.

2 marks – attempt at explanation.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

- 9 The research on defining abnormality by Rosenhan is often criticised on ethical grounds. Outline one argument in support of this study and one argument against this study. [4]**

There are many answers that candidates could give here and the wording of the question allows for answers which make no reference to ethics. However, the most likely answers are that in support of the study they could argue that the results justified the deception, that the pseudopatients agreed to take part and perhaps that no one else was seriously distressed by the research. They might also argue that this type of observation is the only one that could ever get accurate results as overt observations would produce very different results. Against the study it could be argued that this level of deception is never justified, that the pseudopatients were taking up bed spaces/using resources that should have been available to genuine patients and that there were a number of ways in which serious levels of distress might have been caused.

For each argument:

1 mark – brief, muddled answer.

2 marks – clear argument outlined.

- 10 Phillips et al. describe a number of behaviours typically shown by patients with Body Dysmorphic Disorders. Identify two of these behaviours. [2]**

There are many associated behaviours described in the paper. These include excessively checking appearance in mirrors/car bumpers, avoiding mirrors, avoiding magazines or TV commercials focussing on appearance, fear that 'ugly' noses would be fragile and easily damaged, repeated questioning of others about their appearance, camouflaging defects (e.g. growing hair, stuffing clothes etc), and the avoidance of social activities and work/school.

1 mark for each correctly identified behaviour.

- 11 Identify the four conditions of facial symmetry used in the first experiment reported by Rhodes et al. [2]**

These are low symmetry, normal symmetry, high symmetry and perfect symmetry.

1 mark – up to three correctly identified.

2 marks – all four correctly identified.

- 12 Briefly describe one of the self report measures taken in the study by Wang et al. on stress. [2]**

Self reports of stress and anxiety (scale 1–9) taken after the subjects entered the scanner and after each scan.

Self reports of frustration, effort and task difficulty (also on a scale of 1–9) taken after the high and low stress tasks.

1 mark – identification of variable e.g. stress, anxiety.

2 marks – identification of variable with some additional information about how collected or use of scale.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

**Section B**

**13 (a) Describe the background to the key study by Baron-Cohen et al. on autism. [10]**

<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
<p>No answer or irrelevant answer.</p>	0 marks

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9773	01

(b) Evaluate how the key study by Baron-Cohen et al. has helped our understanding of autism. [12]

Any appropriate discussion point may receive credit.

Most likely:

- the usefulness of the research in identifying key characteristics of autism
- the extent to which it can be generalised
- the extent to which the findings have been replicated
- the reliability and validity of the measurements
- the extent to which the research applies to real-life situations
- ethical issues.

<p>Discussion is comprehensive.  Range of points is balanced.  Points are competently organised.  Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge.  Effective use of supporting examples from unit content.  Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed.  Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident.  Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.  10 marks maximum if no explicit focus on the question.</p>	10–12 marks
<p>Discussion is very good.  Range of points is good and is balanced.  Points are well organised.  Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge.  Good use of supporting examples from unit content.  Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.  Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p>	8–9 marks
<p>Discussion is good.  Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced.  Points are organised.  Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge.  Limited use of supporting examples from unit content.  Quality of argument arising from points is limited.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident.  Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	6–7 marks

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

<p>Discussion is sufficient.  Range of points is partial (may be positive or negative only).  Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.  Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates basic psychological knowledge.  Partial use of supporting examples from unit content.  Quality of argument arising from points is acceptable.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident.  Evaluation has adequate detail and understanding is acceptable.</p>	4–5 marks
<p>Discussion is basic.  Some points are evident and may be either positive or negative.  Points are not always organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.  Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident.  Some or no use of supporting examples from unit content.  Argument arising from points is discernible or not present.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is rare or not present.  Evaluation has meagre detail and understanding may not be evident.</p>	1–3 marks
No answer or irrelevant answer.	0 marks

<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</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 autism.** [6]

The alternative could be based entirely on the 'further research' identified in the specification or it could be based on that 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 candidate themselves makes based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.

For example, the candidate may suggest exploring other variables that might aid our understanding of autism or may suggest other methodologies. The Golan et al. study looks at 'hearing the mind in the voice' rather than 'seeing the mind in the eyes', for example. Candidates might also suggest conducting research with different samples or using more naturalistic techniques.

Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is impressive.	5–6 marks
Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is good. Maximum of 3 marks for suggestion only.	3–4 marks
Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. 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 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

**14 (a) Describe the key study conducted by Parke and Griffiths on gambling. [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.          Description of knowledge is accurate, coherent and detailed.          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>	8–10 marks
<p>Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.          Description of knowledge is mainly accurate, coherent and detailed.          Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.          The answer has adequate structure and organisation.          Quality of written communication is good.</p>	6–7 marks
<p>Definition of terms is basic and the use of psychological terminology is adequate.          Description of knowledge is often accurate, generally coherent and has some detail.          Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.          The answer has some structure or organisation.          Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–5 marks
<p>Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is occasional or absent.          Description of knowledge is sometimes accurate, sometimes coherent and has some detail.          Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is occasionally evident.          The answer has minimal structure or organisation.          Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3 marks
No answer or irrelevant answer.	0 marks

**(b) Evaluate the key study conducted by Parke and Griffiths on gambling. [12]**

Any of a number of evaluation issues may be used, for example:

- strengths and weaknesses of method
- ethics
- usefulness
- representativeness of sample.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

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

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</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 gambling.** [6]

The further research required in this question could be based entirely on the 'further research' identified in the specification or it could be based on that 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 candidate themselves makes based on their knowledge of the key study and theory in this area.

For example, the candidate may suggest the investigation of other variables that may play a part in understanding gambling, the use of different samples, or they may suggest the use of different methodologies.

Suggestion of alternative is appropriate and shows insight. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is impressive.	5–6 marks
Suggestion is appropriate. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is reasonably clear and detailed. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is good. Maximum of 3 marks for suggestion only.	3–4 marks
Suggestion is reasonably appropriate although may have only peripheral relevance. Explanation of how this would extend our understanding is basic. Understanding of the possible effects of this alternative on the wider topic area is basic.	1–2 marks
No or inappropriate suggestion.	0 marks