

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 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 2012 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 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

### Section A

- 1 From the study by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony, outline one weakness of the sample of participants that was studied. [2]**

The sample of participants used in the Loftus and Palmer study were all students. It would therefore be appropriate to comment on whether students are a representative sample of the wider population, whether demand characteristics might have been stronger in this sample group or indeed whether the age group might have meant that the majority of the sample had limited driving experience (one weakness only required).

1 mark – brief answer / sample identified  
2 marks – clear outline of one appropriate weakness

- 2 Golan et al conducted further research on autism. Outline one difference between males and females identified in this research. [2]**

Within the AS/HFA group (Aspergers Syndrome / High Functioning Autism) females performed worse than males on the 'reading the mind in the voice' task.

1 mark – brief answer (e.g. females did worse)  
2 marks – clear outline of difference (as above)

- 3 From the study on conservation by Samuel and Bryant:**

- (a) Outline the 'fixed array' condition. [2]**

The fixed array condition was where the child saw no transformation and only the post-transformation display.

1 mark – brief answer  
2 marks – clear outline

- (b) Explain why this condition was included. [2]**

The purpose of this condition was to check whether the children who answered the post transformation question correctly in the other two conditions did so by bringing information over from the pre-transformation display (i.e. a control).

1 mark – brief answer e.g. as a control  
2 marks – clear explanation

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

- 4 From the prison study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo, explain what is meant by the 'dispositional hypothesis'. [2]**

The dispositional hypothesis explains behaviour in terms of the individuals, hence prison behaviour is explained in terms of the characteristics of those who are sent to prison or choose to become prison guards. This contrasts with the situational hypothesis which attempts to explain behaviour as resulting from external situational factors rather than internal dispositional ones.

1 mark – brief or muddled explanation

2 marks – clear / detailed explanation (no requirement to contrast with situational hypothesis for 2 marks)

- 5 From the study on bystander behaviour conducted by Piliavin et al:**

- (a) Outline one ethical issue raised by the study. [2]**

The most likely answers are lack of consent and potential distress.

1 mark – ethical issue identified

2 marks – ethical issue outlined in the context of the study

- (b) Suggest whether the researchers were justified in conducting the study in the way that they did. [2]**

Candidates may answer that the researchers were justified in the way that they conducted the study or that they were not justified in the way that they conducted the study. Lack of consent may be justified in terms of the observation taking place in a public place or in terms of necessity to avoid demand characteristics. Potential distress may be justified in terms of the event being no worse than something that might be expected in everyday life or in terms of the usefulness of the results obtained. It is acceptable to argue that either of these issues mean that the research should not have been conducted.

1 mark – brief answer

2 marks – detailed answer (or two points briefly)

- 6 From the key study on learning aggression by Bandura et al, describe one strength and one weakness in the way that the study was conducted. [4]**

Strengths could include the matching of participants, the manipulation / control of variables, the controlled observation. Weaknesses could include the small numbers of participants in each condition and the ethical issues raised. Any other appropriate answers can be credited.

For strength:

1 mark – appropriate strength identified

2 marks – appropriate strength described

For weakness:

1 mark – appropriate weakness identified

2 marks – appropriate weakness described

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

- 7 The Key Study by Hazan and Shaver contains two studies. Outline one difference in the way these two studies were conducted. [2]**

There are a number of appropriate answers including: the different sample (one self selected respondents to a newspaper 'quiz', the other a sample (non self selected) of undergraduate students); more focus on the 'self' side of mental models in study 2; inclusion of measures of state and trait loneliness in study 2.

1 mark – brief answer  
2 marks – detailed answer

- 8 From the key study by Freud, outline one piece of evidence that suggests Hans was nearing the resolution of the Oedipus complex. [2]**

Hans' fantasy about being a father and making his father their grandfather was interpreted by Freud as showing that 'things were moving towards a satisfactory conclusion'. Rather than needing to get rid of his father he found a more satisfactory solution.

His fantasy about the plumber giving him a 'bigger widdler and a bigger behind' was also interpreted as Hans wishing to become more like his father and through this identification, the Oedipus complex was resolved. Other appropriate evidence may be used although for 2 marks candidates will have to explicitly show how the evidence shows Hans approaching the resolution of the complex.

1 mark – brief answer – evidence without linking this to resolution  
2 marks – evidence clearly linked to resolution

- 9 From the study by Rosenhan, outline two examples of how normal behaviour was interpreted as abnormal by the hospital staff. [4]**

There are several examples of normal behaviour being interpreted in the light of the schizophrenic label. These include:

Note taking behaviour being seen as a symptom of their disorder, pacing the corridors seen as nervousness and again as a symptom of their disorder and queuing for meals seen as evidence of the 'oral acquisitive nature of the syndrome'.

For each example:

1 mark – identification of behaviour  
2 marks – identification of behaviour with the way this behaviour was interpreted

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

- 10 From the study by Parke and Griffiths, suggest one advantage of the researcher gaining employment as a gambling arcade supervisor in order to conduct the research. [2]**

The authors explain that this was done to 'maximise ecological validity and to minimise the effects caused by the presence of a researcher'. The role of supervisor involved walking around observing gamblers in order to look for disruptive or problematic behaviour, he could also record data inconspicuously and gamblers were used to being constantly observed by arcade supervisors.

1 mark – brief suggestion  
2 marks – clear suggestion

- 11 From the study by Perrett et al on facial symmetry, describe the effect of enhancing the masculine facial characteristics of human faces. [2]**

Enhancing masculine facial characteristics increased both perceived dominance and negative attributions (for example, coldness or dishonesty) relevant to relationships and paternal investment.

1 mark – brief answer  
2 marks – clear description of one effect or brief outline of more than one effect

- 12 Outline one conclusion that can be drawn from the study on stress by Wang et al. [2]**

From study (for examiner reference)

The major finding from our study is that ventral RPFC activation is specifically associated with psychological stress, and this activity persists even beyond the stress-task period. This mapping between behavioural-physiological state and neuroanatomy is supported by the association of RPFC CBF changes with both subjective and objective measures of stress responses. Increased cognitive demand and effort accompanying the task stressors cannot explain the present finding, because our regression analyses demonstrated that difficulty or effort did not contribute to RPFC brain activation. Lasting effects of right prefrontal activation were also observed during baseline conditions without any cognitive task, excluding potential confounding effects due to cognitive differences between the two stress tasks.

*(Changes in CBF correlate with salivary cortisol and Heart rate)*

1 mark – brief answer  
2 marks – detailed conclusion (one only required)

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

### Section B

- 13 (a) Describe the background to the key study conducted by Dement and Kleitman on sleep and dreaming. [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
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 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

**(b) Evaluate how the key study conducted by Dement and Kleitman has helped our understanding of sleep and dreaming. [12]**

Candidates may use any appropriate evaluation issues, including methodological issues, sampling issues, ethics and usefulness.

Credit should be given for any appropriate evaluation of the study but top band marks should only be awarded when candidates have made reference to the wider topic area. This could be done for example, by considering further research or practical applications.

<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 summarises 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

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

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.	1–3 marks
No answer or irrelevant answer.	0 marks

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

The alternative could be based entirely on the 'further research' identified on 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 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 be of importance or may suggest other methodologies. Details of the Gale and Martyn study could be included. The use of new technology is also appropriate.

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. Suggestion with no discussion of how this would extend our understanding = MAX 3.	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 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

**14 (a) Describe the key study conducted by Milgram on obedience.**

**[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 (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 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

**(b) Evaluate the key study by Milgram.**

**[12]**

There are many evaluation issues that may be credited here, including methodological issues, sampling issues, ethics, situational versus individual explanations, usefulness.

<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 summarises 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.</p>	1–3 marks

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>01</b>

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.	
No answer or irrelevant answer.	0 marks

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

The alternative could be based entirely on the 'further research' identified on 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 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 obedience or may suggest other methodologies. Details of the Slater study could be included. Candidates might also suggest conducting more field experiments or case studies of real events.

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. Suggestion with no discussion of how this would extend our understanding = MAX 3.	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