

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9773 PSYCHOLOGY

9773/02

Paper 2 (Methods, Issues and Applications),
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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

1 Methodology

(a) Outline two findings that can be drawn from the table above. [4]

Possible findings include:

- Secure lovers scored higher on happiness than the anxious/ambivalent and avoidant lovers. The mean score for secure lovers was 3.51 whereas the mean score for anxious/ambivalent lovers was 3.31 and avoidant 3.19.
- Secure lovers reported having closer friendships with their partners than both the anxious/ambivalent and avoidant groups that had scores similar to each other. The mean score for friendship was 3.50 for secure lovers and 3.19 and 3.18 for anxious/ambivalent and avoidant lovers.
- Secure lovers reported higher trust for their partner than anxious/ambivalent and avoidant lovers. The mean score for secure lovers was 3.43 whereas anxious/ambivalent scored 3.13 and avoidant 3.1.
- Avoidant lovers scored higher on measures of fear of closeness than secure lovers and anxious/ambivalent lovers. The mean score on the scale of fear of closeness was 2.30 for avoidant lovers whereas for anxious ambivalent was 2.15 and secure lovers 1.88.
- Anxious/ambivalent lovers were more likely to accept their partner's imperfections than the other two groups of lovers. The mean score for the anxious/ambivalent lovers is 3.03, with secure lovers coming second with a mean score of 3.01 and avoidant lovers being less accepting with a score of 2.86.

NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

1 mark for basic outline of the results e.g. 'Secure lovers reported having closer friendships with their partners than both the anxious/ambivalent and avoidant groups that had scores similar to each other' and 1 further mark for elaboration such as reference to data e.g. 'The mean score for friendship was 3.50 for secure lovers and 3.19 and 3.18 for anxious/ambivalent and avoidant lovers'. Twice.

(b) Describe the sample used in study 1 and explain two ways in which the sample of this study could have been improved. [8]

Possible features of the sample include:

- Analyses reported in the study are based on the first 620 of over 1,200 replies received within a week following publication of the questionnaire.
- Of these 620 replies, 205 were from men and 415 were from women.
- The participants ranged in age from 14 to 82, with a median age of 34 and a mean of 36.
- Average household income was \$20,000 to \$30,000.
- Average education level was "some college".
- Just over half (51%) were Protestant, 22% were Catholic, 3% were Jewish, 10% were atheist or agnostic, and 13% were "other".
- Ninety-one percent were "primarily heterosexual," 4% were "primarily homosexual," and 2% were "primarily bisexual" (3% chose not to answer).
- Forty-two percent were married at the time of the survey; 28% were divorced or widowed, 9% were "living with a lover" and 31% were dating.
- Newspaper readers.

NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

1 mark per correctly identified feature.

Please note that answers making reference to the sampling method used in this study cannot be credited.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

Possible ways in which the sample of the study could have been improved:

- Increase the sample size, especially for men, as there were twice as many females taking part in the original study.
- Select participants from different educational backgrounds as participants in this study had higher educational levels than the average.
- Recruit participants with a wider range of household incomes as the majority might have come from a similar socioeconomic background.
- Select a wider range of religious orientation as half of the participants selected came from a particular religious group.
- Sexuality might have acted as a confounding variable in this study as it might affect attachment style. To improve this, groups should be studied separately and in depth so comparisons can be made.

1 mark for a suggestion of how the sample of this study could have been improved e.g. select participants from different educational backgrounds and 1 further mark for elaboration e.g. as participants in this study maybe had higher educational levels than the average. Twice.

Please note that answers referring to a change in sampling method cannot be credited.

NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

(c) Using examples from research, debate the usefulness of quantitative data when investigating attachment. [8]

Strengths and weaknesses need to be closely related to the area of attachment through the use of examples that can come from any relevant study but more likely the study by Hazan and Shaver and the study by Ainsworth.

Strengths and weaknesses need to be fully explained and not merely identified.

Strengths include:

- More likely to be objective as it is less affected by subjective analysis.
- Easy to analyse as averages and ranges can be produced.
- Can repeat to test reliability.
- Can look for cause and effect.
- Results from different studies can be compared with each other and so able to draw conclusions between different studies.
- Allow for statistical analysis.

Weaknesses include:

- Can oversimplify complex behaviour as numbers cannot represent the complexity of human experience.
- Cannot gain access to thoughts and feelings.
- Data is not rich and detailed.
- Phenomena can be forced to fit a set measure.

NOTE: any appropriate evaluation point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

| | marks |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 7–8 |
| 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. | 5–6 |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <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 |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

2 Issues, Approaches and Perspectives

(a) Using examples from research, outline two assumptions of the psychodynamic approach in psychology. [6]

- Behaviour is influenced by the three components of the mind, namely the id, ego and superego.
- Behaviour is influenced by different levels of consciousness such as the preconscious, unconscious and defence mechanisms.
- Behaviour is influenced by early childhood experiences.

NOTE: any appropriate answer can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.

| | marks |
|---|--------------|
| 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 |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

- (b) Contrast the psychodynamic approach with the behaviourist approach when explaining children's tantrums. [6]

The question requires not only knowledge of the psychodynamic and behaviourist approaches but also the ability to contrast. Further than this, it requires candidates to apply their knowledge of the approaches to explain phobias.

Answers are likely to make reference to:

- Social learning theory and the imitation of role models, classical conditioning and the association of a stimulus with a response.
- Dominant id and underdeveloped ego and superego.

| | marks |
|---|--------------|
| Contrasts are appropriate. Description of contrasts is accurate and detailed. Relationship of intelligence to the comparisons is explicit. Understanding is full. | 5–6 |
| Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is generally accurate with good detail. Relationship of children's tantrums to the comparisons is evident. Understanding is good. | 3–4 |
| Contrasts are attempted. Description of contrasts is evident with some detail. Relationship of intelligence to contrasts is evident in parts. Some understanding is evident. | 1–2 |
| No or irrelevant answer. | 0 |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

(c) Use examples from research to explain the benefits of studying behaviour using the psychodynamic approach. [8]

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.

- It takes into account both sides of the nature/nurture debate, i.e. Freud claimed that personality is the product of innate drives and childhood experiences.
- It is useful in many ways. For example, the psychodynamic approach has influenced the development of therapies to treat abnormal behaviour and many of these therapies are being used today. It also helped to recognise that psychological problems can result from childhood trauma.
- It reflects the complexity of human behaviour.

| | marks |
|--|--------------|
| <p>Explanations are 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>Apposite examples are used throughout.</p> <p>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>Explanations are mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>Appropriate examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has structure and organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p> | 5–6 |
| <p>Explanations are basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout.</p> <p>The answer has some structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is good.</p> | 3–4 |
| <p>Explanations and use of psychological terminology is evident.</p> <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>Examples are used occasionally.</p> <p>The answer has discernible structure or organisation.</p> <p>Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> | 1–2 |
| No or irrelevant answer. | 0 |

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

3 Applications

- (a) Describe psychological evidence and/or theories that could be relevant to the issues raised in the source. [10]

Candidates can use any appropriate evidence from any other key theory and study or from any key application and the 'explore more' section.

Possible studies/theories include:

- The key study by Haney, C., Banks, C. and Zimbardo, P. (1973) A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison.
- Dispositional hypothesis, social roles and social identity theory.
- The key study by Milgram, S. (1963) Behavioural Study of Obedience.
- The classification of mental disorders and the key study by Rosenhan, D. (1973) On being sane in insane places.

| | marks |
|---|-------|
| <p>Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. 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> | 10–8 |
| <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> | 5–7 |
| <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> | 4–3 |

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <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 |
| No or irrelevant answer. | 0 |

(b) Explain the issues raised in the source using the evidence and/or theories you described in part (a). [10]

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.

| | marks |
|---|--------------|
| <p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive.</p> <p>Application of knowledge (theories/studies) described in part (a) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</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> <p>Relationship to the events raised in the source is explicit.</p> | 10–8 |
| <p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is very good.</p> <p>Application 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>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> <p>Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident.</p> | 5–7 |
| <p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent.</p> <p>Application 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>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> <p>Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident in parts.</p> | 4–3 |

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9773 | 02 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <p>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.</p> | 1–2 |
| No or irrelevant answer. | 0 |