



---

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**9773/02**

Paper 2 Methods, Issues and Applications

**May/June 2016**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9773	02

## 1 Methodology

### (a) Describe two examples of qualitative data collected in Freud's study of little Hans. [4]

Possible examples include:

- Hans was watching his seven day old sister being given a bath. 'But her widdler is still quite small', he remarked; and then added, as though by way of consolation, 'When she grows up, it'll get bigger all right'.
- When he was 3 and a half his mother found him with his hand on his penis. She threatened him in these words: 'If you do that, I shall send for Dr. A. to cut off your widdler. And then what will you widdle with?' Hans: 'With my bottom'.
- At five in the morning, labour began, and Hans's bed was moved into the next room. He woke up at seven and, hearing his mother groaning, asked, 'Why's Mummy coughing?' Then, after a pause, 'The stork's coming today for certain'. He was then called into the bedroom. He did not look at his mother, however, but at the basins and other vessel, filled with blood and water, that were still standing about the room. Pointing to the blood-stained bedpan, he observed in a surprised voice, 'But blood doesn't come out of my widdler'.
- Hans, 4¼. This morning Hans was given his usual daily bath by his mother, and afterwards dried and powdered. As his mother was powdering round his penis and taking care not to touch it, Hans said: 'Why don't you put your finger there?'  
Mother: Because that would be priggish.  
Hans: What's that? Priggish? Why?  
Mother: Because it's not proper.  
Hans (laughing): But it's great fun.
- The fantasy of giraffes: 'In the night there was a big giraffe in the room and a crumpled one, and the big one called out because I took the crumpled one away from it. Then it stopped calling out and then I sat down on top of the crumpled one'.
- The fear of horses: Hans went for a walk with his mother, and saw a bus horse fall down and kick about with its feet. This made a great impression on him. He was terrified and thought the horse was dead; and from that time on he thought that all horses would fall down.
- Daddy, I thought something: I was in the bath, and then the plumber came and unscrewed it. Then he took a big borer and stuck it into my stomach'.
- 'The plumber came and first he took away my behind with a pair of pincers, and then gave me another, and then the same with my widdler. He said: 'Let me see your behind!' and I had to turn round, and he took it away, and then he said.' Let me see your widdler'.

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

1 mark for a mere identification of an example e.g. 'the fantasy of giraffes' and a further mark for elaboration. Twice.

Please note that Freud's interpretations of Hans' anxieties, such as reference to the Oedipus complex or castration anxiety, cannot receive any credit.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9773	02

**(b) Describe two ways in which this study lacks reliability and explain how the reliability of this study could have been improved. [8]**

Possible ways that the study lacked reliability include:

- The case study method was employed and there were no controls in place. Replicating the study using the same procedure would be difficult.
- Inter-rater reliability was absent. All information was collected by Hans' father who might have made subjective judgments in relation to Hans' condition. Freud only met Hans twice and so he was not in a position to validate the results presented by Hans' father.
- The study is based on one subject, little Hans and has not been replicated since. The characteristics of this participant might be very different from the rest of the population.

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

1 mark for identification of how the study lacked reliability e.g. 'inter-rater reliability was absent as information was collected from Hans' father' and a further mark for elaboration e.g. 'he might have made subjective judgments in relation to Hans' condition'.

Possible ways that the reliability of the study could have been strengthened include:

- Freud could have made sure that standardised procedures and controls were in place to allow for a full replication of this study. For example, he could have designed a questionnaire that Hans could have completed and that could have been used with other children. This would have allowed him to establish test-retest reliability.
- Freud could have made joint observations with Hans' father and correlated results to ensure that there was an agreement in their observations. This would have improved inter-rater reliability if agreement was reached.
- Replicating the study with more children would have allowed him to establish greater reliability. For example, Freud could have replicated his observations with other children of the same age suffering from similar phobias to establish whether the conclusions drawn were specific to Hans or could also be observed with other children.

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

2 marks for a suggestion of how the reliability of this study could have been improved e.g. 'Freud could have made sure that standardised procedures and controls were in place to allow for a full replication of this study.'

2 further marks for an explanation e.g. 'This would have allowed to establish test-retest reliability.'

Please note that answers related to validity e.g. 'Hans' father used leading questions' cannot receive any credit unless they are fully justified.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

**(c) Using examples from research, debate the use of the case study method when investigating development in children. [8]**

Strengths and weaknesses need to be closely related to the development of children.

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

Strengths and weaknesses can be taken from any key studies, from further research, from the 'explore more' section or from a Paper 3 option. The choice of examples will reflect the synoptic nature of the whole 2-year course.

Likely examples include Freud's study on psychosexual development, Samuel and Bryant's study on cognitive development and Bandura's study on the development of aggression.

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

Strengths can include:

- Collect a large amount of qualitative and quantitative data on one individual or small group of participants.
- Individuals tend to be in their natural setting so case studies tend to have high ecological validity.
- Can provide in-depth detail of rare unique cases.

Weaknesses can include:

- Case studies are hard to generalize due to the small samples.
- Hard to replicate due to lack of controls so low in reliability.
- Prone to experimenter bias as the researcher is deeply involved with both the participant and the collection of data.

<p>Debate is comprehensive.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is impressive.  Selection and range of arguments is balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.  Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.  Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.  Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.  Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is extensive.</p>	7–8
<p>Debate is very good.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed.  Selection and range of arguments is balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.  Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.  Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.  Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is competent.</p>	5–6
<p>Debate 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

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

Debate 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.	1–2
No or irrelevant answer.	0

## 2 Issues, Approaches and Perspectives

### (a) Outline the nature-nurture debate in psychology using examples from any research.

[6]

The nature argument refers to the belief that all behaviour has a genetic basis and is inherited. The nurture argument refers to the belief that all behaviour is learnt through experience and we are born as a blank slate.

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

Research examples can be taken from key studies, from further research or from the '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.

Maximum of 3 marks if candidates have not outlined both sides of the debate.

Description of the nature-nurture debate 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 nature-nurture debate 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 nature-nurture debate 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

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

**(b) Contrast the nature argument with the nurture argument in the explanation of intelligence. [6]**

The question requires not only knowledge of the nature and nurture debate but also the ability to contrast. Further than this, it requires candidates to apply their knowledge of this debate to explain intelligence.

The nature argument might claim that intelligence is genetically determined. For example brain structure and volume are correlated with levels of intelligence and different parts of the brain are attributed to specific intelligence functions. On the other hand the nurture argument will explain intelligence as being learned through the environment. We are born as a ‘tabula rasa’ and only experiences shape our behaviours and cognitions.

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 intelligence 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 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9773	02

- (c) Using examples from research, explain the problems that psychologists face when they investigate whether a behaviour is learned or inherited. [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.

Problems that psychologists face when they investigate whether a behaviour is learnt or inherited include:

- Very difficult to isolate a human being from all nurture influences which implies that confounding variables are difficult to control.
- Much of the research is based on small samples and so it is difficult to generalize the results.
- Too simplistic to isolate explanations into nature or nurture as much of behaviour is a combination of both.
- It might be unethical to imply that a behaviour is due to inheritance as this might lead to movements such as eugenics.

<p>Explanations are accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. Apposite examples are used throughout. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	7–8
<p>Explanations are mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. Appropriate examples are used throughout. The answer has structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	5–6
<p>Explanations are basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. Peripherally relevant examples are used throughout. The answer has some structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	3–4
<p>Explanations and use of psychological terminology is evident. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. Examples are used occasionally. The answer has discernible structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–2
No or irrelevant answer.	0

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9773	02

### 3 Applications

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

Candidates are required to identify and describe in detail relevant evidence and/or theories to the issues raised in the source. Candidates can use any appropriate evidence from any other key theory and study or from any key application and 'the explore more' section. Explanations of gambling behaviour and the study by Parke and Griffiths on the aggressive behaviours in adult slot machine gamblers are obvious examples, but any relevant research will be credited.

Other possible studies/theories include:

- The key study by Hazan, C. and Shaver, P. (1987) Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process.
- Freudian theories of repression/displacement of traumatic memories.
- Theories of stress and stress management techniques.
- The further research by Gale, C. and Martyn, C. (1998) Larks, owls and health, wealth and wisdom.

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



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016</b>	<b>9773</b>	<b>02</b>

- (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.

<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) described in part a) is accurate, coherent and detailed.  Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.  Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.  The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).  Quality of written communication is very good.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is explicit.</p>	8–10
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is very good.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.  Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.  Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.  The answer has some structure and organisation.  Quality of written communication is good.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident.</p>	5–7
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent.  Application of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.  Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.  Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.  The answer has some structure and organisation.  Quality of written communication is good.  Relationship to the events raised in the source is evident in parts.</p>	3–4
<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