
PSYCHOLOGY

9990/11

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

May/June 2019

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **13** printed pages.



Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): Describe <u>one</u> aim of this study. 1 mark brief aim 2 marks detailed aim e.g. To investigate how obedient people are to an authority figure (1 mark) To investigate how obedient people are to an authority figure asking them to physically harm another person (2 marks) To test out the 'are Germans different' hypothesis (1 mark)	2
1(b)	Describe <u>one</u> strength of this study. 1 mark for identifying strength 1 mark for relating it directly to the study e.g. The procedure was standardised so replication would be easier (1 mark) The procedure was standardised so replication would be easier (e.g. the prods given), another research team could conduct it again to test for reliability (2 marks) The measure of obedience was quantitative and objective (1 mark) The measure of obedience was quantitative and objective (e.g. the maximum voltage that a P would give) so comparisons between Ps is meaningful/valid (2 marks) The actual aim of the study about obedience was hidden (from Ps) (1 mark) The actual aim of the study about obedience was hidden (from Ps) so there would be low demand characteristic/increased 'real' behaviour (2 marks)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning): Identify the concept that was being tested in this study. 1 mark for correct answer. Same/different.	1
2(b)	Alex the parrot remained in his cage during ‘sleep hours’. Describe what Alex was allowed to do during non-sleeping hours, when he was <u>not</u> being used in a trial. 1 mark per correct statement He was allowed free access to all parts of the laboratory; These had to be contingent in a correct vocalisation (e.g. wanna go gym)/he could ask to go anywhere; He was allowed to eat any standard food/drink as much water as he wanted/were always available/not deprived of this/has access too/was fed regularly; He could request fresh fruit/vegetable/nuts; He could request toys.	4

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)(i)	In the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia), the boy completed a disgust/fear hierarchy by giving a distress rating to different stimuli on a scale from 0–8. Name <u>one</u> stimulus which was given a rating of 8. 1 mark for correct name. If more than 1, take the first answer. Clear small (buttons); Coloured small (buttons); Small plastic (buttons).	1
3(a)(ii)	Name <u>the</u> stimulus that was given a rating of 2. 1 mark for correct name. If more than 1, take the first answer. Large denim/jean (buttons).	1
3(b)	Outline the results from the post-treatment assessment session. 1 mark per correct statement. The boy reported minimal distress/there was a reduction in the distress/disgust ratings; He no longer met the DSM-IV/diagnostic criteria for a (specific) phobia; He could now wear (clear) buttons/his school uniform shirt.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Describe the procedure during the brain scanning phase of the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions). 1 mark for each correct statement They entered an fMRI scanner; Ps viewed 96 scenes via a screen; Viewed them through a mirror directed at the screen; Movement was minimised by using a bite-bar; These were already rated for valence/arousal; The order of the scenes was randomised; Each picture/scene was shown for around 3s; There was a gap of c.13s in between pictures/scenes being shown; A fixation cross appeared on the screen; They were told to look at each picture/screen for the time it was on the screen; When fixation cross appeared they had to rate their emotional arousal; This was done by pressing a button/using a clicker The ratings were from 0 (not intense) to 3 (extremely intense).	5

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Identify <u>two</u> of the characteristics of the sample in Group 3. 1 mark per characteristic Students/adults/average age of 20.8 (years) (Nearly) equal males/females; Studying undergraduate degree; From the University of Cambridge; Predominantly studying science; Assumed to have a high IQ; (Assumed to be) non-autistic.	2
5(b)	Explain <u>one</u> problem with the original version of the ‘Reading the Mind in the Eyes’ test. 1 mark for identifying problem 1 mark for explaining problem e.g. It contained basic and complex mental states (1 mark) This reduces validity as some items were too easy/lead to a ceiling effect (1 mark) It contained only two responses choices per pair of eyes (1 mark) This means that the probability of getting it correct is 50% which reduced validity/easy to guess/not a good discriminator (1 mark) There were only 25 questions in the original (1 mark) This means that it had low validity due to a high ceiling effect (1 mark) There are other creditworthy problems.	2

Question	Answer	Marks
6	A teacher, Jayne, has a new class of students. Her students are not concentrating during films (movies) in class. She is thinking of ways to help them and asks you for advice. Outline the advice you would give to Jayne, using your knowledge of the study by Andrade (doodling). 1 mark per piece of evidence clearly based on the study by Andrade. e.g. Jayne could give each student a piece of paper; She could tell them that whilst watching the film they can doodle; They can doodle whenever they want/about whatever they want; Or the paper can already have shapes on it so they can colour them in; She could ask them to focus on specific pieces of information; She must tell them that there will be a test after the film.	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Describe <u>one</u> result about dream recall in REM sleep and <u>one</u> result about the estimations of dream-duration time in REM sleep. You must use data for <u>one</u> of these results. 2 marks per result (must have some meaningful comparison to gain the 2) 1 mark for correct data in <i>one</i> of the answers e.g. dream recall in REM sleep There were many more instances of dream recall in REM (1 mark) compared to instance of no recall/recall in NREM (1 mark); There were 152 instances of dream recall in REM across all participants/39 instances of no recall (1 mark: data)/There were 11 instances of dream recall in NREM/149 instances of no recall (alternative 1 mark: data). DN was more accurate with his estimations of 5 minutes in REM compared to estimations of 15 minutes in REM (2 marks: comparison). He was 80% correct for 5 minutes (1 mark: data)/He was 50% correct for 15 minutes (alternative 1 mark: data). e.g. estimations of dream-duration time in REM sleep Participants were more accurate at estimating 5 mins (1 mark) compared to 15 mins (1 mark); On 88% of trial (45/51) the participants estimated 5 mins correctly (1 mark: data); On 78% of trials (47/60) the participants estimated 15 mins correctly (alternative 1 mark: data).	5

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Mandy has learned about the study by Bandura et al. (aggression). She believes that the results support the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate. Outline what is meant by the ‘nature-nurture debate’. 1 mark for the nature side of argument 1 mark for the nurture side of argument e.g. The nature side of the debate is about what behaviours etc. we are born with (1 mark) whereas the nurture side of the debate is about what we learn in our lives (1 mark).	2
8(b)	Outline why Mandy is correct, using evidence in your answer. 1 mark per point made e.g. The children copied the aggression they had seen so it was learnt; For example they shouted things like sock him/kick him; Bandura stated that it was Social Learning Theory causing the aggressive behaviour; They observed and then imitated what they had seen showing learning; Children had been matched on levels of aggression so any increased aggression levels they showed in the study had to be learnt; Children with an aggressive model were more likely to display aggression compared to a non-aggressive model (2 marks: evidence with comparison); Boys were more likely to be <u>physically</u> aggressive (compared to girls) (1 mark evidence as not stated condition) Girls were more likely to be <u>verbally</u> aggressive (compared to boys) (1 mark evidence as not stated condition) Boys were more aggressive (0 marks evidence as no comparison and not stated condition)	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Describe <u>two</u> aims of the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion). 1 mark for brief aim 2 marks for detailed aim 2 marks available <i>per</i> aim e.g. 1 mark To test out the two factor theory of emotion To test out the role of cognitive labels in emotions To test out the role of physiology in emotions To investigate the effect of a stooge on behaviour e.g. 2 marks To test out the two factor theory of emotion which is that an emotional experience comes from a cognitive label and some physiological arousal To test out how cognitive labels like anger and euphoria affect how we perceive our own emotions To test that when physiologically aroused and there <i>is no</i> immediate explanation for it; do we describe feelings based on available cognitions? To test that when physiologically aroused and there <i>is an</i> immediate explanation for it, we do not use available cognitions to explain it To test given the same cognitive circumstances, will an individual describe their feelings as emotions only when they experience physiological arousal? To investigate the effect of a stooge on behaviour who would be angry or euphoric	4

Question	Answer	Marks												
9(b)	Explain whether each guideline below was broken in the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion): • confidentiality • debriefing • deception • protection Use the following Levels marking for each guideline <u>separately</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The answer explicitly describes the ethical <i>without</i> correct contextualisation/no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Confidentiality e.g. Any data should not be identifiable as a single participants' responses/participants' data must not be named as theirs All we know is that there were male students from the University of Minnesota/only the doctors had access to their medical records Debriefing e.g. After a study has been completed, participants should be told about the true aim of the study/what deception/occurred This guideline was not broken as after the self-report, the researchers explained the deception of the injection/stooge/answered any questions Deception e.g. A participant should not be deceived without a strong justification/only if revealing the deception would not cause discomfort This guideline was broken as they were told the wrong information whilst getting the injection	Level	Descriptor	Marks	2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2	1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical <i>without</i> correct contextualisation/no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1	0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given	0	8
Level	Descriptor	Marks												
2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2												
1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical <i>without</i> correct contextualisation/no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1												
0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given	0												

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	Protection Note: can be answered for or against here – go with intentions of the candidate e.g. Participants should leave the study in the same psychological/physical state as they entered/Participants should not be potentially harmed by the procedure of a study The guideline was broken as the participants did receive an injection which may have caused physical/psychological pain The guideline was not broken as the injection was given by a professional doctor to ensure minimal pain They all had to be health screened prior to the study	

Question	Answer	Marks										
10	Evaluate the study by Piliavin et al. in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of independent measures. <table><tr><td></td><td>Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication</td></tr><tr><td> Level 4 (8–10 marks) - Evaluation is comprehensive. - Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. - Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. - Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material. </td><td> 10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength and one weakness) and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth. </td></tr><tr><td> Level 3 (6–7 marks) - Evaluation is good. - Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. - Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. - Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material. </td><td> Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength and one weakness and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and indepth. </td></tr><tr><td> Level 2 (4–5 marks) - Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. - Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. - Analysis is limited. - Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material. </td><td> Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Piliavin study which is indepth </td></tr><tr><td> Level 1 (1–3 marks) - Evaluation is basic. - Answer demonstrates little organisation. - There is little or no evidence of analysis. - Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material. </td><td> Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief. </td></tr></table>		Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication	Level 4 (8–10 marks) - Evaluation is comprehensive. - Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. - Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. - Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material.	10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength and one weakness) and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth.	Level 3 (6–7 marks) - Evaluation is good. - Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. - Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. - Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material.	Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength and one weakness and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and indepth.	Level 2 (4–5 marks) - Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. - Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. - Analysis is limited. - Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.	Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Piliavin study which is indepth	Level 1 (1–3 marks) - Evaluation is basic. - Answer demonstrates little organisation. - There is little or no evidence of analysis. - Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material.	Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief.	10
	Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication											
Level 4 (8–10 marks) - Evaluation is comprehensive. - Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. - Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. - Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material.	10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength and one weakness) and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth.											
Level 3 (6–7 marks) - Evaluation is good. - Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. - Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. - Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material.	Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength and one weakness and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and indepth.											
Level 2 (4–5 marks) - Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. - Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. - Analysis is limited. - Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.	Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Piliavin study which is indepth											
Level 1 (1–3 marks) - Evaluation is basic. - Answer demonstrates little organisation. - There is little or no evidence of analysis. - Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material.	Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief.											

Question	Answer		Marks
10	Level 0 (0 marks) No response worthy of credit.	If the answer is a description of the study	

PSYCHOLOGY

9990/12

Paper 1 Approaches, issues and debates

May/June 2019

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **11** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)(i)	In his study, Milgram used a fake shock generator to measure levels of obedience. What was the voltage increment from one switch to the next on the generator? 1 mark for correct answer If more than one answer given, credit the first one 15 (volts)	1
1(a)(ii)	What label was underneath the switches from 375–420 volts on the generator? 1 mark for correct answer If more than one answer given, credit the first one Danger/Severe (Shock)	1
1(a)(iii)	How many participants pressed the maximum voltage switch, labelled 450 volts? 1 mark for correct answer If more than one answer given, credit the first one 26	1
1(b)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 1 mark brief conclusion 2 marks detailed conclusion e.g. People will be obedient to an authority figure (1 mark); Individuals appear to be much more obedient to an authority figure than we might expect (2 marks); When people are given orders to act destructively they will be experience high levels of stress/anxiety (2 marks); People will follow/listen to an authority figure even if it means harming another person (2 marks); People are willing to harm someone if responsibility is taken away/passed on to someone else (2 marks)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion): Outline what the participants in the ‘Epinephrine Ignorant (EPI IGN)’ were told during their injection. 1 mark per correct point made They were told that the injection/drug was mild/harmless; They were told that there were no side effects.	2
2(b)	Describe the results from the Activity Index measure in the Euphoria condition for ‘Epinephrine Ignorant (EPI IGN)’ group compared to the Epinephrine Misinformed (EPI MIS) group. You must use data in your answer 1 mark for stating which group scored highest/lowest 1 mark for describing what the result meant 1 mark for using data (can be just the data for one group) e.g. The score on the Activity Index was higher for the Epi Mis/lower for the Epi Ign (1 mark) which meant the Epi Mis joined in more with the stooge <i>or</i> were more euphoric/Epi Ign joined in less <i>or</i> were less euphoric (1 mark). The average score was 22.56 (Epi Mis) and 18.28 (Epi Ign) (1 mark for either)	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 1 mark for brief aim. 1 mark for detailed aim. e.g. To report on the treatment of a button phobia (1 mark); To investigate the cause of a boy’s button phobia (1 mark); To investigate the cause of a boy’s button phobia to see if disgust is involved (2 marks); To treat the button phobia of a boy by targeting fear <i>and</i> disgust (2 marks); To test the effectiveness of exposure (based) treatment of a button phobic (2 marks); To examine the role of evaluative learning/classical conditioning in (button) phobias (2 marks);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	Describe <u>one</u> strength of this study. 1 mark for identifying strength 1 mark for relating it directly to the study including <i>why</i> it is a strength e.g. The study had a follow up of 12-months (1 mark). Therefore, the treatment could be tested for effectiveness in the <i>long term</i> (1 mark) The study was on only one boy so a lot of data could be collected (1 mark). Therefore, the best treatment method could be designed/chosen to ensure it helped to get rid of his button phobia (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Describe the ‘Aggression Arousal’ procedure in the study by Bandura et al. 1 mark per correct point The child was brought to an anteroom/a room; It contained toys (for the children)/shown toys; These included a fire engine, locomotive, a fighter jet, cable, spinning top, doll, doll carriage, crib, car, wardrobe (two need to be named to gain 1 mark); They were told they could play with them; As soon as they did begin to play/get involved (usually 2 mins), the experimenter stopped them; The experimenter explained that she did not let just anyone play with the toys; She then said that she decided they were reserved for some other children; The children were told that they were her very best toys; The experimenter sat away from the child (during this phase)/completed some paperwork	5

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	From the study by Laney et al. (false memory): Identify <u>two</u> characteristics of the sample used in Experiment 1. 1 mark per correct characteristic Undergraduates/students; (from) University of California; Mostly female; Mean age around 21 years	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	The Restaurant Questionnaire measures the likelihood of eating certain foods. Explain <u>one</u> reason why it may <u>not</u> measure this accurately. 1 mark for a reason/problem 1 mark for linking it to the study e.g. What people say they will do on a questionnaire may not ‘mirror’ their behaviour (1 mark); therefore just because they said they would be more likely eat asparagus we don’t know if they actually would (1 mark) 0–8 ratings are subjective/restrictive (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
6	A teacher, Rachael, has a new class of children aged six years. She wants the children to help each other more often in the classroom and asks you for advice. Outline the advice you would give to Rachael, using your knowledge of the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee learning). 1 mark per correct piece of advice given based on <i>any</i> element of the study (does not have to be explicit). e.g. Rachael could set up a game where two children have to work together to solve a task; One child could have tools necessary to solve the whole task; The other child needs to request the correct tool to solve the task/only one tool will help solve it; The children need to work together to use the correct tools to solve the task; Rachael should give a reward to the children when they solve it; She could give a reward to the child who solved it then swap the children over; She can encourage children to ask for help; She could allow the children to get familiar with the classroom/equipment to use;	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7	From the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions): Describe <u>one</u> result about the ratings of emotional intensity of the scenes and <u>one</u> result about the percentage of participants who ‘remembered’ the scene across intensity ratings. You must use data for <u>one</u> of these results 2 marks per result (must have some meaningful comparison to gain the 2) 1 mark for correct data in <i>one</i> of the answers e.g. emotional intensity They were similar across the scenes (1 mark); there were slightly more scenes rated as 0 (not emotionally intense) (1 mark); 29% of scenes were rated as not emotionally intense (1 mark: data) There was a <u>negative correlation</u> between emotional intensity and valence (2 marks; 1 if just ‘correlation’). The r value was -0.66 (1 mark: data) There was a <u>positive correlation</u> between emotional intensity and arousal (2 marks; 1 if just ‘correlation’). The r value was $+0.68$ (1 mark: data) There was a <u>positive correlation</u> between emotional intensity and (left) amygdala activation (2 marks; 1 if just ‘correlation’ OR amygdala activation was higher for scenes rated higher (2 or 3) compared to those rated lower (0 or 1) (2 marks) e.g. ‘remembered’ scenes More of the scenes rated as 3 (extremely emotionally intense) were remembered (1 mark); Those rated 0–2 had similar levels of % remembered/less than those rated 3 (1 mark); 42% of scenes rated 3 were ‘remembered’ (1 mark: data) The scenes which had higher emotional/intensity ratings were remembered more (1 mark) than those with a low emotional/intensity rating (2 marks total: comparison)	5

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Duncan has learned about the Pepperberg (parrot learning) study. He believes that the results support the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate. Outline what is meant by the ‘nature-nurture debate’. 1 mark for the nature side of argument 1 mark for the nurture side of argument e.g. The nature side of the debate is about what behaviours etc. we are born with (1 mark) whereas the nurture side of the debate is about what we learn in our lives (1 mark)	2
8(b)	Outline why you think Duncan is correct, using evidence in your answer. 1 mark per point made e.g. Alex was taught/trained how to use same/different so this was learnt; Alex got rewarded for his efforts and got better at the skill of same/different showing this was learnt; He was taught to label colours and materials so this was learnt; He learnt skills through operant conditioning/social learning/Model-Rival Technique; He could transfer his ‘knowledge’ to novel objects which could have only happened if he had learnt labels; These skills are not common among wild parrots; This shows that Alex was not born with the ability to use labels/eq. Alex had already learned some vocabulary in a previous study.	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Describe <u>two</u> of the independent variables in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans). 1 mark for identifying an IV 1 mark for operationalising the IV e.g. Type/responsibility/condition/behaviour of victim (1 mark); ill versus drunk (1 mark) Race of victim/stooge (1 mark); black versus white (1 mark) The size of the group of bystanders (1 mark); how many people were present (1 mark) Early or late model/The behaviour of the model (1 mark); (help) 70 seconds or 150 seconds after collapse (1 mark)	4

Question	Answer	Marks												
9(b)	Explain whether each guideline below was broken in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): • debriefing • deception • confidentiality • protection Use the following Levels marking for each guideline <u>separately</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>without</i> correct contextualisation/no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2	1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>without</i> correct contextualisation/no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1	0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given	0	8
Level	Descriptor	Marks												
2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2												
1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>without</i> correct contextualisation/no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1												
0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given	0												

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	Debriefing e.g. After a study has been completed, participants should be told about the true aim of the study/what deception/occurred; This guideline was broken people could easily leave the subway carriage at the end of their trip and not be told about the study/participants were not systematically stopped and told that it was in fact a study about bystander behaviour Deception e.g. A participant should not be deceived without a strong justification/only if revealing the deception would not cause discomfort; This guideline was broken as the participants were unaware that the victim was 'faking it' Confidentiality e.g. Any data should not be identifiable as a single participants' responses/participants' data must not be named as theirs The guideline was not broken as no individual data was published/all we know is that there were people on a New York subway train Protection Note: can be answered for or against here – go with intentions of the candidate e.g. Participants should leave the study in the same psychological/physical state as they entered/Participants should not be potentially harmed by the procedure of a study The guideline was broken as the participants had to witness a person collapsing and then maybe not helping them out The guideline was not broken as a participant could literally turn their back on the incident and take no notice of it Other people did help so most passengers may have felt guilty.	

Question	Answer	Marks												
10	Evaluate the study by Andrade (doodling) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of quantitative data. <table><tr><th>Original AOs</th><th>Setter version/Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication</th></tr><tr><td> Level 4 (8–10 marks) Evaluation is comprehensive. Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material. </td><td> 10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength and one weakness) and they are in the context of the Andrade study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth. </td></tr><tr><td> Level 3 (6–7 marks) Evaluation is good. Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material. </td><td> Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength and one weakness and they are in the context of Andrade study and indepth. </td></tr><tr><td> Level 2 (4–5 marks) Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. Analysis is limited. Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material. </td><td> Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Andrade study </td></tr><tr><td> Level 1 (1–3 marks) Evaluation is basic. Answer demonstrates little organisation. There is little or no evidence of analysis. Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material. </td><td> Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief. </td></tr><tr><td> Level 0 (0 marks) No response worthy of credit. </td><td> If the answer is a description of the study </td></tr></table>	Original AOs	Setter version/Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication	Level 4 (8–10 marks) Evaluation is comprehensive. Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material.	10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength and one weakness) and they are in the context of the Andrade study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth.	Level 3 (6–7 marks) Evaluation is good. Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material.	Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength and one weakness and they are in the context of Andrade study and indepth.	Level 2 (4–5 marks) Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. Analysis is limited. Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.	Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Andrade study	Level 1 (1–3 marks) Evaluation is basic. Answer demonstrates little organisation. There is little or no evidence of analysis. Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material.	Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief.	Level 0 (0 marks) No response worthy of credit.	If the answer is a description of the study	10
Original AOs	Setter version/Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication													
Level 4 (8–10 marks) Evaluation is comprehensive. Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material.	10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength and one weakness) and they are in the context of the Andrade study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth.													
Level 3 (6–7 marks) Evaluation is good. Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material.	Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength and one weakness and they are in the context of Andrade study and indepth.													
Level 2 (4–5 marks) Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. Analysis is limited. Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.	Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Andrade study													
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Evaluation is basic. Answer demonstrates little organisation. There is little or no evidence of analysis. Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material.	Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief.													
Level 0 (0 marks) No response worthy of credit.	If the answer is a description of the study													

PSYCHOLOGY

9990/13

Paper 1 Approaches, issues and debates

May/June 2019

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **10** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	From the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion): Outline <u>one</u> aim of the study. 2 marks detailed aim; 1 mark partial / brief aim. e.g. To test out the two factor theory of emotion (1 mark); To test out the two factor theory of emotion which is that an emotional experience comes from a cognitive label and some physiological arousal (2 marks); To test out the role of cognitive labels in emotions (1 mark).	2
1(b)	Describe what the participants in the epinephrine-misinformed (Epi-Mis) condition were told immediately after agreeing to the injection. 1 mark per correct point. They were told to expect some side effects (from Suproxin); The side effects would be short-lived / transitory; The side effect would last for 15–20 minutes; Your feet will probably go numb; You will get an itching sensation over your body; You may get a headache.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee helping): Identify <u>two</u> characteristics of the sample used, other than that they were chimpanzees. 1 mark per correct point. Do not accept chimpanzees. e.g. Five pairs; Each paired with kin / mother; Three were juveniles; Socially housed at a Primate Research Institute; Had participated in previous research that was similar; Had demonstrated sharing behaviour before.	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Describe the results from the second ‘Can See’ condition. You must use data in your answer. 1 mark per correct point. Maximum of 2 if no data is used in answer. e.g. There was an object offered in 97.9% of cases (1 mark: data); The three chimpanzees offered potential tools more frequently than nontool objects (2 marks) with Ai doing this 81.3% of the time (1 mark: data); They offered a relevant tool more frequently than a irrelevant tool for both the stick and straw tasks (2 marks).	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Outline <u>one</u> conclusion about eye movement during REM sleep. 2 marks detailed conclusion. 1 mark partial / brief. No credit for any actual results. Must be generic. e.g. 2 marks Eye movements during REM tend to fit with what the dreamer is looking at suggesting eye movements are not ‘random’ at all. e.g. 1 mark Eye movements during REM tend to fit with what the dreamer is looking at.	2
3(b)	Describe <u>one</u> strength of this study. 1 mark identifying strength. 1 mark contextualising with study. e.g. There was a standardised procedure (which increases reliability) (1 mark); For example, the participant was always in a quiet dark room which makes replication easier to test for reliability (2 marks). There are other creditworthy answers including objectivity, scientific, controls etc.	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Describe the Restaurant Questionnaire completed by participants in the study by Laney et al. (false memory). 1 mark per correct point. Assessed desire to eat 32 dishes; There was a critical item of 'sautéed asparagus (spears)'; Formatted to look like a menu; Five categories (e.g. appetisers, desserts – need to name 2); They had to imagine they were out for a special dinner; Then decide how likely they would order each item; Each choice was rated from 1–8; 1 = definitely no and 8 = definitely yes (require both to gain this available mark).	5

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Identify <u>two</u> examples where a response would be recorded as a 'false alarm' for the recall of names 1 mark per correct point. Names mentioned on the tape as lures; Any new name.	2
5(b)	Suggest <u>one</u> problem with the sample used in this study. 1 mark suggesting problem. 1 mark for contextualising with study. e.g. Might not be a representative sample (1 mark: problem); All were members of a Psychology Unit participant panel so might be more motivated (1 mark: context). The sample was gender biased (1 mark: problem); There were many more females so the results may not generalise to males doodling and remembering (1 mark: context)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
6	Simone is a student who never uses a spoon to eat with at lunchtime because he has a phobia of spoons. Outline how Simone could be helped to overcome his phobia of spoons, using your knowledge of the study by Saavedra and Silverman. 1 mark per correct piece of advice given based on <i>any</i> element of the study (does not have to be explicit). e.g. Simone might ask the child if he can remember any negative experiences with spoons; This will enable Simone to identify a potential cause to help the student reverse the experience; Simone could get the student to rate different spoons on a Fear / Disgust Hierarchy; Whichever has the lowest fear / disgust rating can be presented to the student; They can be rewarded for being able to touch or use the spoon; The feelings of the student can be measured using a Feelings Thermometer.	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7	Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) studied spontaneous helping of victims on a subway. Describe <u>one</u> result about the spontaneous helping of white victims and <u>one</u> result about the spontaneous helping of black victims. You must use data for <u>one</u> of these results. Max. 4 for answers without data presented. Max. 1 mark for correct data in <i>one</i> of the answers. e.g. white victims: The highest incidence of help was for white victims being helped by white helpers in the cane condition (1 mark). This happened 34 times during the study (1 mark: data). Also, there was only one instance of a black participant helping a white drunk victim (1 mark: data). 68% of helpers were white (1 mark: data); There were the same levels of helping when the victim was drunk or ill (2 marks: comparison). This was 100% of the time (1 mark: data). e.g. black victims: More drunk black victims were helped by black helpers than white helpers (2 marks: comparison). Only two white helpers helped a black victim with a cane (1 mark: data). Overall, half of helpers were white though (1 mark: data); Black ill victims were helped more often than black drunk victims (2 marks: comparison). The latter was for 73% of trials (1 mark: data).	5

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Patty has learned about the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions). She believes that the results support the nature side of the nature–nurture debate. Outline what is meant by ‘the nature-nurture debate’. 1 mark for the nature side of argument. 1 mark for the nurture side of argument. Do not credit tautological outlines. e.g. The nature side of the debate is about what behaviours etc. we are born with (1 mark) whereas the nurture side of the debate is about what we learn in our lives (1 mark).	2
8(b)	Outline why Patty is correct, using evidence in your answer. 1 mark per point made. 1 mark available for any result / example from the study itself. Max. 2 if no evidence from study presented. e.g. The study was about brain function which is a biological mechanism; The amygdala is a part of the brain hence it is biological / we are born with it; Blood-oxygen levels were measured which is biological in nature; Females were used in the study as they are likely to show emotional reactions which are a biological difference from men.	4

Question	Answer	Marks												
9(a)	Describe the psychology being investigated in the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning). 1 mark per correct point. e.g. She was testing cognitive skills (of a parrot); To see we can teach an organism to distinguish between same and different; The study also examined Social Learning Theory as a mechanism for learning; This is when an organism pays attention to a role model; The organism retains the information for later use; The organism then reproduces the observed behaviour; They organism must feel motivated to replicate / via vicarious reinforcement; Operant conditioning is when you learn by the consequences of your behaviour.	4												
9(b)	Studies in psychology can be assessed on ethical issues: whether they follow ethical guidelines or not. Four ethical guidelines relating to animals are listed below. Explain whether each guideline was followed in the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning): • Deprivation • Housing • Numbers • Species Use the following Levels marking for each guideline <u>separately</u>: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The answer explicitly describes the ethical <i>without</i> correct contextualisation / no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2	1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical <i>without</i> correct contextualisation / no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1	0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given	0	8
Level	Descriptor	Marks												
2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline <i>and</i> the example is contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2												
1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical <i>without</i> correct contextualisation / no contextualisation OR The ethical guideline is <i>implicit</i> from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study OR The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1												
0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect OR no answer given	0												

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	e.g. Deprivation Animals should not have any food / water withheld in a study unless it is absolutely necessary; Alex would be given extra food if he asked / was not stopped from having food if he got an answer incorrect (not broken). e.g. Housing Housing should take into account the social behaviour of species (e.g. caging); Alex was housed alone which might be stressful as parrots are social (broken). e.g. Numbers Psychologists should use the least number of animals as possible to accomplish goals; Alex was the only participant (not broken). e.g. Species Researchers should choose an appropriate species for their study; Alex had been used for over 10 years in different studies about cognitive abilities so was an ideal participant (not broken).	

Question	Answer	Marks
10	Evaluate the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of quantitative data. Level 4 (8–10 marks) • Evaluation is comprehensive. • Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. • Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. • Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material. Level 3 (6–7 marks) • Evaluation is good. • Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. • Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. • Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material. Level 2 (4–5 marks) • Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. • Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. • Analysis is limited. • Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material. Level 1 (1–3 marks) • Evaluation is basic. • Answer demonstrates little organisation. • There is little or no evidence of analysis. • Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material. Level 0 (0 marks) No response worthy of credit.	10