



Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY

9990/11

Paper 1 Approaches, issues and debates

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **8** 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 Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Identify the main research method of this study. 1 mark for the correct answer. Case study.	1
1(b)	Describe the incident that the boy recalls that started his phobia of buttons. 1 mark per correct point. There was an art project using buttons (in kindergarten); He had run out of buttons (for his project); He was asked to go to the front of the class to get more (buttons); They were in a large bowl (on the teacher's desk); His hand slipped as he reached for the bowl; All of the buttons fell down on him.	3
1(c)	Outline the results from the 6-month follow up. 1 mark per correct point. He reported minimal distress (about buttons); He was in remission according to DSM (criteria); He (continued) to wear clear plastic buttons; He wore them daily/on his school uniform.	2
2(a)	From the study by Yamamoto et al. that used chimpanzees as participants: Outline <u>one</u> psychological concept that was investigated in this study 1 mark for identifying 1 mark for outlining <i>Altruism</i> The willingness to do certain things/doing certain things for someone else even if it disadvantages yourself. <i>Empathy</i> The ability to understand the emotional state of someone else by imagining what it would be like to be in that situation.	2
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result from the 'First "Can See" Condition'. 2 marks = full result (with a meaningful comparison) 1 mark = partial result e.g. All chimpanzees, except Pan, first offered potential tools significantly more often than nontools (2 marks) Pan offered a brush on 80% of trials (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): Outline <u>one</u> result about helping a victim with no model present. 2 marks = full result (compares two relevant conditions) 1 mark = partial result (e.g. one condition) e.g. When the victim was black and drunk, help was only given on 73% of trials whereas when the victim was white and drunk this was 100% (2 marks). When the victim was white with a cane the rate of help was 100% (1 mark)	2
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study. 1 mark = an appropriate methodological strength 1 mark = applied to Piliavin e.g. The study was in a natural setting so has increased levels of ecological validity (1 mark). People were travelling on a subway car which is a normal everyday event (1 mark). The sample size was large meaning results could be generalisable (1 mark). Over 4,400 people ‘participated’ from a wide range of backgrounds meaning that the behaviours probably represent a wide range of people/society (1 mark).	2
3(c)	Outline <u>one</u> ethical weakness of this study. 1 mark = an appropriate/possible ethical issue 1 mark = applied to Piliavin e.g. The participants were deceived by the whole set up (1 mark). The victim was acting ill/drunk but the participants never knew this (1 mark). As there were so many participants, debriefing never happened so not everyone knew it was a fake set up/had taken part in a study (1 mark). Debriefing after the event happened would have ensured people knew it was fake (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Describe the procedure of this study from when the participant arrived at the laboratory until the participant fell asleep for the first time. 1 mark per correct procedural point. They were told to eat normally (that day); But refrain from alcohol/caffeine (on that day); Each participant had 2+ electrodes placed near their eyes; Two or three electrodes were placed on the scalp; The participant then went to bed in a dark/quiet room; All electrode wires were (further) attached to top of the head;	4
4(b)	Outline how dream recall was recorded in this study. 1 mark per correct point. Participants were woken up (to record their dreams); Participants spoke into a recording device (near to their bed); They were asked to state whether or not they had been dreaming; If they could, they were asked to recall the dream; When they had finished the experimenter sometimes entered the room to question them more;	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Mark wants to replicate the Epinephrine Informed (Epi Inf) condition from the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion) and needs your help. You must produce clear instructions for Mark, from when the participant arrives until they are given the injection. Suggest instructions that Mark could use to replicate this part of the study. 1 mark per correct instruction. Max 3 for instructions given that are not specific to the Epi Inf condition. General: You must tell the participant that the study is about vision; You must tell them that it is about how vitamins affect vision; You must tell them that a vitamin compound/Suproxin is being assessed; You must then gain their permission to be injected (with Suproxin); You must tell them that the injection is mild/harmless; Epi Inf specific: You must also tell them/reveal that there may be side effects; Tell them that they are short-lived; Tell them they will last about 15 minutes or so; Tell them that their hand will begin to shake/heart will pound/face may get warm;	5

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	From the study by Laney <i>et al.</i> (false memory): Identify <u>three</u> characteristics of the sample used in Experiment 1. 1 mark per characteristic. Undergraduates; (studying at the) University of California; Mostly female (77%)/Minority male (23%); Mean age approx. 20–21 years;	3
6(b)	Describe how the participants were recruited for Experiment 1. 1 mark per correct point made. Participants were studying at a university (California); They chose to take part to receive course credits;	2
6(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 2 marks = full conclusion 1 mark = partial conclusion 0 marks = purely results e.g. It is possible to implant false beliefs/false memories for a positive childhood experience of loving asparagus (2 marks) It is possible to implant false beliefs/false memories (1 mark) About one-quarter of participants in the Love group reported a memory of trying asparagus (0 marks)	2
7(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 2 marks = full aim 1 mark = partial aim e.g. To test whether doodling aided concentration/improved memory (2 marks) To test what could improve concentration/memory (1 mark) To test the effects of doodling (1 mark)	2
7(b)	Suggest <u>one</u> real-world application of this study. 1 mark for application (clearly based on Andrade) 1 mark for who it would benefit/elaboration e.g. Let workers draw/doodle/colour-in whilst working on a job that is boring/tiring as this will improve their concentration (2 marks); Let school children doodle in class to help them (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks																		
8(a)	The study by Milgram study (obedience) is from the social approach. Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the social approach, using any example for each. 1 mark = appropriate assumption (x2) 1 mark = any relevant example (x2) e.g. Behaviour/cognitions/emotions can be influenced by other individuals (1 mark). For example, in Milgram's study, the experimenter in the lab coat used prods to get them to continue to give electric shocks (1 mark) Behaviour/cognitions/emotions can be influenced by groups (1 mark). For example, in emergency situations people may believe other people are giving/calling for help so just walk on by when they usually help (1 mark).	4																		
8(b)	Explain how one result from the study by Milgram supports the situational explanation of obedience and how one result does not support the situational explanation of obedience. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Criteria</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the situational explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditworthy answer.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria	Marks	4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.	4	3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.	3	2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the situational explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.	2	1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1	0	No creditworthy answer.	0	8
Level	Criteria	Marks																		
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.	4																		
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.	3																		
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the situational explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the situational explanation.	2																		
1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1																		
0	No creditworthy answer.	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
9	Evaluate the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about 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



Cambridge International AS & A Level

PYSCHOLOGY

9990/12

Paper 1 Approaches, issues and debates

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **9** 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 Milgram (obedience): Identify the sampling technique used in this study. 1 mark for correct answer. Volunteer/self-selecting	1
1(b)	Identify <u>two</u> examples of ‘signs of extreme tension’ shown by participants in this study. 1 mark for ‘sign’ – if more than one written in either scaffolded slot then take the first answer for each. Signs of extreme tension: Sweat; Tremble; Stutter; Bit lip; Groan; Dig fingernails into flesh; Nervous laughing (fits); Smiling; Full-blown seizures;	2
1(c)	Describe the ‘preliminary run’ that participants had to complete before the ‘regular run’ in this study. 1 mark per correct point. The participant/teacher was given 10 words to read (to the learner); Three of these were neutral/ones the learner would get correct; Seven of these were ‘incorrect’ answers; So a voltage of 105v was administered;	3
2(a)	From the study by Laney et al. who investigated whether new information about liking asparagus can change old information: Outline <u>one</u> psychological concept that was investigated in this study. 1 mark for identifying 1 mark for outlining e.g. (Positive) false memories (1 mark). These are memories that are an apparent recollection of an event/behaviour/situation that never actually happened (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result from the Food History Inventory in Experiment 2 of this study. 2 marks = full result (with a meaningful comparison) 1 mark = partial result e.g. The mean confidence of the Love Group increased <i>more</i> than the Control Group (2 marks) The mean confidence of the Love Group increased (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Outline <u>one</u> result from the memory scores for names (monitored information) in this study. 2 marks = full result (compares the two conditions correctly) 1 mark = partial result (e.g. one condition) e.g. The doodling condition scored (on average) higher than the control condition (2 marks) The average score for the doodling group was 5.1 (1 mark)	2
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study. 1 mark = an appropriate methodological strength 1 mark = applied to Andrade e.g. The study had controls so we could establish cause and effect (1 mark); The study controlled things like the length of the script/the time the participant was spoken to before recall, meaning that Andrade could be confident it was doodling causing changes in recall rate(s) (2 marks) There was a standardised procedure meaning reliability could be assessed (1 mark)	2
3(c)	Outline <u>one</u> ethical weakness of this study. 1 mark = an appropriate/possible ethical issue 1 mark = applied to Andrade e.g. Participants were deceived (1 mark); They did not know that they would have to remember the names/places in telephone message (1 mark) Participants might have experienced some psychological distress (1 mark) because they were not expecting a memory test/could not remember the names/places (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	In the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning), a principal trainer and secondary trainers were used during the ‘test procedures’. Describe what the principal trainer would do during the ‘test procedures’. 1 mark per correct point. She was sat in the room with her back to Alex/the parrot; She did not look at Alex/the parrot during the presentation of (test) objects; She did not know what object was being presented; She repeated out loud what Alex/the parrot said; It was then decided if the response was correct/incorrect/indistinct.	4
4(b)	Outline how the overall test score was calculated in this study. Dividing the total number of correct identifications (1 mark) by the total number of presentations required (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Adelia wants to replicate the Epinephrine Misinformed (Epi Mis) condition from the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion) and needs your help. You must produce clear instructions for Adelia, from when the participant arrives until they are given the injection. Suggest instructions that Adelia could use to replicate this part of the study. 1 mark per correct instruction. Max 3 for instructions given that are not specific to the Epi Mis condition. General: You must tell the participant that the study is about vision; You must tell them that it is about how vitamins affect vision; You must tell them that a vitamin compound/Suproxin is being assessed; You must then gain their permission to be injected (with Suproxin); You must tell them that the injection is mild/harmless; Epi Mis specific: You must also tell them/reveal that there may be side effects; Tell them that they are short-lived; Tell them they will last about 15 minutes or so; Tell them that their feet will feel numb/itching sensation/might get a slight headache;	5

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Identify <u>two</u> characteristics of the sample used in Group 3. 1 mark per characteristic. (normal) adults; Students; Males and females (even split); Studying at Cambridge University;	2
6(b)	Describe how the participants were recruited for Groups 2 and 3. 1 mark per correct point Max 2 for Group 2; Max 2 for Group 3 Group 2: Opportunity/volunteer sampling; From adult community/education classes in Exeter; From public libraries in Cambridge; Group 3: Opportunity/volunteer sampling; From students studying degrees at Cambridge University; All students had performed well in Advanced Level qualifications;	3
6(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 2 marks = full conclusion 1 mark = partial conclusion 0 marks = purely results e.g. The Revised 'Eyes Test' overcame the problems of the original version (1 mark) The Revised 'Eyes Test' overcame the problems of the original version making it a valid test of social intelligence (in adults) (2 marks) The Revised test could discriminate AS and non-AS participants (1 mark) AS/HFA participants scored lower on the Eyes Test than all other groups (0 marks)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotion): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 2 marks = full aim 1 mark = partial aim e.g. To investigate whether the amygdala is sensitive to different levels of experienced emotional intensities (2 marks) To investigate whether the degree of emotional intensity affects the role of the amygdala in enhancing memory (2 marks) To investigate the role of the amygdala in memories (1 mark)	2
7(b)	Suggest <u>one</u> real-world application of this study. 1 mark for application (clearly based on Canli) 1 mark for who it would benefit/elaboration e.g. People in advertising may want to use emotionally intense imagery (1 mark). The images in this study that were rated emotionally intense were remembered better so products linked to this type of imagery may also be well remembered (1 mark) Psychologists may want to use the same procedure with people who have memory difficulties (1 mark). If a patient does not remember emotionally intense imagery then they may have a problem with/may have a damaged amygdala (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks																		
8(a)	The study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee helping) is from the social approach. Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the social approach, using any example for each. 1 mark = appropriate assumption (×2) 1 mark = any relevant example (×2) e.g. Behaviour/cognitions/emotions can be influenced by other individuals (1 mark). For example, in the study by Milgram, the experimenter in the lab coat used prods to get them to continue to give electric shocks (1 mark) Behaviour/cognitions/emotions can be influenced by groups (1 mark). For example, in emergency situations people may believe other people are giving/calling for help so just walk on by when they usually help (1 mark).	4																		
8(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> result from the study by Yamamoto et al. supports the individual explanation of prosocial behaviour and how <u>one</u> result does <u>not</u> support the individual explanation of prosocial behaviour. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Criteria</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the individual explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditworthy answer.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria	Marks	4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.	4	3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.	3	2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the individual explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.	2	1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1	0	No creditworthy answer.	0	8
Level	Criteria	Marks																		
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.	4																		
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.	3																		
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the individual explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support the individual explanation.	2																		
1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1																		
0	No creditworthy answer.	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
9	Evaluate the study by Bandura <i>et al.</i> (aggression) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about observations. 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



Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY

9990/13

Paper 1 Approaches, issues and debates

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **9** 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 Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions): Identify the sampling technique used in this study. 1 mark for correct answer Volunteer/self-selecting	1
1(b)	Outline the scale that was used by participants to indicate their emotional arousal to each picture. 1 mark per correct point. (The scale was) 0 = not emotionally intense at all; To 3 = extremely emotionally intense; There were four choices (per image); It was a scale of buttons that they had to press.	2
1(c)	Describe what happened to a participant during the ‘recognition test’ in this study. 1 mark per correct point. Participants were asked if they had seen the picture before; If they said ‘yes’ they had two choices; Whether they had remembered with certainty; Whether they had a feeling of familiarity (rather than certainty); Participants responded with a no if the picture had not been seen before; They were shown a mixture of pictures they had and had not seen before; The foils were balanced for valence and arousal characteristics;	3

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Pepperberg that used a parrot as the participant: Outline <u>one</u> psychological concept that was investigated in this study. 1 mark for identifying 1 mark for outlining e.g. Social Learning (1 mark). This is when a person/animal observes and imitates a chosen behaviour (1 mark). The concepts of same and different (1 mark). This is about understanding whether two objects share a feature such as matter or not (1 mark) Animal cognition (1 mark). This is about whether non-humans have the ability to think and reason (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result for first-trial-only performance from this study. You must use data in your answer. 2 marks = full result with data + naming the test 1 mark = partial result or result does not name the test but is identifiable e.g. Familiar objects On familiar objects he scored 70% (2 marks) He scored above chance on familiar objects (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Outline <u>one</u> result from this study. Refer only to results from the eyes test in your answer. 2 marks = full result (compares the two conditions correctly) 1 mark = partial result (e.g. one condition) e.g. The AS/HFA participants/Group 1 scored lower on the eyes test compared to the students/Group 3 (2 marks) The AS/HFA participants /Group 1 scored lowest on the eyes test (1 mark) The distributions of scores followed a (rough) normal distribution with the modal score being 24/36 (2 marks)	2
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study. 1 mark = an appropriate methodological strength 1 mark = applied to Baron-Cohen e.g. The Revised Eyes Test follows a standardised procedure (1 mark). All participants had the same 36 pairs of eyes to judge so direct comparisons could made across groups (1 mark) The Revised Eyes Test is a standardised measure (of Theory of Mind) (1 mark)	2
3(c)	Outline <u>one</u> ethical weakness of this study. 1 mark = an appropriate/possible ethical issue 1 mark = applied to Baron-Cohen e.g. Participants (especially AS/HFA) may have felt psychological distress (1 mark). They may not have understood the emotions in any of the eyes which could have stressed them (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	In the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia), the boy with the phobia went through a ‘behavioural exposures’ procedure as part of his treatment. Describe the ‘behavioural exposures’ procedure as used in this study. 1 mark per correct point. It was based on contingency management (procedures); The mother would provide positive reinforcement; Contingent on the child successfully completing the gradual exposure to buttons; Treatment sessions lasted about 30 minutes with the boy; And then another 20 minutes with the boy and mother; A hierarchy of distress was constructed (for buttons); A series of buttons were rated from 0–8; This was using a Feeling Thermometer.	4
4(b)	Outline the posttreatment follow-up assessment session. 1 mark per correct point. They re-administered two measures; One was the ADIS-C-P/measured his anxiety towards buttons; He was also assessed against DSM (IV) criteria; To see if he still had a diagnosed phobia (of buttons)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Maria wants to replicate the Epinephrine Ignorant (Epi Ign) condition from the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion) and needs your help. You must produce clear instructions for Maria, from when the participant arrives until they are given the injection. Suggest instructions that Maria could use to replicate this part of the study. 1 mark per correct instruction. Max 3 for instructions given that are not specific to the Epi Ign condition. General: You must tell the P that the study is about vision; You must tell them that it is about how vitamins affect vision; You must tell them that a vitamin compound/Suproxin is being assessed; You must then gain their permission to be injected (with Suproxin); You must tell them that the injection is mild/harmless; Epi Ign specific: You must not tell them about any side effects; You must then leave the room; You must remind the physician to re-iterate no side effects/harmless/mild;	5

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): Identify <u>two</u> characteristics of the sample used in this study. 1 mark per characteristic. Males and females; 45% black; 55% white; Travellers on a subway (in New York);	2
6(b)	Describe how the sample was obtained for this study. 1 mark per correct point They were unsolicited people on a New York Subway; They would be travelling between 11 am and 3 pm; From Harlem to the Bronx; On a weekday; Between April and June; Recruited/obtained via opportunity sampling/from those available at the time;	3
6(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 2 marks = full conclusion 1 mark = partial conclusion 0 marks = purely results e.g. People help ill victims more often (1 mark); A person who is 'ill' is more likely to receive help than a person who is 'drunk' (2 marks) 100% of the white drunk victims got help when no model was present (0 marks)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 2 marks = full aim 1 mark = partial aim e.g. To investigate if dream recall differs between REM and nREM stages of sleep (2 marks); To investigate dream recall and stages of sleep (1 mark); To investigate if there was a (positive) correlation between estimates of dream duration and length of REM sleep (2 marks); To investigate estimates of dream duration (1 mark); To investigate if eye movement patterns were related to dream content (2 marks); To investigate eye movement and dreams (1 mark);	2
7(b)	Suggest <u>one</u> real-world application of this study. 1 mark for application (clearly based on Dement and Kleitman) 1 mark for who it would benefit/elaboration e.g. This could be useful to help diagnose a (potential) sleep disorder in a patient (1 mark). They could undergo an EEG whilst sleeping to see if REM and nREM sleep is happening 'correctly' (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks																		
8(a)	The study by Bandura et al. (aggression) is from the learning approach. Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the learning approach, using any example for each. 1 mark = appropriate assumption (×2) 1 mark = any relevant example (×2) e.g. Conditioning can help to explain our behaviour (1 mark); If we reward someone they are likely to want to repeat that behaviour (1 mark) Social learning can help explain our behaviour (1 mark); Bandura found that children will observe and imitate an aggressive role model (1 mark)	4																		
8(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> result from the study by Bandura et al. supports the nature side of the nature–nurture debate and how <u>one</u> result supports the nurture side of the nature–nurture debate. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Criteria</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the nature/nurture explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditworthy answer.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria	Marks	4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.	4	3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.	3	2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the nature/nurture explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.	2	1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1	0	No creditworthy answer.	0	8
Level	Criteria	Marks																		
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.	4																		
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.	3																		
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about the nature/nurture explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports the nature/nurture explanation.	2																		
1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1																		
0	No creditworthy answer.	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
9	Evaluate the study by Laney et al. (false memory) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about generalisations. 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