

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/11**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

May/June 2024**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 2024 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 **24** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**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 descriptions 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.

PUBLISHED**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.

PUBLISHED**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However, spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	In the study by Pozzulo et al. (line-ups), cartoon character targets were used. Identify <u>one</u> of the cartoon characters used. 1 mark for correct answer Dora (The Explorer) (Go) Diego (Go).	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u> .
1(b)	Identify <u>two</u> features of the participants in the ‘young children’ group. 1 mark per correct feature n=59. Aged 4–7 years/average age c.5 years. Majority male/38 males + 21 females In pre-kindergarten/kindergarten. Living in Canada/Eastern Ontario. Familiar with the cartoon characters.	2	List is definitive. n tolerance is 58–60. Accept any age range from within 4–7 years (e.g., accept 4–6 but do not accept 3–7) Do not accept ‘Canadian’ as we do not know. Accept ‘likely to be of higher socio-economic status’. Accept from (3) <u>private</u> schools.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 2 marks for detailed conclusion. 1 mark for partial/brief conclusion. e.g., Children make errors in (target-absent) identification because of social demands rather than faulty cognitive processing (2 marks). Children make errors in (target-absent) identification because of social demands (1 mark). Children are not very good at saying that the person they saw is not in a line-up (1 mark). Adults had a correct identification rate of 0.95 for cartoon faces (0 marks: a result). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore pure results or anything comparing children and adults on performance of choosing cartoon or human faces.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 2 marks detailed aim. 1 mark partial/brief aim. e.g., To investigate how obedient people are to an authority figure asking them to physically harm another person (2 marks) To investigate how obedient people are to an authority figure (1 mark) To test out the 'are Germans different' hypothesis (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore 'to investigate obedience' by itself as this in the question.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> way in which the participants were deceived. 2 marks for clear/detailed way deception happened. 1 mark for brief/unclear way deception happened. e.g., They were deceived into thinking that when they pressed a button, the other ‘participant’ got an electric shock when this did not happen (2 marks) They thought that the person pounding on the other side of the wall was real when it was a recording (2 marks) They thought that they had a 50/50 chance of being the teacher/learner but this was fixed as each slip had teacher on it (2 marks) They were told the wrong aim that it was about punishment and memory (2 marks) They thought they were giving real electric shocks (1 mark) They thought that they had a 50/50 chance of being the teacher/learner (1 mark) They were told the wrong aim (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	For two marks there must be a reason given for the deception. If the candidate states that the confederate was shouting/screaming then max 1.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences): Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to the duration of play by the monkeys with the ‘wheeled’ toys. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison e.g., (sex differences) Males, on average, played (with wheeled toys) for longer compared to females (2 marks) Males, on average, played (with wheeled toys) for longer (1 mark) e.g., (species differences) Both male monkeys and male children played with wheeled/masculine toy for the longest time (2 marks) e.g., (toy type differences) Males, on average, played with wheeled toys for longer compared to plush toys (2 marks) Males, on average, played with wheeled toys for longer (1 mark)	2	Accept responses based around the standard deviation. Comparisons can be male vs female, monkey vs child, or wheeled vs plush Do not accept ‘played more’ as the Q is about duration of play and not frequency of play. Do not accept responses about ‘toy preference’ as the question is about the duration of play.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to the rank of female monkeys and the duration of play. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful correlation/comparison 1 mark for result with no meaningful correlation/comparison e.g., There was a positive correlation between rank and total duration of play for plush toys (2 marks: correlation) There was no (significant) correlation between rank and total duration of play for wheeled toys (2 marks: correlation) There was a relationship between duration of play and rank for plush toys but not for wheeled toys (2 marks: comparison) There was a correlation between the two (1 mark)	2	1 mark maximum if the type of toy is not explicitly mentioned. Do accept if presented as high ranked played for longer with plush toys than low ranked. Similar to Q3(a) do not credit 'played more' or 'preferred'.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of this study. 1 mark for the identification of weakness 1 mark for explaining the weakness via example from the study. e.g. (Lacks) generalisability (1 mark: identification) as the troop were captive so may not represent wild (rhesus) monkey behaviour (1 mark: explained in context). (Lacks) mundane realism (1 mark: identification) as in the wild (rhesus) monkeys would not play with wheeled/plush toys (1 mark: explained in context). (Difficult to) control (extraneous) variables (1 mark: identification) There are other creditworthy responses, including ethics and observer bias.	2	Do not accept ‘cruel as not in the wild’ type answers. Do not accept ‘monkeys cannot communicate to tell us.’ Do not accept broke the ethical guideline of numbers. Do not accept does not generalise to humans as an explanation (but do credit ID). If identification and explanation do not match, can still award the identification mark. Do not accept opportunity sampling.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4(a)	From the study by Bandura et al. (aggression): Outline how ‘mallet aggression’ was defined in this study. 1 mark per point listed below: Strikes/hits object with mallet The object was not the Bobo doll.	2	List is definitive. <i>Mallet aggression: Subject strikes objects other than the Bobo doll aggressively with the mallet.</i>
4(b)	Outline <u>one</u> feature of social learning theory, using an example from this study. 1 mark for identification of a feature 1 mark for outlining the feature (must be generic) 1 mark for example from Bandura et al. e.g., Replication (1 mark: identification). This is when the person feels they can replicate an observed behaviour (1 mark: outline). In Bandura, the children replicated hitting the Bobo doll (1 mark: example) Attention/observation (1 mark: identification). This is when a person observes a role model engaged in some behaviour (1 mark: outline). In Bandura, some children observed the adult hitting the Bobo doll (1 mark: example) Imitation/reproduction (1 mark: identification). This is when a person copies the behaviour of a model (1 mark: outline). In Bandura, some children imitated hitting a Bobo doll (1 mark: example) There are other creditworthy responses, include modelling and retention.	3	Ignore responses about positive reinforcement or punishment. If more than one feature is covered, mark all and credit the best.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	Suggest at least one application to everyday life of the study by Andrade (doodling). Do <u>not</u> refer to more than three applications in your answer. Your suggestion(s) <u>must</u> be ethical. Use the banded marking grid below. If more than three applications given, mark all and credit the best three. e.g., Teachers in classrooms to help students concentrate/pay attention. People in offices/meetings etc. where they need to concentrate. Students revising for an examination to help concentrate/with memory. Therapeutic settings to get clients to concentrate/pay attention.	5	Annotate in the following way: tick = what plus = how I = what/how implicit (see below) Ignore responses about explaining everyday behaviours with examples. They must be proactive/prospective applications to everyday life, not explanations/retrospective. Do not credit the same how more than once (e.g., doodle on paper) – annotate with REP. Implicit what = can be used by teachers/in school/in workplace (not suggest as to what it is being used for). Implicit how = allow people to doodle. See accompanying Question 5 grid. If the secondary task is not doodling but makes sense (e.g., music, fidget toy) then award L2 maximum.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance
5	Marks	Description		
	5	One application suggested in depth and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved		
	3–4	One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.		
	1–2	One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved		
	0	No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	In the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans), on each trial a team of four students boarded the train. Describe the procedure from this point until the victim collapsed. 1 mark per correct point. The team was always made up of 2 males and 2 females. The team boarded the train using different doors. The location of the 'experimental' car was always varied. Females took seats outside critical area/in adjacent area. Recorded data as covertly as possible during ride. Male victim/model always stood up. Victim was always next to pole (in critical area)/centre of the critical area. The model would go to adjacent/critical area (depending on the condition). The victim waited 70s before collapsing.	5	List is definitive. 1 mark maximum available for the description of one of the victims. 1 mark available for an example of the data that was recorded covertly. If 2 females plus one male model and one male victim = 1 mark (award in the same way as 2 males 2 females using the highlighter). 'The victim was standing next to the pole' = 2 marks

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	Suggest <u>two</u> problems that could arise if children were used as participants in the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test). For each problem (max 2 per problem) 1 mark for identification/outline of the problem (generic) 1 mark for linking it to Baron-Cohen et al. e.g., There are ethical issues with using children (1 mark: identification/outline This could be protection from psychological harm (1 mark alternative: identification/outline). In this study, children may have found the procedure stressful as it could have felt like a test or examination (1 mark: link). Children may not understand what is being asked of them (1 mark: identification/outline). Therefore, the children may not understand how the eyes test works (1 mark alternative: identification/outline). As a result, the children may have seen it as a game and therefore theory of mind might not have been measured (1 mark: link). Children do not have fully developed brains (1 mark: identification), therefore it would be difficult for them to recognise emotional expressions from eyes (1 mark: link). Children have a lack of experience with human interactions (compared to adults) (1 mark: identification), therefore they would have limited ideas/experiences of judging emotions) (1 mark link).	4	Go with the intention of the candidate. Do not credit generalise to adults.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	The linguistic skills of children are limited (compared to adults), therefore (even with a glossary) children would probably not understand the words used in the eyes test (1 mark link). There are other creditworthy responses.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	Two friends, Jack and Daphne, are discussing the ethics of the study by Perry et al. (personal space). Jack says the study is ethical, but Daphne says the study is <u>not</u> ethical. Explain why you think <u>either</u> Jack <u>or</u> Daphne is correct, using evidence from this study in your answer. 1 mark can be awarded for the identification of a relevant ethical guideline. 1 mark per point explaining why ethical/not ethical via <u>evidence from the study</u>. e.g., Jack Written consent was taken from the participants (1 mark). The ethical committee at the Medical Centre/University approved the study as being ethical (1 mark). The task of watching someone get closer is not particularly stressful as it was not real (1 mark). Also, they could press the spacebar to stop the figure approaching more, protecting them from psychological stress (1 mark).	4	If both Jack and Daphne feature in the answer, mark them independently and credit the highest score. Go with the intention of the candidate. For Daphne, do not credit deception linked to the administration of OT/placebo as this level of deception is justifiable (therefore, can be credited for Jack). Relevant guidelines: Jack: consent, limited stress as simulation, debriefed, confidentiality. Daphne: deception (but see above), distress/harm. Do not credit anything about the right to withdraw as not reported in the paper.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	e.g., Daphne In experiment 2 they were deceived into thinking they would be chatting with another participant (1 mark). They were told that the computer would calculate an average distance for seating, but this did not happen (1 mark). The act of intruding into someone's personal space (even if it was an animation) can still be psychologically stressful (1 mark). There was also no way of knowing if any participant would react to oxytocin so there was risk involved (1 mark).		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	Outline <u>two</u> dreams reported by participants in the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams). 2 marks detailed outline. 1 mark brief outline e.g., 2 marks Watching two people throwing tomatoes at each other. Standing at the bottom of a cliff operating some sort of hoist machine. Climbing a set of ladders looking up and down as they did. Throwing basketballs (at a hoop) then looking up at net/down to pick up another ball. (The P reported) driving a car and staring at the road ahead. At an intersection a car appeared speeding at them. (The P reported) driving a car and staring at the road ahead. They saw a man on the road asking for a lift. e.g., 1 mark Standing at the bottom of a cliff. (The P reported) driving a car and staring at the road ahead. At an intersection a car appeared speeding at them They saw a man on the road asking for a lift. Throwing tomatoes. Climbing a set of ladders. Throwing basketballs (at a hoop).	4	List is definitive.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> differences between the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams) and <u>one</u> other study from the biological approach. One of the differences <u>must</u> be about the sample of participants. Use the marking grid below. One must be about the sample. 4 marks for the difference (twice), e.g., brain measurement, research techniques used, type of data collected (quantitative/qualitative), experimental design. e.g. difference e.g. 4 marks Hölzel used an MRI scan to be able to see brain density changes after a mindfulness stress reduction course. Dement and Kleitman used a different technique called an EEG that could only monitor brain wave activity/patterns. Therefore, Hölzel's method looked at structure whereas Dement and Kleitman looked at (real-time) function (explanation). e.g. 3 marks Different techniques were used to measure the brain. Hölzel used an MRI scan to be able to see brain density changes after a mindfulness stress reduction course/Dement and Kleitman used a different technique called an EEG that could only monitor brain wave activity/patterns. e.g. 2 marks Hölzel used an MRI scan measure brain density whilst Dement and Kleitman used an EEG. e.g. 1 mark Both studies used different techniques to measure the brain.	8	The other biological studies are: Hassett Hölzel Award L1-L4 for each difference. For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the difference. Different species/assumptions/aims = L1 (if they simply write what both studies did, this is still different aims). For description of the sample (e.g., n=....) from the two studies with no explicit note about size differences or effect on generalisability = L2 Only accept opportunity sampling for Dement and Kleitman. For D&K vs Hassett, different ethical guidelines = L1. Place a tick next to the difference that is about the sample. If no tick can be placed then mark both differences independently but <u>only credit the best</u>.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Level	Description		
	4	The difference is well explained using both studies as examples.		
	3	The difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.		
	2	The difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The difference is well explained but there is no study evidence.		
	1	The difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.		
	0	No creditable response.		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Fagen et al. (elephant 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. Strengths include: reliability, standardisation, validity (internal), quantitative data, ethics Weaknesses include: sample, ethics. Example: in detail The study collected quantitative data which makes it easier to make meaningful comparisons between groups/conditions. They counted the number of trials it took to pass the trunk wash and the degree of difficulty for each task. As a result, they could compare performance across the five elephant participants to see any trends/differences etc. Example: brief but in context The sample only had 5 elephants as part of it. This could make generalisations difficult as they might not represent other elephants including adult ones. Example: no context The study followed a standardised procedure making it easier to replicate.	10	Do not credit demand characteristics low as used elephants. Do accept arguments about using elephants for this type of research is more practical than using humans. • describe ethical guidelines as used in psychology – minimising harm (and maximising benefit) – replacement – species – numbers – procedures ◦ pain, suffering and distress ◦ housing ◦ reward, deprivation and aversive stimuli

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	5	• Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10		
	4	• Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8		
	3	• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. • Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. • Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	2	- Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue. - Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. - Some points may have no context. - Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.	3–4		
	1	- Little or no evaluation. - Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial. - Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2		
	0	No creditable response.			

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/12**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

May/June 2024**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 2024 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 **19** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**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 descriptions 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.

PUBLISHED**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.

PUBLISHED**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However, spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	The first stage of the study by Bandura et al. (aggression) was when the children were rated on four scales by the experimenter and a nursery school teacher. One of these scales was ‘aggressive inhibition’. Identify <u>one</u> of the other scales used in this first stage. 1 mark for correct answer. Physical aggression. Verbal aggression. Aggression towards inanimate objects.	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u>. List is definitive.
1(b)	Outline how the children were assigned to one of the conditions in this study. 1 mark per correct point. The scores on the four scales were added together. Participants were arranged ‘in triplets’/matched on their (initial aggressive) ratings. Assigned at random to one of the conditions.	2	List is definitive. Ignore reference to being divided by gender/type of model.
1(c)	Identify <u>two</u> features of the final experimental room used in the ‘test for delayed imitation’. 1 mark per correct feature <u>Variety</u> of toys. Some were ‘aggressive toys’/Bobo doll (any aggressive toy can be awarded mark). Some were ‘nonaggressive toys’/tea set (any nonaggressive toy can be awarded mark). Arranged in a fixed order/always in the same place. One way mirror.	2	Allow ‘no model/experimenter in the room’. Do not accept 2-way mirror. predominantly nonaggressive forms of behavior. The aggressive toys included a 3-foot Bobo doll, a mallet and peg board, two dart guns, and a tether ball with a face painted on it which hung from the ceiling. The nonaggressive toys, on the other hand, included a tea set, crayons and coloring paper, a ball, two dolls, three bears, cars and trucks, and plastic farm animals. <i>In order to eliminate any variation in behavior due</i>

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Outline the experimental design used in this study. 1 mark for correct identification of experimental design. 1 mark for the correct outline (generic or by example). Independent groups (1 mark: identification) Participants only took part in one condition/level of IV/two <u>separate</u> groups (1 mark: outline generic) Participants were either in the doodling group or non-doodling/control group (1 mark: example).	2	List is definitive. ...as there was a doodling <u>group</u> and a control <u>group</u> = 1 mark.
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 2 marks full conclusion 1 mark partial/brief conclusion e.g., People concentrate better/their memory is better when allowed to doodle as it focuses their attention/stops them getting distracted (2 marks). People can pay attention to information even when engaged in dual-processing (tasks) (2 marks). Doodling aids concentration/memory as it increases arousal/alertness/attention/reduces daydreaming (2 marks). Doodling aids concentration/memory (1 mark). Participants recalled more names in the doodling condition (0 marks: result). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore pure results. Do credit a conclusion presented <u>after</u> the results in a response

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to REM sleep and dream recall. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison. 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison. e.g., There were more dreams recalled in REM compared to NREM sleep (2 marks). There were more dreams recalled in REM (1 mark). There was a positive correlation between the number of words used to recall dream (in RME) and length of time in REM. WD had the highest recall level in REM compared to the other participants/KC/DN etc. (2 marks). There are other creditworthy responses	2	Dreams are more vivid in REM (than NREM) = 1 mark. Most dreams occur in REM (than NREM) = 1 mark. Dreams are more detailed in REM (than NREM) = 1 mark. Do not credit dreams only occur in REM.
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to dream duration estimates when participants were woken up 15 minutes after the onset of REM sleep. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison. 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison. e.g., Participants were less likely to estimate 15 mins correctly compared to 5 mins correctly (2 marks). There were 47 instances of correct estimation compared to 13 instances of incorrect estimation (2 marks). DN only got the estimate correct 50% of the time (1 mark). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Accept on 78% of trials, Ps could estimate 15 minutes correctly = 1 mark. Accept 'most' estimations of length were correct = 1 mark. However, 78% of Ps could estimate correctly is incorrect = 0 marks.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of this study. 1 mark for the identification of weakness. 1 mark for explaining the weakness via example from the study. e.g. (Lacks) generalisability (1 mark: identification) as the sample size was only 5 for those studied intensively and these people may be unique (1 mark: explanation in context). (Lacks) mundane realism (1 mark: identification) as being asked to guess how long you have been asleep for is not a typical daily behaviour (1 mark: explanation in context). (Lacks) ecological validity (1 mark: identification). There are other creditworthy responses, including ethics.	2	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): Outline what is meant by the term ‘obedience’. 1 mark for aspect of following orders. 1 mark for aspect of it being an authority figure. e.g., The act of following order (1 mark) given by a figure in authority (1 mark).	2	Ignore tautological responses with the word obedience in the definition (obey is fine though). Do not accept conformity.
4(b)	Outline how <u>one</u> ethical guideline was broken in this study. 1 mark for identification of an appropriate ethical guideline. 1 mark for outlining the ethical guideline. 1 mark for example from Milgram. e.g., Deception (1 mark) is when you are given false information about the study (1 mark). In Milgram, the participants thought that the shock was real (1 mark). Right to withdraw (1 mark) is when participants are able to leave a study without consequence (1 mark). In Milgram, the prods given by the experimenter stopped the participants from leaving (1 mark). There are other creditworthy responses.	3	Candidates can also get 3 marks for identifying an ethical guideline and then the other two marks for two different ways that guideline was broken. ‘He did not tell the true aim’ is not enough for an example mark here.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance										
5	Suggest at least one application to everyday life of the study by Hölzel et al (mindfulness and brain scans). Do <u>not</u> refer to more than three applications in your answer. Your suggestion(s) <u>must</u> be ethical. e.g., Employers with employees who are feeling stressed. (Counsellors in) schools can use them to help reduce stress in students (around exam time). Using brain scans to examine grey matter concentration in therapy/people with problems/head injuries. Yoga instructors can introduce elements of mindfulness into their classes to decrease stress. <table><tr><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>One application suggested in depth, and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved</td></tr><tr><td>3–4</td><td>One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.</td></tr><tr><td>1–2</td><td>One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only</td></tr></table>	Marks	Description	5	One application suggested in depth, and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved	3–4	One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.	1–2	One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved	0	No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only	5	Annotate in the following way: tick = what [explicit] plus = how [explicit] I = what/how implicit (see below) Ignore responses about explaining everyday behaviours with examples. They must be proactive/prospective applications to everyday life, not explanations/retrospective. Implicit what = can be used by teachers/in school/in workplace (not suggest as to what it is being used for). Implicit how = get people to ‘do mindfulness’.
Marks	Description												
5	One application suggested in depth, and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved												
3–4	One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.												
1–2	One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved												
0	No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only												

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	From the study by Pozzulo et al (line-ups): Describe the ‘line-up presentation’ for the target-absent condition. 1 mark per correct point made up to 4 marks. 1 mark for the marking point in bold as it is unique to the target-absent condition. The target was replaced with a similar foil/foil had similar features to the target. All of the pictures were shown simultaneously. The target and target replacement were always in the same position. The target’s line-up position was randomised. There were four photographs/foils in the line-up. A silhouette was in the line-up (to represent the possibly of an absent target) Each participant watched <u>four</u> videos. These were presented on a laptop/computer/on a screen. These were in a random order. The photo array/line-up was shown after each video. The position of the replacement was counterbalanced across photo arrays/line-ups. None of the (four) photographs had been in the video.	5	The list is definitive. For the annotations use ticks are per usual but use tick-b for the point in bold to know that the response can access all available marks. 3 foils in the line-up plus a silhouette = 2 marks [4 foils and the silhouette mark are added together]. Do not credit how the photographs were chosen. Do not credit what a participant was expected to do. Do credit target was not in the line-up. 4 foils and a silhouette = 1 mark for the 4 foils only.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	Suggest <u>two</u> problems that could arise if children were used as participants in the study by Perry et al. (personal space). For each problem (max 2 per problem): 1 mark for identification/outline of the problem (generic). 1 mark for linking it to Perry et al. e.g. There are ethical issues with using children (1 mark: identification/outline). This could be protection from psychological harm (1 mark alternative: identification/outline). In this study, children may have found the situation about invading personal space stressful as it could have felt like a test or examination (1 mark: link). Children may not understand what is being asked of them (1 mark: identification/outline). Therefore, the children may not understand how the figures approaching task worked (1 mark alternative: identification/outline). As a result, the children may have seen it as a game and therefore it might not be invasion of personal space that is being measured (1 mark: link). Children might not be able to use a computer (1 mark: identification/outline). There are other creditworthy responses, including parents might get distressed with child receiving oxytocin, potential side effects of oxytocin for children, likely to drop out due to high number of trials.	4	Go with the intention of the candidate. Do not credit cannot generalise to adults. Do not accept anything about injecting oxytocin into children as a link as this did not happen in the study.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	Two friends, Sabtu and Joyah, are discussing the validity of the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans). Sabtu says the study has validity, but Joyah says the study does <u>not</u> have validity. Explain why <u>either</u> Sabtu <u>or</u> Joyah is correct, using evidence from this study in your answer. 1 mark can be awarded for the identification of a relevant example of validity/concept linked to validity. 1 mark per point explaining why valid/not valid via <u>evidence from the study</u>. e.g., Sabtu The study did have some controls like the model dressing with similarity (1 mark). This means that this variable was less likely to affect the DV of helping (1 mark). This also meant that it was more likely that the type of victim affected helping (1 mark). As the subway car was a real-world setting, it can be argued that the study had ecological validity (1 mark + 1 mark: identification) e.g., Joyah There were so many variables that could not be controlled like participant variables of experience in situations (1 mark: identification). This means that it would have been difficult to know if the type of victim was directly affecting helping (1 mark). Also, there were no black models which reduces the ecological validity of the study as it does not represent real life (1 mark). In addition, there was also wide variation in the victims across the two conditions which may have affected the dependent variable of helping behaviour more than just whether they were ill or drunk (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	4	If both Sabtu and Joyah feature in the answer, mark them independently and credit the highest score Acceptable types of validity/concepts include: Ecological validity Mundane realism Internal validity Population validity (must be labelled this and not generalisability). Role of extraneous and participant variables. Qualitative data. Do not credit reliability, quantitative data, standardisation, field experiment, generalisability. If they write which friend has been chosen but they write nothing else, this is 0 and not NR. No ID mark for demand characteristics.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	Describe the psychology being investigated in the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning). 1 mark per correct point. 1 mark available for example from the study by Fagen et al. e.g., Operant conditioning is learning by consequence. If you are rewarded you are more likely to repeat a behaviour The elephants got chopped banana if they were successful at any task (example) If you are punished you are less likely to repeat a behaviour A primary reinforcer is one that fulfils a biological need. A secondary reinforcer can be used as an exchange for a primary reinforcer. Secondary positive reinforcement can use a sound as a secondary reinforcer that is consistently followed by a primary reinforcer/food. There are other creditworthy responses, including shaping and behavioural chaining.	4	No identification mark. Ignore reference to classical conditioning.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning) and <u>one</u> other study from the learning approach. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the similarity, e.g., observational, lack mundane realism, quantitative data collection, use of rewards/operant conditioning, standardisation, lacking generalisability. 4 marks for the difference, e.g., qualitative data collection, sample, level of controls. e.g., similarity e.g. 4 marks Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques. This means that specific behaviours could be operationalised to improve validity (explanation). For example, in Fagen there was trunk down which meant the trunk was hanging loose and in Bandura gun play was pretending to shoot at an object in the room. e.g. 3 marks Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques. For example, in Fagen there was trunk down which meant the trunk was hanging loose/Bandura gun play was pretending to shoot at an object in the room. e.g. 2 marks Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques. For example, in Fagen there was trunk down. e.g. 1 mark Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques.	8	Award L1–L4 for similarity. Award L1–L4 for difference. For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the similarity or difference. The other studies from the learning approach are: Bandura Saavedra and Silverman Different species = L1. Different aims = L1. Different ethical guidelines = L1 Both opportunity sampling (for Bandura and S&S comparison) = L2 For description of the sample (e.g., n=....) from the two studies with no explicit note about size differences or effect on generalisability = L2

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Mark/ Level	Description		
	4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.		
	3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.		
	2	The similarity/difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity/difference is well explained but there is no study evidence.		
	1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.		
	0	No creditable response.		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
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 ethics. Strengths include: reliability, standardisation, validity (internal), quantitative data, ethics. Weaknesses include, validity (external), sample, lack of random allocation Example: in detail (named) The study was unethical as the process of attempting to identify emotions from eyes for the AS/HFA was going to be stressful as it predicted that they would find it difficult therefore it could have been psychologically stressful for those participants. Also, not understanding the words to choose from even with the glossary may have caused unnecessary stress. Example: brief but in context The sample only had 15 AS/HFA participants and they were all male. This could make generalisations difficult as they might not represent females with AS/HFA. Example: no context The study followed a standardised procedure making it easier to replicate.	10	Ignore if candidate calls it a laboratory experiment but do credit controls and standardisation if argued correctly. Please note that the only ethical guidelines that are covered in the journal paper are: Adhere: minimising harm (weak), informed consent, confidentiality. Break: minimising harm only. The remainder: right to withdraw, deception, privacy and debriefing are not mentioned in the journal paper.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	5	- Very good evaluation including the named issue. - Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. - Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10		
	4	- Good evaluation including the named issue. - Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. - Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8		
	3	- Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. - Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. - Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	2	- Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue. - Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. - Some points may have no context. - Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.	3–4		
	1	- Little or no evaluation. - Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial. - Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2		
	0	No creditable response.			

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/13**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

May/June 2024**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 2024 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 **20** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**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 descriptions 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.

PUBLISHED**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.

PUBLISHED**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However, spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	From the study by Perry et al. (personal space): State the number of participants used in this study. 1 mark for correct answer 40 or 54.	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u>. There is <u>no</u> tolerance.
1(b)	Outline what is meant by the term ‘interpersonal distance (personal space)’. 1 mark per correct point e.g., It is an invisible ‘bubble’/boundary around us. We choose who can enter this. This depends on the situation we find ourselves. It is used to regulate how we interact with other people. There are other creditworthy responses	2	1 mark maximum for an example from Perry.
1(c)	Outline how a participant was allocated to the ‘high empathy’ group in this study 1 mark per correct point They completed the IRI/Interpersonal Reactivity Index. Those half a standard deviation away from the mean formed this group/with a score of 40 (or above).	2	List is definitive. Do <u>not</u> credit ‘empathy test’

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Bandura et al. (aggression): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 2 marks detailed aim 1 mark brief/partial aim e.g., To investigate whether children imitate the aggressive behaviour of an aggressive model (2 marks). To investigate whether children are more likely to imitate the behaviour of a same-sex model (2 marks). To investigate whether children would imitate aggression of a model in the absence of the model (2 marks). To investigate how children learn aggression (1 mark). To see if aggression was nature or nurture (1 mark). To investigate social learning theory (1 mark). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Accept sex difference aim.
2(b)	Outline how the response measure of ‘aggressive gun play’ was defined in this study. 1 mark for each point listed below: Shoots darts Aims gun at object in room. Fires imaginary shots.	2	List is definitive. <i>Aggressive gun play: Subject shoots darts or aims the guns and fires imaginary shots at objects in the room.</i>

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to the race of helper when the victim was ‘drunk’. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison e.g., There was more same race helping irrespective of the race of victim (2 marks) The victim in the drunk condition was helped more by their own race (2 marks) There was the same pattern of same race helping for ill and drunk victim when victim was white (2 marks) There was more same race helping when victim was black and drunk compared to black and ill (2 marks) There was more same race helping (1 mark) The race of the helper was more likely to be white (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore reference to time taken to help = 0.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to the number of males in the critical area and the time taken for the victim to receive help. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison/relationship 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison e.g., The more males there were in the critical area the faster the latency time for help to be given (2 marks). When the group size was small, people helped faster when the victim was ill compared to when victim was drunk (2 marks). Small groups were slow at helping (1 mark). Large groups were fast at helping (1 mark). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	<u>Do</u> accept the group size of 7 vs group size of 3 comparison. Do <u>not</u> credit male vs female comparisons. Ignore frequency of help.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of this study. 1 mark for the identification of weakness 1 mark for explaining the weakness via example from the study. e.g. (Lacks) generalisability (1 mark: identification) this is because it was in New York City only and people in other countries may show different prosocial behaviour/bystander apathy (1 mark: explanation in context). Broke ethical guideline(s) (1 mark: identification) as the participants were deceived into thinking that a real person needed help, but it was fake (1 mark: explanation in context). Difficult to replicate (1 mark: identification). (Difficult to) control of (extraneous) variables (1 mark: identification). There are other creditworthy responses, including observer bias.	2	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Describe what is meant by the term ‘attention’. 1 mark per correct point It refers to our ability to concentrate/focus. When we exclude other stimuli (to focus on one thing). Cognitive resources are focused on certain aspects of the environment. We can select to focus on one stimulus (over another). We can divide it between two or more tasks. We can be prepared to focus on a specific stimuli if we are primed to. For example, participants in the Andrade study had to pay attention to a (boring) telephone message. There are other creditworthy responses	3	Credit any example for 1 mark <u>max</u> (including from Andrade). Ignore tautological responses using the word attention. Focus on one specific stimulus/object/person etc. = 2 marks. Focus on a specific thing = 1 mark.
4(b)	The sample consisted of 40 participants from a participant panel. Identify <u>two</u> other features of this sample. 1 mark per correct feature It was an opportunity sample. They had just finished a different study (before being asked to participate in this one) General population. Aged 18–55 years. Paid for participation. Majority female/35 female 5 male/control: 18F 2M/doodle: 17F 3M.	2	List is definitive. Accept ‘adults’. Do not accept ‘males + females’.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance										
5	Suggest at least one application to everyday life of the study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences). Do <u>not</u> refer to more than three applications in your answer. Your suggestion(s) <u>must</u> be ethical. Use the banded marking grid below. If more than three applications given, mark all and credit the best three. e.g., Useful for advertising to focus content. Useful for product development for toy manufacturers. Rehabilitation of monkeys/primates. <table><tr><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>One application suggested in depth and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved</td></tr><tr><td>3–4</td><td>One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.</td></tr><tr><td>1–2</td><td>One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only</td></tr></table>	Marks	Description	5	One application suggested in depth and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved	3–4	One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.	1–2	One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved	0	No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only	5	Annotate in the following way: tick = what plus = how I = what/how implicit (see below) Ignore responses about explaining everyday behaviours with examples. They must be proactive/prospective applications to everyday life, not explanations/retrospective. Do not credit the same how more than once- annotate with REP. Implicit what = used for toy manufacturing Implicit how = make toys sex-specific See accompanying Question 5 grid. Do <u>not</u> credit anything about gender issues and mental health.
Marks	Description												
5	One application suggested in depth and it is clear what the application is and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested in less depth but still clearly showing what the application is and how it will be achieved												
3–4	One application suggested which has some detail with the application identifiable and how it will be achieved; OR More than one application suggested that are brief but the application is identifiable with how it will be achieved.												
1–2	One or more application suggested that are/is brief but may lack clarity as to what the application is and/or how it will be achieved												
0	No creditworthy real-world application or description of study only												

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	From the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning): Describe how the elephants were trained to perform the ‘trunk up’ behavioural task. 1 mark per correct point Used the lure <u>and</u> shaping techniques. This is when the elephant is tempted to perform a behaviour/trunk up. As a reward is placed strategically to help perform the behaviour/trunk up. In this case it was banana pieces a few inches from their (fore)head. The elephant could only reach the banana by lifting the trunk up. If the elephant was adult/too big, the lure was at the end of trainer’s arm. The position of the trunk was shaped. The shaping used increasing height until trunk up was achieved.	5	List is definitive. 1 mark for identifying either the primary (banana) or secondary (whistle) reinforcer. The response gets credit if they use reward or banana throughout. Raising trunk into the air correctly, obtained a reward = 1

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	Suggest <u>two</u> problems that could arise if children were used as participants in the study by Hölzel et al. (mindfulness and brain scans). For each problem (max 2 per problem): 1 mark for identification/outline of the problem (generic) 1 mark for linking it to Hölzel et al. e.g. It can be difficult for children to keep still (1 mark: identification/outline). For an MRI scan to work, the person has to remain still for a period of time (1 mark alternative: identification/outline). Therefore, there may be no valid way of measuring brain density as the scans may never be correct/never happen (1 mark: link) Children may not understand what is being asked of them (1 mark: identification/outline). Therefore, the children may not understand how yoga/mindfulness works (1 mark alternative: identification/outline). As a result, the children may have seen yoga as a game and therefore effectiveness might not have been measured (1 mark: link). There are other creditworthy responses, including children can lie about participation in homework, brain developing so grey matter could increase for different reason(s).	4	Go with the intention of the candidate.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	Two friends, Luis and Ava, are discussing the application to everyday life of the study by Milgram (obedience). Luis says the study does have application to everyday life, but Ava says the study does <u>not</u> have application to everyday life. Explain why <u>either</u> Luis <u>or</u> Ava is correct, using evidence from this study in your answer. 1 mark for a feature of Milgram linked to someone being obedient (e.g., prods, lab coat). 1 mark per correct point made that is explicit to Milgram. e.g., Luis One of the aims of the study was to test whether Germans were different (1 mark). Therefore, it can be used to help us understand why people do bad things such as some behaviours during the Holocaust (1 mark). As people in uniform/in authority have the power to get people to do things they would never typically do (1 mark) as in this study 65% of participants administered what would have been a lethal electric shock to a stranger (1 mark). e.g., Ava The study took place in a controlled environment with a set procedure which does not represent everyday life (1 mark). Giving an electric shock to someone for not learning a word-pair has no real-world application (1 mark). There have been no real-life accounts of people having to meet a stranger, make them learn a task that is about word-pairs and then punish them for incorrect answers (1 mark) so there is no way a task like this can then help explain a real-world event like genocide (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	4	If both Luis and Ava feature in the answer, mark them independently and credit the highest score For Luis If the response is all about how military/teachers can wear uniform/dress professionally to get soldiers/students to be more obedient = 2 marks max [can still get the feature mark]. If just a 'generic' chat about everyday obedience = 1 mark [can still get the feature mark]. <i>The idea presented needs to be more retrospective than prospective due to AOs being tested.</i> Go with the intention of the candidate.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Describe the sample used in <u>either</u> Group 1 <u>or</u> Group 2. 1 mark per correct point Group 1 Adults/mean age c.30y. Males. n=15. Diagnosed with AS/HFA. Volunteer sample/Responded to an advert in a National Autism Society magazine. Same socioeconomic class as Group 2. Same educational levels as Group 2. Typical range IQ/<u>average</u> IQ = 115/matched IQ with Group 4. Group 2 Adults/mean age 28y. n=122. From adult community/education classes (in Exeter). Public library users (in Cambridge). Broad range of occupations. Same socioeconomic class as Group 1. Same educational levels as Group 1/broad range of educational levels.	4	Lists are definitive. Accept opportunity sample for Group 2 Group 1 mean age tolerance is 29–30y If both groups covered, mark independently and credit the best, placing the annotation REP at the end of the response.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> similarities between the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test) and <u>one</u> other study from the cognitive approach. Do <u>not</u> refer to the sample in your answer. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the similarity, e.g., experimental, lack mundane realism, quantitative data collection e.g., similarity e.g. 4 marks Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen studies were experimental in nature. For example, both studies had IVs. In the Andrade study there were two conditions of doodling and non-doodling. In the Baron-Cohen study the IV was natural and based around if a person had been diagnosed with AS/HFA or not. Therefore, both were trying to establish cause and effect (explanation) e.g. 3 marks Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen studies were experimental in nature. For example, both studies had IVs. In the Andrade study there were two conditions of doodling and non-doodling/in the Baron-Cohen study the IV was natural and based around if a person had been diagnosed with AS/HFA or not. e.g. 2 marks Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen studies were experimental in nature. For example, both studies had IVs and measured DVs. e.g. 1 mark Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen were experimental in nature.	8	Do not credit any answer about the sample. Award L1–L4 for similarity For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the similarity. The other studies from the cognitive approach are: Andrade Pozzulo et al Both had hypotheses that were supported = L2 max. If they state that Baron-Cohen was a laboratory experiment then no credit for it but you can credit features of the experimental method. Anything linked to the sample or sampling technique = L0, placing a X next to the response.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Level	Description		
	4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.		
	3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.		
	2	The similarity/difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity/difference is well explained but there is no study evidence.		
	1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.		
	0	No creditable response.		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia) 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. Strengths include: reliability, standardisation, quantitative data, follow-up Weaknesses include: validity (external), sample, ethics Example: in detail (named) The study collected quantitative data which makes it easier to make meaningful comparisons over time. They looked at the change in distress ratings across different scenarios and different time points in the therapeutic process. As a result, they could compare the changes in distress ratings to make more valid conclusions about the progression of his phobia. Example: brief but in context The sample was only one boy with a button phobia which may make generalisation difficult. A person with a different childhood experience or a female phobic may not respond to therapy in the same way. Example: no context The sample was only one person making generalisations difficult.	10	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
10	Level guidance for Question 10														
	<table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Mark</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td> • Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective. </td><td>9–10</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td> • Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective. </td><td>7–8</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td> • Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. • Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. • Selection of evidence is mostly effective. </td><td>5–6</td></tr></table>	Level	Description	Mark	5	• Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10	4	• Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8	3	• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. • Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. • Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6		
	Level	Description	Mark												
	5	• Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10												
	4	• Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8												
3	• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. • Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. • Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6													

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	2	- Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue. - Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. - Some points may have no context. - Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.	3–4		
	1	- Little or no evaluation. - Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial. - Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2		
	0	No creditable response.			