
PSYCHOLOGY

9990/11

Paper 1 Approaches Issues and Debates

October/November 2018

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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

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



Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Generic Marking Principles

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	From the study by Canli et al (brain scans and emotions): Name <u>one</u> of the brain scanning techniques used in this study. 1 mark for the correct answer MRI / Magnetic Resonance Imaging/Imagery; fMRI / functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging/Imagery.	1
1(b)	Identify the purpose of using the brain scanning technique you named in part (a). 1 mark for purpose linked to the brain scan named in (a) <i>MRI</i> The purpose is to look at the structure of the brain <i>fMRI</i> The purpose is to look at the function of the brain	1
1(c)	Outline what a participant had to do immediately after seeing a fixation cross on the screen. 1 mark per correct point x2 They had to indicate their emotional arousal; By pressing a button (with their right hand); They had to choose from one of four buttons; From 0 (not emotionally intense at all) to 3 (extremely emotionally intense)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the Schachter and Singer study (two factors in emotion): Describe the psychological theory that was being tested in this study. 1 mark per correct point made x3 e.g. Physiological + cognitive (1 mark) Cognitions arising from a situation can be interpreted via past experiences and this allows us to understand/label the emotion; When someone experiences an emotion, physiological arousal happens; They need a cue to be able to label the physiological arousal; This may result in misinterpretations of the emotion as it is based on the physiological arousal	3
2(b)	Identify <u>one</u> ethical issue raised in this study. 1 mark for an appropriate issue e.g. Deception/participants were deceived; Lack of physical protection; Lack of psychological protection; Lack of confidentiality; Lack of informed consent	1

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Outline how the subjective rating of distress was measured in this study. 1 mark per correct point x2 e.g. Using a Feeling Thermometer; On a 9-point scale/0–8 rating A low score was little distress/high score was much distress	2
3(b)	Describe how the rating changed over the first three sessions in response to imagining hundreds of buttons falling on his body. 1 mark per correct point x2 e.g. The distress ratings dropped between session 1 and 2; They dropped again between session 2 and 3; As the sessions advanced there was a lower level of disgust/eq.; It dropped from 8 to 5 midway through the imagery exposure/session 1 to 2; Then dropped from 5 to 3 after the imagery exposure/session 2 to 3	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	From the Andrade study (doodling): Outline <u>one</u> finding from this study. 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. 2 marks The memory score for the doodling group was higher than the control group; Doodling aids concentration whilst participating in a boring/mundane task. e.g. 1 mark The memory score was higher for those able to doodle; Doodling aids concentration.	2
4(b)	Explain <u>one</u> real world application based on the finding you outlined in part (a). 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. This could be useful for teachers (1 mark) as they should let students doodle during watching a film or when giving them a task they need to concentrate on (1 mark). e.g. Teachers may want to use this idea in the classroom (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Yamamoto et al. used chimpanzees as participants in their study about helping. Describe <u>two</u> ethical guidelines for working with animals that are relevant to this study. 1 mark for naming a relevant guideline, 1 mark for description (x2) e.g. Numbers (of animals) (1 mark). The research team need to use the minimum amount of animals necessary to fulfil the aim/Yamamoto only used five chimpanzee kin pairings in their study (1 mark). Replacement (1 mark). The research team should consider using footage from wild/zoos as evidence or computer simulations (1 mark). Deprivation (1 mark). The research team should not withhold food/basic needs to test social behaviour (1 mark).	4

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	Describe <u>two</u> assumptions of the learning approach, using a different example for each assumption. 1 mark per assumption, 1 mark per example (x2) e.g. Social Learning helps to explain changes in behaviour (1 mark). A child may watch an adult being aggressive and then copy that behaviour (1 mark). Stimulus-Response can explain behaviour (1 mark). In Classical Conditioning a dog may salivate after a bell has been rung (1 mark). We learn through operant conditioning/by consequence (1 mark). If a dog is given a treat to learn how to sit it is likely to repeat the behaviour (1 mark).	4
6(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the Pepperberg study (parrot learning) supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions of the learning approach. 1 mark for finding, 1 mark for link to an assumption e.g. 2 marks Alex scored well above chance on tests for same/different with familiar objects (1 mark). This may be because he was rewarded (conditioned) during training/testing (1 mark). Alex did learn the concept of same/different (1 mark). This was through the model-rival technique showing he could imitate and observe (1 mark). e.g. 1 mark The parrot received a reward for the correct answer. The parrot did learn the concepts of same/different.	2

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Identify the sampling technique used to recruit the AS/HFA group in this study. 1 mark for correct answer Volunteer/self-selected	1
7(b)	Describe how the AS/HFA sample was recruited in this study. 1 mark for each point x3 Via advertisements; Via the National Autistic Society magazine (or a support group); All had to have been diagnosed in specialist centres; All given the WAIS-R.	3
7(c)	Outline <u>one</u> strength of the sampling technique used to recruit the AS/HFA group in this study. 1 mark for strength, 1 mark for link to the study e.g. Volunteers tend to be more motivated and therefore are less likely to drop out of the study (1 mark). Therefore, the AS/HFA participants would be more likely to complete the Eyes Test/AQ (1 mark). More likely to find a larger sample in this instance (1 mark), as AS/HFA is a difficult group to find so advertising should have improved the chances of this (1 mark). As they have volunteered, they have already given their consent to take part (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Two friends, Brett and Mia, are discussing the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans) in terms of the debate about individual and situational explanations. Outline the debate about individual and situational explanations in psychology. 1 mark for the individual side of the debate, 1 mark for the situational side of the debate e.g. The individual side refers to behaviours from factors within the person (dispositional) (e.g. personality) The situational side refers to behaviour from factors in the external environment (e.g. home life)	2
8(b)	Mia believes the Piliavin et al. study supports the individual side of the debate but Brett believes it supports the situational side of the debate. Outline why you think <u>either</u> Brett <u>or</u> Mia is correct, using evidence from the study. 1 mark per point made x4 e.g. Brett When no model was present, every trial with the cane/ill victim, someone came to help (1 mark). This suggests that the situation of seeing an 'ill' victim triggered helping behaviour (1 mark). People did leave the critical area when no help was provided (1 mark) which shows that the situation was too distressing so they left to decrease arousal (1 mark) e.g. Mia When no model was present, every trial with the cane/ill victim, someone came to help (1 mark). This could suggest that there is a certain type of person(ality) who is willing to help out an 'ill' victim (1 mark).	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Some research has found that children readily imitate behaviour shown by an adult model when that model is present. Describe <u>two</u> ways in which the Bandura et al. study (aggression) differs from this. 1 mark for the difference and 1 mark for outlining what that was in the Bandura study (x2) e.g. They tested the (aggressive) behaviour in a novel setting (1 mark). The children were observed in a ‘set up’ play room/ different room to witnessing the role model to see if imitation occurred (1 mark). The control group was not exposed to the behaviour of a model (1 mark). They were simply observed in the generalisation situation/observation room (1 mark). Children displayed (verbal/physical) aggression once they were left alone with the Bobo doll. This shows they do internalise behaviours for <i>future</i> use (2 marks). They showed imitative behaviour/aggression in the absence of a model (1 mark). Children displayed acts of aggression that were not shown by the adult (1 mark).	4

Question	Answer	Marks																		
9(b)	Explain <u>one</u> result from the Bandura et al. study that <u>supports</u> Social Learning Theory and <u>one</u> result that does <u>not</u> <u>support</u> Social Learning Theory. e.g. support Imitation of physical aggression, verbal aggression e.g. does not support Mallet aggression, novel aggression <table> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Criteria for each result</th><th>Marks</th></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support SLT</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 SLT; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support SLT</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 SLT; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support SLT</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> </table>	Level	Criteria for each result	Marks	4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support SLT	4	3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support SLT; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support SLT	3	2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about SLT; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support SLT	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 for each result	Marks																		
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support SLT	4																		
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support SLT; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports/does not support SLT	3																		
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about SLT; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how the result supports/does not support SLT	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
10	Evaluate the Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams) study in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of quantitative data. Strengths include quantitative data, laboratory conditions, replication, standardisation Weaknesses include ethics, qualitative data, generalisability, ecological validity 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

PSYCHOLOGY

9990/12

Paper 1 Approaches Issues and Debates

October/November 2018

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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** 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 Pepperberg study (parrot learning): State <u>one</u> question that Alex the parrot was asked during the training phase of the study. 1 mark for correct answer What's same? What's different?	1
1(b)	Probes trials were done as part of the study. Give an example of an object that would be presented at the same time as a blue wooden triangle, during a Probes trial. 1 mark for a correct example e.g. Yellow wooden triangle; Blue wooden square etc.	1
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> ethical guideline that would have been important for Pepperberg to consider when designing this study. 1 mark for naming the guideline and 1 mark for description e.g. Replacement (1 mark). The research team need to have considered alternatives like video footage (1 mark). Numbers (of animals) (1 mark). The research team need to use the minimum amount of animals necessary to fulfil the aim/it was only one parrot in the Pepperberg study (1 mark). Replacement (1 mark). The research team should consider using footage from wild/zoos as evidence or computer simulations (1 mark). Deprivation (1 mark). The research team should not withhold food/basic needs to test social behaviour (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Describe the theory that Baron-Cohen et al. were testing with their ‘Reading the Mind in the Eyes’ Test. 1 mark for correct point x3 Theory of Mind (1 mark) This refers to our ability to attribute mental states to ourselves and others; These can be desires, emotions etc.; The person can put themselves in the position of someone else; It is also about how we use this knowledge to explain and predict the actions of other people; We use this knowledge to understand that people may have different ideas and hold different emotions to us;	3
2(b)	Identify <u>one</u> problem with the original ‘Reading the Mind in the Eyes’ Test, as identified by Baron-Cohen et al. 1 mark for identifying one of the problems. Forced choice of two items; Basic and complex mental states; ‘Eye direction’; More female pairs (of eyes); Two choices semantic opposites; Comprehension problems/no glossary; Ceiling effect; Too narrow range of scores	1

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Outline the procedure used in the Andrade study for a participant who was in the doodling condition. 1 mark per correct point x4 They were recruited after completing a different/unrelated study; They were taken into a visually dull room; They were asked to listen to a tape recording of a telephone message; (Whilst listening) they were asked to shade in the squares and circles (on a piece of paper given to them); They were told it does not matter how neat/how quickly as it is to relieve the boredom; They had been instructed to write down the names of the party-goers; After a minute of talking with the experimenter they were then asked to write down the names of the party-goers or the places; They had not been told about the test on places/it was a surprise test.	4

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	Describe the task that chimpanzees needed to solve in the Yamamoto et al. study (chimpanzee helping). 1 mark per correct point x2 A chimpanzee had to select and transfer an appropriate tool to another chimpanzee (1 mark) so he/she could solve a task to obtain juice (reward) (1 mark).	2
4(b)	Outline <u>one</u> way in which this study has real world application for children. 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. Could be useful for teachers (1 mark). They can teach children about altruism/empathy by creating a similar task for children to complete (1 mark). They could show footage from the study to show children how helping behaviour is 'good' (alternative 1 mark). We can improve children's social interactions/helping skills by using a targeted game (1 mark). Children can be taught about altruism/empathy (1 mark)/we can educate children to give help even when it is not asked for (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Describe the procedure used by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams) to collect data about dream recall. 1 mark per correct point x4 An (ordinary) doorbell sound was used to wake participants; It was placed near the bed; The participant had to speak into a recording device (next to the bed); They had to state if they had dreamed (or not); If they had then they had to speak about the content; Sometimes an experimenter would enter the room and ask them more questions; The awakenings were done in REM/nREM sleep.	4

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	Describe <u>two</u> assumptions of the learning approach, using a different example for each assumption. 1 mark per assumption, 1 mark per example (x2) e.g. Social Learning helps to explain changes in behaviour (1 mark). A child may watch an adult being aggressive and then copy that behaviour (1 mark). Stimulus-Response can explain behaviour (1 mark). In Classical Conditioning a dog may salivate after a bell has been rung (1 mark). We learn through operant conditioning/by consequence (1 mark). If a dog is given a treat to learn how to sit it is likely to repeat the behaviour (1 mark).	4
6(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the Bandura et al. study supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions of the learning approach. 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. Boys were more likely to imitate physical aggression from a male model (1 mark). This supports the idea of SLT as the boys paid attention to the role model/imitated them/the behaviour (1 mark). The girls reproduced verbal aggression after observing a female model being verbally aggressive (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the Schachter and Singer study (two factors in emotion): Identify the sampling technique used in this study. 1 mark for correct answer Volunteer/self-selected;	1
7(b)	Describe how the sample was recruited in this study. 1 mark per correct point x3 e.g. The study was advertised to students who were part of a participant pool; They were volunteers from introductory (psychology) classes / at Minnesota University; They were to receive (two) extra points; All (volunteers) were cleared with the Student Health Service; This was to ensure no harmful effects.	3
7(c)	Outline <u>one</u> strength of the sampling technique as used in this study. 1 mark for strength, 1 mark for linking it to the study Volunteers tend to be more motivated and therefore are less likely to drop out of the study (1 mark). Therefore, the participants were more likely to agree to the injection part of the study (1 mark). As they were volunteers there was no issue around giving informed consent (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Two friends, Amar and Bo, are discussing the Milgram study (obedience) in terms of the debate about individual and situational explanations. Outline the debate about individual and situational explanations in psychology. 1 mark for the individual side of the debate, 1 mark for the situational side of the debate e.g. The individual side refers to behaviours from factors within the person (dispositional) (e.g. personality) The situational side refers to behaviour from factors in the external environment (e.g. home life)	2
8(b)	Bo believes the Milgram study supports the individual side of the debate but Amar believes it supports the situational side of the debate. Outline why you think <u>either</u> Amar <u>or</u> Bo is correct using evidence from the study. 1 mark per point made x4 e.g. Amar All of the participants went to 300 V as a minimum voltage (1 mark). This could be due to the situation of having prods to keep them going to this level of volts (1 mark). The majority of participants obeyed the authority figure (to 450 V) (1 mark). This could be due to the situation of having an authority figure/man in lab coat watching them (1 mark) e.g. Bo All of the participants went to 300 V as a minimum voltage (1 mark). This could be due to a core personality people have which makes them obedient (to a certain point) (1 mark). Not all participants obeyed to the level of 450 V / some panicked / some remained calm (1 mark). This shows that different people reacted differently which is individual (1 mark).	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	In the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans), there were a number of confederates playing different roles. Outline the roles of the confederates in this study. 1 mark for each correct point x4 The females (confederates) sat in the adjacent area (to record data); The males (confederates) acted as if they were ‘drunk’ or ‘ill’ in the critical area; The confederate (victim) had to collapse/fall over; One of the males acted as a model and helped the victim (depending on the condition); The model was positioned in either the adjacent or critical area; One female (confederate) counted the number of individuals/total who helped/race, sex of helper; The other female (confederate) coded the race/sex/location of people in the adjacent area.	4

Question	Answer	Marks																		
9(b)	Explain what psychologists have learned about bystander behaviour using <u>two</u> results from the Piliavin et al. study. e.g. The (small) correlation between group size and helping behaviour was positive (rather than negative); People in groups of seven or more were consistently faster at responding than those in groups of 3. The correlation should have been negative as when group size increases, helping should decrease (if diffusion of responsibility was happening); Speed of helping should <i>decrease</i> with <i>increased</i> group size (if diffusion of responsibility was happening) e.g. In the no model present trials, 100% of the passengers came to help the victim who had a cane; This was irrespective of race of victim. This shows that people are willing to help someone who is perceived as being 'ill'; Therefore, people are likely to help others who look like they <i>need</i> help (and the problem is not self-inflicted). <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Criteria for each result</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour</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 what we have learned about bystander behaviour; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour</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 for each result	Marks	4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour	4	3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour	3	2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour	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 for each result	Marks																		
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour	4																		
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour; The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour	3																		
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation; The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour	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
10	Evaluate the Laney et al. study (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 the use of quantitative data. Strengths include: quantitative data, reliability, standardisation, application Weaknesses include: use of questionnaires, ecological validity, generalisability, ethics 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

PSYCHOLOGY

9990/13

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2018

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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.



Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Generic Marking Principles

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	From the Dement and Kleitman study (sleep and dreams): In which phase of sleep did participants recall most of their dreams? 1 mark for correct answer REM/Rapid Eye Movement/Paradoxical sleep	1
1(b)	An EEG (electroencephalogram) was used in this study. What does an EEG measure? 1 mark for correct answer Brain waves; Brain activity; Voltage	1
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study about the relationship between eye movements and dreaming. 1 mark – partial answer, 2 marks – detailed/full answer e.g. eye movements appear to correspond to the content of a dream (1 mark); This suggests that eye movements are not purely random but are related to dream imagery (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)(i)	From the Andrade study (doodling): Identify <u>two</u> features of the sample used in this study. 1 mark per feature x2 e.g. Aged 18–55 years; 18 females (2 males) in control; 17 females (3 males) in doodling; 35 females (5 males); All from MRC Applied Psychology Unit/Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit	2
2(a)(ii)	State how the participants were allocated to conditions in this study. 1 mark for the allocation e.g. Allocated to either condition <i>randomly</i>; Had an equal chance of being chosen for either condition/doodling v non-doodling	1
2(b)	Identify <u>one</u> strength of this study. 1 mark for a relevant strength e.g. Experimental so easier to replicate; Experimental so cause-effect relationship found/studied; Quantitative data collected so comparisons easier	1

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Describe the shock generator that was used in the Milgram study (obedience). 1 for each correct point x4 It consisted of 30 lever switches/buttons; Each switch was clearly labelled with a voltage; The volts ranged from 15 V to 450 V; Each button went up by 15 V levels; Verbal designations for groups of four voltage levels; Last two were labelled (simply) XXX; Upon depressing a switch a red light appeared; An electric buzzing was emitted; A blue light labelled voltage energizer would light up; Labelled Slight Shock to XXX	4

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	Describe <u>one</u> result from the Food History Inventory in Experiment 1 of the Laney et al. study (false memory). 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. The mean ratings for the <i>Love</i> group increased after manipulation (1 mark). It increased by (an average) of 2.6 points (indicating an increase in confidence) (1 mark) The mean ratings for the <i>Control</i> group remained (roughly) the same after manipulation (1 mark). It increased by (an average) of just 0.2 points (indicating no increase in confidence) (1 mark) The critical item score was the same for both groups pre-manipulation (1 mark). However, at post-manipulation the <i>Love</i> group had increased significantly more than the <i>Control</i> group (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	Explain <u>one</u> real world application of the result you described in part (a). 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. The results are useful for children who could be seen as fussy eaters (1 mark); a parent/health worker could use the same manipulation like ‘you have always loved fruit’ to help children change their views on food (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Describe the psychology that was being investigated in the Saavedra and Silverman study (button phobia). 1 mark per correct point x4 e.g. Investigated evaluative learning/classical conditioning (identification mark); A person comes to perceive (evaluate) a previously neutral object or an event negatively. The person negatively evaluates the object/event <i>without</i> anticipating any threat/danger. This negative evaluation elicits a feeling of disgust rather than fear. Differs from Classical Conditioning as the person is being cognitively active by <i>thinking about disgust and consequences</i> rather than being a passive organism (2 marks)	4

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	Describe <u>two</u> assumptions of the cognitive approach. 1 mark – partial answer, 2 marks – full answer x2 e.g. Behaviour and emotions can be explained in terms of the role of thinking (cognitive) processes like attention, memory and language (2 marks) Behaviour can be explained in terms of processes like memory/language (1 mark) e.g. Similarities and differences between people can be understood via cognitions. These can be the way we process information/ the way we store information (2 marks) Similarities/differences between people can be understood via cognitions (1 mark)	4
6(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the Baron-Cohen et al. study (eyes test) supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions of the cognitive approach that you have described in part <u>(a)</u>. 1 mark – partial answer, 2 marks – full answer e.g. The AS/HFA group scored significantly lower on the Eyes Test (compared to the other three groups) (1 mark) This shows that differences between the groups can be explained by cognitions/thinking processes, in this case, Theory of Mind (1 mark) The AS/HFA group scored significantly lower on the Eyes Test (compared to the other three groups) (1 mark) This clearly shows that differences between people can be explained by how they process information/via cognitions (1 mark)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
7(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-selected	1
7(b)(i)	Only females were used in this study. Identify <u>one</u> feature of the sample, other than gender. 1 mark for one other feature e.g. (All) right handed (All) healthy	1
7(b)(ii)	Outline why only females were used as participants. 1 mark – partial answer, 2 marks – full answer e.g. (Females) are more likely to report intense emotional experiences/males less likely (1 mark); so are therefore more likely to be affected by the imagery (1 mark)/more likely to express their true emotion (1 mark). (Females) are more likely to show more physiological reactivity (in conjunction with valence judgements)/males less likely (1 mark)	2
7(c)	Outline <u>one</u> strength of the sampling technique as used in this study. 1 mark for strength, 1 mark for linking it to the study Volunteers tend to be more motivated and therefore are less likely to drop out of the study (1 mark). Therefore, the participants were more likely to agree to the brain scan/looking at 'disturbing' imagery (1 mark) As they were volunteers there was no issue around giving informed consent (1 mark).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Two friends, Jon and Crystal, are discussing the Bandura et al. study (aggression) in terms of the nature versus nurture debate. Outline the nature versus nurture debate in psychology. 1 mark for nature side of the debate, 1 mark for nurture side of the debate e.g. The nature side of the debate refers to aspects of us that are biological/innate/born with The nurture side of the debate refers to aspects of us that are environmental/learnt/developed from birth	2
8(b)	Crystal believes the Bandura et al. study supports the nature side of the debate but Jon believes it supports the nurture side of the debate. Outline why you think <u>either</u> Jon <u>or</u> Crystal is correct, using evidence from the study. 1 mark per point made x4 e.g. Jon The boys were more likely to imitate the physical aggression they had only seen from a model (1 mark). This shows that they have learnt the aggressive behaviour from observing the role model (1 mark) e.g. Crystal The boys were more likely to imitate physical aggression (compared to the girls) (1 mark). This shows that boys are ‘born’ more aggressive as they are naturally more aggressive (1 mark)	4

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)(i)	From the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning): Give <u>one</u> question that Alex the parrot was asked in the study. 1 mark for correct answer e.g. What's same? What's different?	1
9(a)(ii)	In order to give a correct answer when asked a question, it was assumed that Alex would have to process the information in four steps. The fourth step would be to produce a vocal response of a category. Outline the first <u>three</u> steps. 1 mark per correct step x3 Attend to multiple aspects of two different objects; From the vocal question determine whether the response is based on sameness (or difference); Work out <i>what</i> was same or different;	3

Question	Answer	Marks																		
9(b)	Explain how the study by Pepperberg met <u>two</u> ethical guidelines for working with animals. Include examples from the study in your answer. e.g. ‘ethical’ guidelines Pepperberg only used one parrot in the study so they did use the least amount of animals possible. The study still accomplished its goals with only one parrot. Rewards were used appropriately and Alex was <i>not</i> deprived of food/treats if he answered incorrectly. He would be given extra food if he requested it. Alex was placed in his usual cage during ‘sleeping hours’ which was ‘normal for him. He was never placed in an unusual situation/situation he was not used to during the study. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Criteria</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>The ethical guideline is clearly outlined and there is a clear explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The ethical guideline is clearly outlined and there is a brief explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline; The ethical guideline is briefly outlined (or just named) but there is a clear explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The ethical guideline is clearly outlined but there is a no explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline; The ethical guideline is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The ethical guideline is identified or there is a basic attempt at explaining how Pepperberg ensured the study was ethical</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 ethical guideline is clearly outlined and there is a clear explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline	4	3	The ethical guideline is clearly outlined and there is a brief explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline; The ethical guideline is briefly outlined (or just named) but there is a clear explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline	3	2	The ethical guideline is clearly outlined but there is a no explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline; The ethical guideline is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline	2	1	The ethical guideline is identified or there is a basic attempt at explaining how Pepperberg ensured the study was ethical	1	0	No creditworthy answer	0	8
Level	Criteria	Marks																		
4	The ethical guideline is clearly outlined and there is a clear explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline	4																		
3	The ethical guideline is clearly outlined and there is a brief explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline; The ethical guideline is briefly outlined (or just named) but there is a clear explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline	3																		
2	The ethical guideline is clearly outlined but there is a no explanation as to how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline; The ethical guideline is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining how Pepperberg met that ethical guideline	2																		
1	The ethical guideline is identified or there is a basic attempt at explaining how Pepperberg ensured the study was ethical	1																		
0	No creditworthy answer	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
10	Evaluate the Piliavin et al. study in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about field experiments. Strengths include: ecological validity, replicability, quantitative data, qualitative data Weaknesses include: ethics, qualitative data, quantitative data, controls 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