
PSYCHOLOGY

9990/11

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **10** 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 Andrade (doodling): Outline the instructions that were given only to the ‘doodling’ group. These were given before they listened to the telephone message. 1 mark per correct statement They were asked to shade in the squares and circles; They were told it does not matter how neatly they do it; They were told it does not matter how quickly they do it; They were told it was to relieve any boredom;	3
1(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result from this study. 1 mark – brief result (no comparison) 2 marks – full result (comparison) e.g. Participants in the doodling group recalled more (1 mark); Participants in the doodling group had a better memory score than the control (1 mark); The doodling condition recalled a mean of 7.8 names compared to 7.1 of the non-doodling group; Participants in the doodling groups recalled more names/places compared to the control group (2 marks); The doodlers (mainly) doodled and the non-doodlers did not (2 marks);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Bandura et al. (aggression): Outline <u>one</u> aim of this study. 1 mark – brief aim 2 marks – detailed aim e.g. To investigate how children learn aggression (1 mark); To see if aggression was nature or nurture (1 mark); 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);	2
2(b)	One of the response categories was ‘imitation of physical aggression’. Identify <u>three</u> examples of ‘imitation of physical aggression’ from this study. 1 mark per example Hitting Bobo with a mallet; Sitting on the Bobo doll and punching the Bobo doll (on the nose); Kicking the Bobo doll; Tossing the Bobo doll into the air;	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions): Explain why the study is from the biological approach. 1 mark – brief answer 2 marks – clear explanation or linked to a general assumption e.g. The study was interested in the role of the brain in behaviour and this is biological (1 mark); The study was investigating the role of the amygdala in memories (1st mark); The biological approach is interested in the role of the brain in our behaviour/experiences (2nd mark); They were testing the role of the amygdala in memory (1 mark) and this is part of the brain which is biology/neurology (1 mark);	2
3(b)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of using brain scans in this study. 1 mark – brief answer or answer not linked to study 2 marks – detailed answer linked to study e.g. People may act differently when having a scan compared to real life (1 mark); People may act differently when having a scan compared to real life so the emotional intensity scores may have been different in a real-life situation rather than on a screen (2 marks); People may feel stressed/anxious whilst having a brain scan (1st mark) and this could have affected how they rated the emotional intensity of each picture/scene (reducing validity) (2nd mark);	2
4(a)	In the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams), the procedure that the researchers first used to measure participants' estimations of REM sleep duration was unsuccessful and had to be revised. Describe how the researchers first attempted to measure participants' estimations of REM sleep duration. 1 mark per correct point Participants were woken at different increments of time (in REM); They were then asked to estimate the time they had been dreaming; To the nearest minute; So, they were not given a fixed choice;	2
4(b)	Describe the revised procedure used to measure participants' estimations of REM sleep duration. 1 mark per correct point Participants were woken at either 5 or 15 minutes after the onset of REM; They were then asked to choose if they had been dreaming for 5 or 15 minutes;	2

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): Outline what the model was supposed to do in the ‘Adjacent area – late’ condition. 1 mark per correct statement Model stood in (the middle of) adjacent car; Waited until passing the sixth station/waited for approximately 150s; Then began to help the victim;	2
5(b)	Describe <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study. 1 mark – identifying strength 1 mark – linking it to the study e.g. The study has ecological validity (1 mark); This is because the setting was a real-life subway carriage (1 mark); The study has mundane realism (1 mark); This is because the ‘task’ of seeing a person collapse does happen in the real world (1 mark); The procedure was standardised (1 mark); The models only helped out after a set time (e.g. 70s) so the study could be replicated/tested for reliability (1 mark);	2
6	Describe the psychology being investigated in the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee helping). 1 mark for each correct statement Examples from the study by Yamamoto et al. can gain credit (1 mark maximum) e.g. Altruism was investigated which is helping another chimpanzee without any benefit to themselves; For example, one chimp gave another chimp a straw to drink the juice even though the chimp giving the straw never got the juice; The study was about prosocial behaviour which is about helping others who may need it; Empathy was looked into which is understanding the emotional state of another organism (by imagining themselves in ‘their shoes’); Looked into targeting helping which is the ability to help someone else in a situation; Looked at targeting helping and seeing if organisms would use altruism to help/help without expecting a reward; Can an organism comprehend the specific needs of another organism?	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning): Identify <u>two</u> colours that Alex the parrot could already name <i>before</i> this study began. 1 mark per correct answer Rose/red; Grey; Green; Blue; Yellow;	2
7(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result from the ‘Transfer Tests with Novel Objects’. You <u>must</u> use data in your answer. 1 mark for the result 1 mark for correct use of data e.g. Alex’s score was above chance of 1/3 (1 mark); Alex’s score was 85% correct on all trials (2 marks); Alex’s score was 82.3% on first-trial performance (2 marks);	2
7(c)	Suggest <u>one</u> real life application of this study. 1 mark for brief application but linked to study <u>or</u> plausible application outlined but not explained/only has the what or how; 2 marks for application that clearly shows who would benefit/linked to study/how it would be done/has the what and how. e.g. Be useful to see if other species can learn abstract concepts using the same procedure, e.g. assistance animals (1 mark); The technique could be useful in helping children who are having difficulty learning abstract concepts; By using the model/rival technique, the child can learn the concepts through rewards/engaging with the model/rival (2 marks); Use the model-rival technique to teach children behaviours/train animals to perform certain tasks (1 mark);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8	Two friends, Javier and Lorena, are discussing the ethics of the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia). Javier thinks the study is ethical but Lorena thinks it is unethical. Explain <u>one</u> reason why Javier is correct and <u>one</u> reason why Lorena is correct, using evidence from this study. 3 marks for the answer for Javier 3 marks for the answer for Lorena e.g. Javier The study did gain informed consent (1 mark). This was taken from the boy and his mother before the therapy started (1 mark). Therefore, both the boy and mother knew exactly what the therapy was going to entail (1 mark); the boy/mother agreed to wanting to take part in the study/having results published (alternative 1 mark). Also, they started the therapy with his least distressing scenario (1 mark). The mother used positive reinforcement during the therapy so the boy would not get too distressed (1 mark) Therefore, the boy was protected from any harm throughout the therapy (1 mark). e.g. Lorena The study could have easily caused psychological stress (1 mark). The boy was having to confront his button phobia throughout the therapy (1 mark). He also had to discuss potential causes/effects of the phobia (e.g. buttons falling on him in art class) which would be stressful (1 mark).	6

Question	Answer	Marks																		
9(a)	Describe <u>two</u> independent variables from the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion). 1 mark for identifying an IV, ×2 1 mark for operationalising the IV, ×2 The emotional situation (1 mark); anger or euphoria (1 mark); The injection information (1 mark); misinformed/informed/ignorant/placebo (1 mark for any two of these);	4																		
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> differences between the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion) and the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions). e.g. 4 marks They used different sexes as participants. Schachter and Singer used 184 male students from the University of Minnesota whereas Canli only used 10 females who were all right-handed. e.g. 3 marks They used different sexes as participants. Schachter and Singer used (184) male students from the University of Minnesota whereas Canli only used females. e.g. 2 marks They used different sexes as participants. Schachter and Singer used males whereas Canli used females. e.g. 1 mark They used different sexes as participants. <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 difference is well explained using both studies as examples.</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>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.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditworthy material.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria for each result	Marks	4	The difference is well explained using both studies as examples.	4	3	The difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.	3	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.	2	1	The difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.	1	0	No creditworthy material.	0	8
Level	Criteria for each result	Marks																		
4	The difference is well explained using both studies as examples.	4																		
3	The difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.	3																		
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.	2																		
1	The difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.	1																		
0	No creditworthy material.	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
10	Evaluate the study by Laney et al. (false memory) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of self-reports. 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 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **10** 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 the main brain structure investigated in this study. 1 mark for correct answer. If more than 1 answer given credit the first Amygdala;	1
1(b)	Outline how the participants rated their emotional arousal towards the scenes 1 mark per correct statement (after viewing a picture), a fixation cross appeared on the screen; They pressed a button to give the picture a rating; This ranged from 0–3; 0 = not emotionally intense/3 = extremely emotionally intense;	2
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 1 mark brief conclusion 2 marks detailed conclusion e.g. The amygdala affects memory (1 mark); Amygdala activation could/can predict memory (1 mark); The activity in the (left) amygdala during encoding could predict subsequent memories (2 marks);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Outline <u>one</u> aim of the study. 1 mark brief aim 2 marks full aim/detailed aim e.g. To improve the Eyes Test (1 mark); To test for Theory of Mind (1 mark); To test people on a revised Eyes Test to see if some of the original deficits were no longer seen (2 marks); To see if females would score higher on the Eyes Test compared to males (2 marks); To see if people with AS/HFA lack/have a Theory of Mind (2 marks); To investigate if there would be a relationship between AQ and Eyes Test scores (2 marks);	2
2(b)	Describe the results for the Autism Spectrum Quotient (AQ) test for <u>two</u> groups of participants. You <u>must</u> use data in your answer. 2 marks available for the results (a comparison is needed) 1 mark for use of correct data for ONE group e.g. The AS/HFA group scored the highest (1 mark) compared to students/IQ matched controls (1 mark). The average score for the AS/HFA group was 34.4(/50) (1 mark); Males score higher on the AQ (1 mark) compared to females (1 mark);	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee helping): Explain why this study is from the social approach. 1 mark for brief answer/2 marks for clear description or linked to a general assumption e.g. The study investigated how two chimpanzees interacted (to solve a task) (1 mark); The study investigated how two chimpanzees interacted to solve a task and to see how their behaviour was influenced by a social context of being able to see the other chimpanzee (2 marks); The study involved chimpanzees interacting to gain a juice reward (1 mark); The study involved chimpanzees interacting to gain a juice reward so the behaviour was influenced by individuals around them which is about the social approach (2 marks); The study was about chimpanzees in a social context, that of providing targeted help when requested (2 marks);	2
3(b)	Explain <u>one</u> strength of using animals as participants in this study. 1 mark for a brief answer or answer not linked to study 2 marks for detailed answer linked to study e.g. Can allow for greater controls to be used to establish cause-effect (compared to humans) (1 mark); Can allow for greater controls to be used (compared to humans) so in this study using the experimental booths/tool box choice/nature of task is something we cannot perform on humans (2 marks);	2
4	Describe how the ‘transfer tests with novel objects’ were conducted on Alex the parrot during the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning). 1 mark per correct statement made Alex was presented with pairs of objects that combined attributes never used in training; They also had not been used in any previous tests asking same/different; The objects may also have been ‘totally’ novel/never encountered before; These objects were kept on a shelf in view of Alex; Therefore, at least one of the pair of objects was unfamiliar to Alex; These could be colours/shapes he had no label for; He was then asked ‘What’s Same?’/‘What’s Different?’ If he answered correctly he was praised or rewarded (kept object)/if incorrect the experimenter said ‘no’;	4

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): The teacher was given a ‘sample shock’. Describe this procedure. 1 mark per correct statement This was given before they took on the role of teacher; The shock was always 45 volts; The shock was applied to the wrist; The source was a 45 v battery attached to the shock generator;	2
5(b)	Explain <u>one</u> methodological weakness of the study by Milgram. 1 mark identifying weakness 1 mark for linking it to the study e.g. The study lacks mundane realism (1 mark); this is because the act of shocking a stranger if they get a word pair wrong is not a real life task (1 mark); The study may lack generalisability (1 mark); this is because the sample was of only 40 white males from New Haven (1 mark);	2
6	Describe the psychology that is being investigated in the study by Laney et al. (false memory). 1 mark for each correct statement Examples from the study by Laney et al. can gain credit (max 1) e.g. People may have memories for events, etc. that never actually happened; People can reconstruct memories of events that have real and false memories in them; These could alter our perception of childhood memories (or any memory); People can fill in the gaps using false information; The information can be post-event that gets embedded in the actual memory; They can be either negative (a crime) or positive (liking asparagus);	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Name <u>two</u> things that participants were asked to do (or not to do) prior to the study 1 mark per correct statement Arrive a little before normal bedtime; Eat normally; Avoid alcohol; Avoid caffeine-containing drinks;	2
7(b)	Outline <u>one</u> quantitative result from this study. 1 mark brief 2 marks for result with a comparison Participants were more likely to recall a dream in REM (1 mark) compared to nREM sleep (1 mark); Participants were more likely to estimate 5 minutes of REM (1 mark) compared to 15 minutes of REM (1 mark); 152 dreams were recalled (from 191 trials) in the REM condition (1 mark) compared to 11 (from 160 trials) in the nREM condition (1 mark); On 88% of trials the participants were accurate at estimating 5 minutes dream duration (1 mark) compared to 78% of trials for 15 minutes (1 mark);	2
7(c)	Suggest <u>one</u> real life application from this study. 1 mark for brief application but linked to study OR plausible application outlined but not explained/only has the what <u>or</u> how 2 marks for application that clearly shows who would benefit/linked to study/how it would be done/has the what <u>and</u> how e.g. The EEG can detect REM/nREM sleep so can be useful in diagnosing problems with these (1 mark); The EEG can detect REM/nREM sleep so can be useful in diagnosing problems with these so that a treatment can be found to help with any disorder (2 marks); The EEG can detect REM/nREM sleep so could be useful for people with sleep disorders. A psychologist can use the EEG output to see how their sleep patterns are different to a 'normal' sleeper (2 marks); Can be used to analyse dream content (0 marks);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8	Two friends, Lok and Hiruni, are discussing the ethics of the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion). Lok thinks the study is ethical but Hiruni thinks it is unethical. Explain <u>one</u> reason why Lok is correct and <u>one</u> reason why Hiruni is correct, using evidence from this study. 3 marks for the answer for Lok 3 marks for the answer for Hiruni e.g. Lok Data collected was kept confidential (1 mark). No individual data was published (1 mark) as all we know is that there were male students from the University of Minnesota (1 mark). e.g. Hiruni The participants were deliberately deceived (1 mark). They were told the wrong information whilst getting the injection (1 mark). For example one group was told that they would experience numb feet/get a headache after the injection (1 mark)/told it was Suproxin for vision (alternative 1 mark).	6

Question	Answer	Marks																		
9(a)	Describe what was recorded by the female observers in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans). 1 mark per correct statement made One noted race/sex/location of passengers in the critical area/adjacent areas/in the carriage; She also counted the number of passengers in the critical area/in the carriage; She also counted the total number of people who came to help the victim; The race/sex/location of every helper was recorded by her; Another recorded the latency time of the first helper; She also recorded the latency time of help <i>after</i> the model began to help (if necessary); Both noted comments made by the passengers; Spontaneous/elicited comments from passengers;	4																		
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> similarities between the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) and the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee learning). 4 marks available for each similarity e.g. 4 marks Both the studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim who was ill or drunk and had collapsed on a subway train whereas in the Yamamoto study this was helping a chimp solve a puzzle or getting some juice or being able to drink some juice. e.g. 3 marks Both the studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim (who was ill or drunk) whereas in the Yamamoto study this was helping a chimp solve a puzzle. e.g. 2 marks Both the studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim (who was ill or drunk). e.g. 1 mark Both studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. <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 similarity is well explained using both studies as examples.</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The similarity is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>The similarity is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity is well explained but there is no study evidence.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The similarity is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditworthy material.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria for each result	Marks	4	The similarity is well explained using both studies as examples.	4	3	The similarity is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.	3	2	The similarity is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity is well explained but there is no study evidence.	2	1	The similarity is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.	1	0	No creditworthy material.	0	8
Level	Criteria for each result	Marks																		
4	The similarity is well explained using both studies as examples.	4																		
3	The similarity is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.	3																		
2	The similarity is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity is well explained but there is no study evidence.	2																		
1	The similarity is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.	1																		
0	No creditworthy material.	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
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 case studies. 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 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

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

Generic Marking Principles

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): One female observer noted the race of every rider (passenger) standing or seated in the critical area. Name <u>two</u> features she noted about every rider (passenger) in the critical area. 1 mark per correct answer Sex (of each rider); Location (of each rider); Race (of each rider);	2
1(b)	State <u>one</u> reason why the experiment was conducted between the two stations used. 1 mark for a valid reason e.g. It lasted for 7.5 minutes/long so enough time to run the trial; To aid replicability; To aid standardisation;	1
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 1 mark – brief conclusion 2 marks – detailed conclusion e.g. People help ill victims more often (1 mark); A person who is 'ill' is more likely to receive help than a person who is 'drunk' (2 marks);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): Describe the instructions given to the ‘teacher’ about how to deliver the shocks to the ‘learner’. 1 mark per correct statement They were told to give a shock each time a wrong response was given; They were told to move to the next button up each time a wrong response is given; They had to announce the voltage level before giving a shock; The shock was ‘given’ by pressing the button (on the shock generator);	3
2(b)	Identify <u>two</u> examples of signs of ‘tension’ that were shown by the ‘teachers’ during the study. 1 mark per correct example Sweat(ing); Tremble/trembling; Stuttering; Biting lip; Groaning; Dig nails into flesh; Nervous laughing; Smiling; Violent convulsion/seizure;	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Explain why this study is from the learning approach. 1 mark – brief answer 2 marks – clear description or linked to a general assumption e.g. He had gained his phobia from an experience in the classroom, so it was learnt (1 mark); The learning approach states that conditioning helps to explain changes in behaviour. The therapy involved positive reinforcement to motivate him to complete his distress hierarchy (2 marks).	2
3(b)	Explain <u>one</u> problem when using children in psychological research, using this study as an example. 1 mark – brief answer or answer not linked to study 2 marks – detailed answer linked to study e.g. Children get bored easily so might not take tasks seriously (1 mark); The child might easily get distressed if young (1 mark); Using children might be unethical as they can get distressed easily – in this study the boy would have been distressed as he was exposed to buttons which he had a phobia of (2 marks); Sometimes children may not understand the language used by adults – the therapist may have explained the Feelings Thermometer, but the child may not have fully understood it (reducing validity) (2 marks);	2
4	Describe how the target words and foils were developed for the revised ‘Reading the Mind in the Eyes’ test in the study by Baron-Cohen et al. 1 mark per correct statement They were created by two of the experimenters; Piloted on eight judges; At least 5/8 judges had to agree that the target word was most suitable; Also, no more than 2/8 judges had to pick the foil; Items that failed had new target words/foils created; These were then re-assessed by the judges until the item ‘passed’;	4

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	From the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion): Identify <u>two</u> behaviours from participants in the euphoria condition that would be coded as 'joins in activity'. 1 mark per correct behaviour named Made or flew paper airplanes; Threw paper basketballs; Hula hooped; Shooting at pile of folders; Shoots paper with rubber band;	2
5(b)	Explain <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study. 1 mark – identifying strength 1 mark – relating it directly to the study The study was experimental (well controlled) so cause and effect could be established (1 mark); They could be confident that it was the (mis)information given to the participants that was causing their thoughts and behaviours (1 mark); The study was standardised so that it could easily be tested for reliability (1 mark); The actions of the stooge in the anger and euphoria conditions meant that another research team could replicate and check for reliability (1 mark);	2
6	Describe the psychology being investigated in the study by Bandura et al. (aggression). 1 mark per correct point People pay attention to/observe the behaviour of a role model; They then retain that information in their memory; They will then imitate/reproduce the behaviour if they feel capable; If they witnessed the model get rewarded (vicarious) then they are more likely to repeat/try to repeat; The imitation is seen as more probable if the role model is of the same sex (as the observer);	4

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	From the study by Laney et al. (false memory): Outline the rating scale used in the Food History Inventory. 1 mark for each correct statement They had to rate each item on a scale of 1–8; 1 = definitely did not happen (before the age of 10); 8 = definitely did happen (before the age of 10);	2
7(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result from Experiment 1, using data collected from the Food History Inventory. 1 mark – result 1 mark – using correct data Only the Love group's ratings changed (after manipulation); The Love group's (average) rating increased 2.6 points; The control group's (average) rating increased 0.2 points;	2
7(c)	Suggest <u>one</u> real life application of this study. 1 mark for brief application but linked to study <u>or</u> plausible application outlined but not explained/only has the what <u>or</u> how. 2 marks for application that clearly shows who would benefit/linked to study/how it would be done/has the what <u>and</u> how. This can be used to help improve the diet of people (1 mark); This can be used to help improve the diet of fussy eaters; Therapists/nutritionists can use the 'computer generated' fake profile to change the memories of food someone dislikes (2 marks);	2

Question	Answer	Marks
8	Two friends, Kim and Alphonse, are discussing the ethics of the study by Pepperberg (parrot learning). Kim thinks the study is ethical but Alphonse thinks it is unethical. Explain <u>one</u> reason why Kim is correct and <u>one</u> reason why Alphonse is correct, using evidence from this study. 3 marks for the answer for Kim 3 marks for the answer for Alphonse e.g. Kim The smallest number of animals should be used in research (1 mark) in order to meet the aims and goals of the study (1 mark). Pepperberg only used one parrot in the study (1 mark). e.g. Alphonse Caging conditions need to be taken in account in research (1 mark). Alex was kept in a cage of only about 70cm high at night (1 mark). This might not be enough space for him to be comfortable and could have caused stress/these parrots are social birds so being alone in his cage might have caused stress (1 mark).	6

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Describe the <u>two</u> tasks the chimpanzees had to solve in the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee learning). 1 mark for brief outline 2 marks for detailed outline e.g. Stick One chimpanzee needed a stick to reach for juice (1 mark); One chimpanzee needed a stick to reach for juice in another booth which was out of reach without it (2 marks); e.g. Straw One chimpanzee needed a straw to drink some juice (1 mark); One chimpanzee needed a straw to drink from a carton that was fixed to the wall (2 marks);	4

Question	Answer	Marks																		
9(b)	Explain <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee helping) and study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans). 4 marks – one similarity 4 marks – one difference e.g. 4 marks Both the studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim who was ill or drunk and had collapsed on a subway train whereas in the Yamamoto study this was helping a chimp solve a puzzle or getting some juice or being able to drink some juice. e.g. 3 marks Both the studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim (who was ill or drunk) whereas in the Yamamoto study this was helping a chimp solve a puzzle. e.g. 2 marks Both the studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim (who was ill or drunk). e.g. 1 mark Both studies were about ‘helping’ behaviour. <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 similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>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</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditworthy material</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria for each result	Marks	4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples	4	3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly	3	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	2	1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples	1	0	No creditworthy material	0	8
Level	Criteria for each result	Marks																		
4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples	4																		
3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly	3																		
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	2																		
1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples	1																		
0	No creditworthy material	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks
10	Evaluate the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about laboratory-based studies. 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