

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/11**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2024**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **22** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

PUBLISHED**3 Calculation questions:**

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4 Annotation:

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	In the study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences): A sample of monkeys from a troop of 135 was used. State the total number of monkeys used as the final sample. 1 mark for correct answer 34	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u>. Accept when given as number of males (11) and females (23).
1(b)	Identify <u>two</u> toys that were categorised as ‘wheeled’ in this study. 1 mark per correct answer Wagon Truck Car Construction vehicle Shopping cart Dump truck/bin wagon	2	List is definitive. ‘Vehicle’ = 0
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study. 2 marks for full conclusion 1 mark for brief/partial conclusion e.g., Toy preference (in monkeys) reflect hormonally influenced behavioural/cognitive biases which are affected by social pressures/processes (2 marks). Toy preference in monkeys is influenced by hormones and social pressures (1 mark). Male monkeys preferred wheeled toys the most (0 marks = result). There are other creditworthy responses	2	Do not credit results. There are four things here: Hormones/biology Behavioural (bias)/preference Cognitive (bias)/thoughts Social processes/socialisation Three or more = full Two or less = partial Do not credit responses based on gender.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Outline the change in ratings of distress when the boy had to imagine hugging his mother with her shirt full of buttons. 1 mark per correct point e.g., The (severity) rating began at 7 then decreased to 4 and at the end of the final session was a 3 (2 marks) The ratings decreased from Session 1/before imagery exposure to Session 2/midway through imagery exposure The ratings further decreased from Session 2/midway through imagery exposure to Session 3/after imagery exposure The ratings decreased from Session 1/before imagery exposure to Session 3/after imagery exposure The largest decrease was from Session 1/before imagery exposure to Session 2/midway through imagery exposure There are other correct responses	2	2). Figure 3 shows how his rating decreased from 7 (immediately before the exposure) to 4 (midway through the exposure) to 3 (immediately after the exposure) (Fig. 3). If data presented with at least two correct data points = 2 marks One correct data point or all numbers incorrect but show decrease = 1 mark

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of this study. 1 mark for the identification of weakness 1 mark for explaining the weakness via example from the study e.g. (Lacks) generalisability (1 mark: identification) as it was a case study on one child with a phobia of buttons and he may be unique (1 mark: explained in context) (Potentially) unethical (1 mark: identification) as increased levels of distress were recorded in some scenarios with buttons (1 mark: explained in context) Difficult to control (participant) variables (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Do accept 'it was a rare phobia'.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Pozzulo et al (line-ups): Outline <u>one</u> aim of the study. 2 marks for full aim 1 mark for partial/brief aim e.g., To investigate the role of social and cognitive factors in false positive responding of children in line-ups (2 marks) To investigate whether the pattern in correct identification and positive responding would remain when familiarity of a target is manipulated (2 marks) To investigate the role of cognition in identification of faces (1 mark) To investigate whether children are good eyewitnesses (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Responses about testing false negative/positive responses = 0 as this is how the <u>aim was tested</u>; it is not the aim of this study. The false responses are the <u>predictions</u> based on the aim.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	Explain why this study is from the cognitive approach in psychology. 2 marks = clearly linked to cognitive approach (either through example or assumption) 1 mark = partially linked to cognitive approach/assumption of the cognitive approach only e.g. Children correctly identified 99% of the cartoon faces (1 mark example). This could follow the principles of input (see cartoon), process (memory of cartoon) and output (remember cartoon) (1 mark assumption link) Adults correctly identified 66% of human faces (1 mark example). This shows that people do have individual differences in memory recall (1 mark assumption link). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore <i>only</i> descriptions of the study with no attempt at the <i>why</i> bit of the question.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4(a)	In the study by Milgram (obedience), there was a ‘learning task’. Milgram called this a ‘paired-associate learning task’. Describe this ‘learning task’ as used in this study. 1 mark per correct point The P read out a series of word pairs (to the learner). The P then read out one word. Along with four terms. The learner then had to indicate which word had been originally paired/responded with the corresponding word. This was done by him pressing one of four switches. This lit up one of four quadrants in the answer box.	5	List is definitive. The answer has to be about the <u>learner</u> and not the <u>teacher</u>. The learning task is different to the shock instructions so ignore reference to the latter. Award 1 mark max for: Each incorrect answer received a shock/correct answer moved to next word.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the biological approach in psychology. 2 marks for full assumption 1 mark for partial/brief assumption e.g., 2 marks Behaviour, cognitions and emotions can be explained in terms of the working of the brain and the effect of hormones, genetics and evolution (any two of these needed) Similarities and differences between people can be understood in terms of biological factors and their interaction with other factors e.g., 1 mark Behaviour, cognitions and emotions can be explained in terms of the working of the brain Similarities and differences between people can be understood in terms of biological factors There are other creditworthy responses.	4	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the study by Hölzel et al. (mindfulness and brain scans) supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions you outlined in <u>part (a)</u>. 1 mark for result/conclusion. 1 mark for linking it to an assumption explicitly (not by name only: a relevant concept needs to be mentioned) e.g. There was a significant increase in grey matter in the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction group (1 mark result). This shows that there were similarities between the MBSR group in terms of how the program interacted with their brain density (1 mark supported link). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	If the link is not with an assumption from 5a, can only be awarded the result/conclusion mark.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	In the study by Perry et al (personal space), the participants had to complete two conditions, one week apart. One was the oxytocin condition. Describe how the participants received the ‘oxytocin’. 1 mark per correct point The participant had to self-administer the oxytocin 24 international units (in 250ml). This was done in the presence of the experimenter It was administered intranasally/via the nose From a medicine dropper Three drops per nostril.	3	List is definitive.
6(b)	Identify what was received by the participants in the other condition, instead of oxytocin. 1 mark for correct answer Saline.	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u>. Accept ‘placebo’ as Q is identify. Do not accept placebo pill or placebo injection.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(c)	Explain <u>one</u> strength of this study. 1 mark for the identification of strength 1 mark for explain the strength via example from the study e.g. There were controls in place to try to ensure it was the IV (directly) affecting the DV (1 mark: identification). For example, <u>all</u> participants waited 45 mins to ensure OT levels had plateaued making sure it was the empathy/oxytocin affecting personal space (1 mark explained in context) There was a clear standardised procedure which improves reliability/study can be replicated to check results etc. (1 mark: identification). For example, in Experiment 1 the figure approached for 3s in which the participant had to press the spacebar to stop it getting any closer (1 mark explained in context). The double-blind technique could reduce demand characteristics (1 mark: identification) as the participant did not know if they had been given oxytocin/placebo (1 mark explained in context). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Strengths can be methodological, practical or ethical.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	Gabriela has a job where she needs to listen to recorded telephone conversations to check for the quality of customer service. However, she finds it difficult to pay attention to the recordings. She wants advice on how to improve her attention. Outline what advice you would give to Gabriela, using your knowledge of the study by Andrade (doodling). 1 mark per piece of advice clearly based on the study by Andrade. e.g. Tell Gabriela to get a piece of paper. Tell her that <u>whilst listening</u> to/during the conversations she can doodle. Gabriela could go and sit in a dull/boring room. Tell her she can doodle whenever she wants/about whatever she wants. Or tell Gabriela that the paper can already have shapes on it so she can colour them in. Ask Gabriela to focus on specific pieces of information that are important. Tell her she could review her concentration levels afterwards with a colleague checking the recollection of the conversation(s). Gabriela could write down information/take notes about the conversation. There are other creditworthy responses.	4	No mark for simply saying 'doodle' Has to be advice based on the Andrade study, so <i>any</i> secondary task is fine to gain credit. Do not credit 'use a pencil/pen'.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	Adamu is talking about the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test). He says that the findings are <u>not</u> generalisable. Explain why Adamu is correct that the findings are <u>not</u> generalisable, using evidence from the study in your answer. Up to 1 mark available for defining generalisability/not generalisable. Up to 4 marks available per correct point made based on evidence. e.g., Generalisability is about whether the findings can extend beyond the sample to the target population (1 mark: definition). Group 1 were all males, so this makes it difficult to generalise to females (with AS/HFA). The AS group was volunteers so may be different to non-volunteer AS people. Group 2 was only made up of people from education classes/library users which is a specific part of the population. Group 3 were only from a prestigious university (Cambridge) so may not represent other undergraduates. The majority of Group 3 were science students so these may be different to humanities students. There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Ignore responses about it <u>having</u> generalisability. Max 1 mark can be awarded for 'cannot generalise to everyday life' with an example from the study.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Outline <u>two</u> dreams reported by participants that had vertical eye movements. For each dream: 2 marks for detailed answer 1 mark for brief answer One P reported a dream of standing at the bottom of a cliff operating a hoist/looking at climbers on the cliff (2 marks). One P reported a dream of standing at the bottom of a cliff (1 mark). One P reported climbing up a ladder and looking up/down as he climbed (2 marks); One P reported climbing up a ladder (1 mark). One P reported playing basketball and looking up at the hoop as they shot/looking down to pick it up (2 marks). One P reported playing basketball (1 mark).	4	Dream list is definitive.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> differences between the study by Dement and Kleitman and the study by Hölzel et al. (mindfulness and brain scans). One of the differences <u>must</u> be about the technique used to investigate the brain. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the difference (twice), e.g., brain measurement, research techniques used, type of data collected (quantitative/qualitative), generalisability, sample size. e.g. difference 4 marks Hölzel used an MRI scan to be able to see brain density changes after a mindfulness stress reduction course. Dement & Kleitman used a different technique called an EEG that could only monitor brain wave activity/patterns. Therefore, Hölzel's method looked at structure whereas Dement looked at (real-time) function (explanation). 3 marks Hölzel used an MRI scan to be able to see brain density/grey matter changes after a mindfulness stress reduction course. Dement & Kleitman used a different technique called an EEG that could only monitor brain wave activity/patterns (during REM etc.) 2 marks Hölzel used an MRI scan measure brain density whilst Dement & Kleitman used an EEG. 1 mark Hölzel used an MRI scan and/or Dement & Kleitman used an EEG.	8	Award L1-L4 for each difference For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the difference. If both differences do not focus on technique used to investigate the brain, then <u>mark both but only credit the best.</u> Annotate with a tick to show they have a difference based on the technique. To get L2 for technique, one of the techniques must be mentioned in relation to what was being measured. Correct techniques must be mentioned to get L3 or L4. Different aims = L1 Quantitative/qualitative argument = L3 max Do credit experimental designs as D&K utilised repeated measures and Hölzel used independent groups. Extra rules for techniques: For L3 there needs to be specific examples of what was measured from both studies If one of the techniques is incorrect, then L1 max.

PUBLISHED

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Bandura et al. (aggression) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about validity. Strengths include: reliability (standardisation), quantitative data, validity; children showing less demand characteristics Weaknesses include: ecological validity, ethics, generalisability, quantitative data Example: in detail (named issue) One control was the participants being rated on aggression prior to the study, so Bandura could be more confident it was the IV (type of model) affecting the DV (behaviour shown by the children including physical aggression). Example: brief but in context There was a standardised procedure. For example, the aggressive model always followed the same procedure. This increases the reliability of the study. Example: no context There were controls in place so they could establish cause and effect/has internal validity.	10	Use level descriptors in table below

PUBLISHEDLevel descriptors for **Question 10:**

Level	Description	Mark
5	• Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10
4	• Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8
3	• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. • Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. • Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6
2	• Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue. • Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. • Some points may have no context. • Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.	3–4
1	• Little or no evaluation. • Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial. • Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2
0	No creditable response.	0

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/12**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2024**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **21** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

PUBLISHED**3 Calculation questions:**

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4 Annotation:

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	In the study by Saavedra and Silverman, a boy was treated for a specific phobia. Identify the specific phobia the boy was being treated for. 1 mark for correct answer Button/Koumpounophobia.	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u> .
1(b)	Describe the ‘Feelings Thermometer’ used in the study. 1 mark per correct point 1 mark can be awarded for a correct stimuli rated This was a hierarchy of distress/fear/disgust. It measured the subjective feelings of distress of the boy/about types of buttons. On a 9-point scale/scale of 0–8/0=no distress or 8=highest level of distress. There were 11 different buttons to rate. Small denim jean buttons were rated a 3 (example mark).	2	List is definitive. Accept ‘researchers wanted to know his distress levels/used it to assess his distress’ = 1 mark. Do not credit ‘measured how he felt’ by itself (needs to mention distress/buttons).
1(c)	Identify <u>two</u> findings from the post-treatment session. 1 mark per correct point Reported minimal distress about buttons. No longer met (DSM) criteria for phobia/no longer feared buttons. He could now wear (clear) <u>plastic</u> buttons. On his school uniform shirt (on a daily basis).	2	List is definitive. Do not credit improvement in boy or that fear decreased. ‘Could wear plastic buttons on his school uniform’ = 2 marks.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al (eyes test): Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to sex of participant and scores on the Reading the Mind in the Eyes test. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison e.g., 2 marks Males from the general population scored lower than male students/female students Females from the general population scored lower than female students/male students e.g., 1 mark Males scored lower than females Males scored the lowest There are other creditworthy comparisons.	2	Do not credit judgement responses like 'better' or 'worse'. Do not credit 'normal' group or 'control' group by itself. Credit any combination across Groups 2 (general population) and 3 (students). Do not credit responses about Groups 1 (AS/HFA as all male) and 4 (IQ controls) as these were never analysed by sex. Accept no significant difference between males and females in Group 2/3 = 2 marks.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of this study. 1 mark for the identification of weakness 1 mark for explaining the weaknesses via an example from the study e.g. (Lacks) generalisability (1 mark: identification) as the sample size for AS/HFA was small and they may be unique (1 mark: explained in context)/all males so difficult to generalise to females (1 mark: alternative) (Lacks) mundane realism (1 mark: identification) as looking at pairs of (static) eyes and guessing an emotion is not a typical everyday task (1 mark: explained in context). It was unethical (at times)/might cause psychological distress (1 mark: identification) as the AS/HFA group may have become distressed by not being able to identify emotion/knowing they are expected to score low (1 mark: explained in context) Difficult to control (participant) variables (1 mark). There are other creditworthy weaknesses.	2	Accept any reasonable weakness. It can be practical, methodological, or ethical.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): Outline what is meant by the term ‘bystander apathy’. 1 mark for general component of bystanders 1 mark for general component of apathy e.g., This is when people witness an event (like a crime) (1 mark: bystander) they are less likely to intervene/give help (1 mark: apathy). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Accept arguments based on diffusion of responsibility. Ignore <u>more</u> likely to help. Accept examples from Piliavin that illustrate either component. Accept ‘no help’ as meaning ‘less likely to help’.
3(b)	Explain <u>one</u> reason why this study supports a situational explanation of behaviour. 1 mark for explaining what is meant by situational explanation 1 mark for example from the study by Piliavin et al. e.g., The situational explanation states that the environment we find ourselves in affects our behaviour (1 mark: meaning). In this study, the situation of seeing an ill or drunk victim affected the likelihood that someone might help (1 mark: example). In this study the amount of people in the subway carriage did affect how quickly help was given (1 mark: example). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore tautological responses like situational explanations is about the situation.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	In the study by Hölzel et al (mindfulness and brain scans), one of the groups participated in a ‘Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction course’. There were ‘inclusion criteria’ for this group. Describe these inclusion criteria. 1 mark per correct point Doctor or self-enrolled on MBSR course/seeking stress reduction. Self-report of physically/psychologically healthy (in last six months)/no health issues. Not taking any medication(s). No meditation class participation in the last six months. No more than four meditation classes in the past five years/ten in lifetime. Aged 25–55. No issues with an MRI scan e.g., claustrophobia/metal implants Commitment to attend all eight classes/do all homework. Taken from four MBSR classes/MBSR classes in New England.	5	List is definitive. Be careful with points made about medication and meditation. Ignore anything about what the participants actually did in the MBSR course. Accept MBSR as ‘meditation class’. Handedness was not an inclusion criterion. Accept had to be ‘healthy’ or had no psychological disorders.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the social approach in psychology. 2 marks for full assumption 1 mark for partial/brief assumption e.g., 2 marks Behaviour, cognitions and emotions are influenced by social contexts, social environments and groups (any two of these). Behaviour, cognitions and emotions are influenced by the actual, implied or imagined presence of others (any two of these). e.g., 1 mark Behaviour, cognitions and emotions are influenced by social contexts. Behaviour, cognitions and emotions are influenced by the imagined presence of others.	4	Ignore 'affected by social factors' as too generic Do accept 'social demands' or any explicitly named social factor.
5(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the study by Perry et al. (personal space) supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions you outlined in <u>part (a)</u>. 1 mark for result/conclusion. 1 mark for linking it to an assumption explicitly (not by name only: a relevant concept needs to be mentioned). e.g., Overall friends were allowed to be closer into a person's personal space compared to a stranger (1 mark: result). Therefore, people were having their personal space size influenced by the imagined presence of different types of people approaching (1 mark: link). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	If the link is not with an assumption from 5a, can only be awarded the result/conclusion mark.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	In the study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences), each trial lasted for 25 minutes within the monkey enclosure. Describe the procedure for a trial. 1 mark per correct point Monkeys/subjects/the social group was placed indoors. One wheeled and one plush toy was placed in outdoor area. These were 10m apart. Location of toy was counterbalanced (left/right). The monkeys were then allowed into the outdoor area. Each interaction with a toy was recorded/videotaped/each trial recorded on camera. There was a separate camera focused on each toy.	4	List is definitive. Do not credit behavioural checklist, two observers, or time recorded interacting as this happened <u>after</u> the trial. Accept 'enclosed area' to mean either indoor or outdoor when used by a candidate.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(b)	Explain <u>one</u> strength of this study in relation to observations. 1 mark for identifying a strength of observations 1 mark for example from the study e.g. As the interactions were videotaped it was easy to quantify measures/be objective in analyses (1 mark). For example, the amount of time the monkey played with the toy/total number of interactions was objective, so comparisons were meaningful (1 mark example). Covert observations used cameras away from the play area to increase validity/decrease demand characteristics (1 mark). The interaction of monkeys with the toys was therefore not influenced by the presence of the observers (1 mark example). Two observers analysed the videotapes using the same checklist (1 mark), so this ensured that the behaviour was coded correctly/time interacting measured accurately (1 mark example) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Credit any strength that is feasible using observational techniques as used in this study. Arguments about inter-observer reliability is max 1 as it was never measured in the study. Do not credit ethics.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	Children can be eyewitnesses to a crime. However, children’s identification of the criminal can be inaccurate. Suggest how child eyewitnesses can be helped to accurately identify the criminal they have seen, using your knowledge of the study by Pozzulo et al (line-ups). 1 mark per piece of evidence clearly based on the study by Pozzulo et al. e.g., Dress of the investigator can be more casual/less formal/less authoritative. Investigator can engage in child friendly play beforehand. Anything authoritative needs to be kept at a minimum. Make sure the child is comfortable before questioning. When questioning a child, always ensure there is a correct answer. Do not have line-ups where the ‘target’ is absent. Increase trust for decisions by children where the ‘target’ is known to them (e.g., family member). In a line-up ensure that the proposed ‘target’ is in there. Do not question a decision to make a child doubt what they have chosen/said. Do ask open-ended questions to try to get more detail about the crime. Monitor children for signs of stress/distress/anxiety and stop questioning until feeling better. There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Go with the intention of the candidate as long as it is based on Pozzulo et al. Do credit have the line-up drawn as cartoon characters = max 1. Accept ask non-leading questions as this is mentioned in the implications part of the original paper. Accept do not use jargon words. Accept suggestions about reducing social pressure/stress (go with the logic of the candidate with the example). Accept that the tone of voice needs to be calm/should not be stern.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	Tejas is talking about the study by Bandura et al (aggression). He says that the study is not ethical. Explain why Tejas is correct that the study is <u>not</u> ethical, using evidence from this study in your answer. Up to 1 mark available for identifying one ethical guideline that was broken Up to 1 mark available for explaining one ethical guideline that was broken (generic) Up to 3 marks available per correct point made based on evidence e.g., The children were put under psychological stress/psychological harm (1 mark: identifying ethical guideline). Some were having to witness an adult being aggressive towards a Bobo doll (and this may have scared them). All children had to go through the 'Aggression Arousal' phase where they were stopped from playing with toys that were for 'better children'. The children did not know they were being observed in the final test for delayed imitation. The children could have hurt themselves during the final session, playing with aggressive toys/aggressively with toys. There was no attempt to reduce any aggressive behaviour before exiting the study. They were stopped from leaving one of the rooms so no right to withdraw (at times). No (valid) consent was taken from children/parents. They were exposed to physical/verbal aggression. They could have been aggressive after the study as learned to imitate it. There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Go with the intention of the candidate. Acceptable guidelines: Minimising harm Valid consent not taken Right to withdraw Deception Debriefing Non-acceptable guidelines: Confidentiality Privacy (unless well argued about the final room)

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	Describe the sample used in the study by Milgram (obedience). 1 mark per correct point n=40. Males. Volunteer sample/responded to a newspaper advertisement. Aged 20–50 years. From New Haven (and surrounding areas). Wide range of occupations. Wide range of educational level. Paid for participation.	4	Do credit any data about percentage total for different occupational groups and age ranges (see Table 1 of original paper)

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> differences between the study by Milgram (obedience) and the study by Perry et al. (personal space). One of the differences <u>must</u> be about ethics. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the difference (twice), e.g., stooges, ethics, data collection techniques, generalisability, (ecological) validity. e.g., difference 4 marks The studies used stooges in <u>different ways/they were different ‘types’</u> (explanation). Milgram used a human stooge that the participant met beforehand but did not see during the duration of the procedure. In the Perry study the participants ‘met’ the animated stooge in various rooms/scenarios until they felt the stooge was invading personal space. Example: 3 marks Milgram used a human stooge that the participant met beforehand but did not see during the duration of the procedure/ in the Perry study the participants ‘met’ the animated stooge in various rooms/scenarios until they felt the stooge was invading personal space Example: 2 marks The studies used stooges in different ways. Milgram used a human stooge that the participant met/ Perry used an animated stooge. Example: 1 mark The studies used stooges in different ways. Overall, Milgram was less ethical/Perry more ethical.	8	Award L1–L4 for each difference For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the difference. If both differences do not focus on ethics, then <u>mark both but only credit the best</u>. Use a tick annotation to indicate that one of the differences is about ethics. Description of studies with no explicit difference = L1 Different aims = L1 Different experimental designs used = 0 Both volunteer samples so = 0 Ethical differences are: Consent, harm, right to withdraw, deception. Confidentiality/Debriefing = 0 Rule for ethics: Explanation = Milgram less ethical and Perry more ethical. L4: explaining why Milgram less ethical etc. via a named guideline with explicit examples from both studies. L3: Describing a difference based on one guideline with examples but no explanation OR explanation given but comparison is on different guideline. L2: Describing a difference with only one example or compare studies on different guidelines

PUBLISHED

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Andrade (doodling) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the sampling technique used. Strengths include: reliability, standardisation, validity (internal), sampling technique Weaknesses include: validity (external), sample, ethics, sampling technique Example: in detail One control was the participants in the doodling group being encouraged to doodle (in the hope of it affecting concentration), so Andrade could be more confident it was the IV (doodling or not) affecting the DV (memory recall/concentration/level of attention). Example: brief but in context There was a standardised procedure. For example, the telephone message was the same for all participants. This increases the reliability of the study. Example: no context There were controls in place so they could establish cause and effect/has internal validity.	10	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	5	- Very good evaluation including the named issue. - Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. - Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10		
	4	- Good evaluation including the named issue. - Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. - Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8		
	3	- Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. - Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. - Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6		
	2	- Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue. - Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. - Some points may have no context. - Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.	3–4		

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	1	- Little or no evaluation. - Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial. - Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2		
	0	No creditable response.			

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/13**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2024**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **18** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

PUBLISHED**3 Calculation questions:**

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4 Annotation:

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	In the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams), five participants were studied intensively. There were also a number of participants who had minimal data collected from them. State the number of participants who had minimal data collected from them. 1 mark for the correct answer 4	1	Take the first answer <u>only</u> .
1(b)	Before the study began, participants were given two instructions about what they must <u>not</u> do: • do not consume alcohol • do not consume caffeine Participants were also given instructions about what they must do. States these two instructions. 1 mark per correct answer Arrive a little bit before usual bedtime/at their usual bedtime Eat 'normally'	2	List is definitive.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(c)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study in relation to dreaming. 2 marks for detailed conclusion 1 mark for partial/brief conclusion e.g. Dreams are not instant events but are reported/experienced in real time (2 marks) Eye movements during sleep do correspond with the content of a dream (2 marks) Dreaming happens more in REM (1 mark) Eye movements match dreams (1 mark) Ps recall more dreams in REM compared to NREM (0 marks: a result) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore answers that are just results. These include things like named correlations, comparisons of behaviour during REM/nREM etc. However, 'correlation' used in an answer about eye movement and content of dream <u>is</u> creditworthy (as this is linguistic).

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Hassett et al (monkey toy preferences): Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to sex differences in frequency of play with 'plush' toys. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison e.g. Female (monkeys) played with plush toys, on average, with a higher frequency compared to males (monkeys). (2 marks) Females played with a higher frequency. (1 mark)	2	Do not credit duration or preference. Reject 'more of the females.' Do credit any response based on the standard deviation. If response compares males plush with wheeled then female plush with wheeled = 1 mark. Response must be male versus female otherwise 0 marks. Accept 'more' as frequency.
2(b)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of this study. 1 mark for the identification of a weakness 1 mark for explaining the weaknesses via an example from the study e.g. (Lacks) generalisability (1 mark: identification) as the sample was captive (rhesus) monkeys so wild monkeys may respond differently (1 mark: explained in context) (Lacks) mundane realism (1 mark) as choosing (human) toys is not a typical everyday activity for (rhesus) monkeys (1 mark: explained in context). Difficult to control (participant) variables (1 mark) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Do not credit ecological validity/unethical as use captive monkeys. Do not credit comparisons with children.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Outline how positive reinforcement was used in the treatment of the boy's phobia. 1 mark per correct point This was provided by the boy's mother It was contingent on him successfully completing a gradual exposure to buttons.	2	List is definitive.
3(b)	Explain one reason why this study supports the nurture side of the nature versus nurture debate. 1 mark for explaining what is meant by nurture 1 mark for example from the study by Saavedra and Silverman e.g., Nurture is about learning/developing a behaviour after birth/through experiences (1 mark: meaning) In this study the boy had a bad experience in the classroom with a bowl of buttons and this probably caused his phobia (1 mark: example) By gradually making him think about buttons, the level of distress/anxiety decreased meaning it changed through the experience of therapy (1 mark: example) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore tautological responses like nurture is about the being nurtured. Do accept arguments that it is 'not inherited'. 'An experience' by itself cannot get the example mark.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	From the study by Pozzulo et al. (line-ups): Describe the ‘line-up presentation’ for the target-present condition. 1 mark per correct point made, up to 4 marks 1 mark for the marking point in bold as it is unique to the target-present condition The target was in the line-up with three other photographs/foils. All of the pictures were shown simultaneously. The target’s line-up position was randomised. Each participant watched <u>four</u> videos. These were presented on a laptop/computer/on a screen. These were in a random order. The photo array/line-up was shown after each video. The position of the target was counterbalanced across photo arrays/line-ups. A silhouette was also included in the line-up.	5	The list is definitive. For the annotations use ticks as per usual but use tick-b for the point in bold to know that the response can access all available marks. Do not credit how the photographs were chosen. Do not credit what a participant was expected to do.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the learning approach in psychology. 2 marks for full assumption 1 mark for partial/brief assumption e.g., 2 marks We all begin life as a blank slate. Experiences and interactions with the environment shape our behaviour/these changes are directly observable. We learn through the processes of operant conditioning, classical conditioning and social learning (at least 2 need to be named). (This can be understood using the stimulus-response model). e.g., 1 mark We all begin life as a blank slate. We learn through the processes of operant conditioning/classical conditioning/social learning.	4	Do not credit environment by itself.
5(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the study by Bandura et al. (aggression) supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions you outlined in part (a). 1 mark for result/conclusion. 1 mark for linking it to an assumption explicitly (not by name only: a relevant concept needs to be mentioned and it does not have to be one mentioned in 5(a)) e.g., Children were more likely to imitate aggressive behaviour if they had seen an aggressive model compared to a non-aggressive model (1 mark: result). Therefore, this supports the idea of Social Learning as they observed and imitated the behaviour(s) (1 mark: link) There are other creditworthy responses.	2	If the link is not with an assumption from 5(a), can only be awarded the result/conclusion mark. Ensure SLT is mentioned in 5(a), otherwise only result/conclusion mark is available.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Describe the psychology being investigated in this study. 1 mark per correct point e.g. Looking at whether doodling aids (cognitive) concentration/memory/attention. Arousal levels need to be maintained to be able to concentrate. Cognitive processing of dual tasks compete for the same levels of performance. This may slow down our overall cognitive processing speed. Boredom plays a role in paying attention to information. Information processing when asked to do ‘two things at once’/multitasking. Removes attention/takes away concentration/acts as a distraction (a second task). There are other creditworthy responses.	4	There are no ID marks available. 1 mark is available for an example from Andrade. Do credit definitions of terms like attention, memory etc.
6(b)	Explain <u>one</u> strength of this study in relation to reliability. 1 mark for standardisation <u>and</u> replication (identification of the strength) 1 mark for example from the study e.g. The procedure was standardised so could be replicated (1 mark). For example, the telephone message was the same length/contained the same information for all participants (1 mark link). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore reference to controls.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	Your friend Ruru has read a story in a newspaper about a nurse who gave incorrect medicine to a patient because a doctor told her. Ruru says that he cannot understand why the nurse would do that. Suggest to Ruru why the nurse gave the incorrect medicine, using your knowledge of the study by Milgram (obedience). 1 mark per piece of evidence clearly based on the study by Milgram The doctor was seen as a person in authority The uniform would have shown that the doctor was in authority In Milgram, the participants did give an electric shock without really questioning The doctor may have had a stern appearance The doctor may have said ‘you <u>must</u> give that dose of medication’ The doctor may have told the nurse that it was the doctor’s responsibility as an authority figure The nurse may have just got a job at the prestigious hospital so did not want to question The consequence of giving the medicine will not be hers, but the doctors There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Go with the intention of the candidate. 1 mark available for a relevant finding from Milgram (result or conclusion). 1 mark available for general commentary about why she gave the medicine, e.g., she was simply following orders.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	Betsy is talking about the study by Hölzel et al (mindfulness and brain scans). She says that the study has validity. Explain why Betsy is correct that the study has validity, using evidence from this study in your answer. Up to 1 mark available for explaining what <u>one</u> type of validity is Up to 4 marks available per correct point made based on evidence e.g., Validity is about whether a measure is truly measuring what it should be (1 mark: explaining)/Internal validity is about whether the IV is directly affecting the DV due to strong controls (1 mark: alternative explaining). The study used MRI scans which are objective measures of brain matter. The study did have some controls like the inclusion criteria for participation meaning that this variable was less likely to affect the DV of grey matter density. As the MBSR program was a conducted in the real-world setting, it can be argued that the study had ecological validity. There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Marks can only be awarded for evidence (except one definition mark). Accept 'control group'. Go with the logic/intention of the candidate to assess if about validity. FFMQ is a valid measure of mindfulness (progress).

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	Describe the sample used in the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning). 1 mark per correct point n=5 All females Same elephant stable in Nepal Four were juveniles/aged 5–7 years One was an adult/aged in her 50s Elderly elephant had foot abscess/impaired vision Selected for docility Not pregnant/no calf Mahout was willing to participate too All had been trained using traditional methods No experience of secondary positive reinforcement training.	4	List is definitive. Accept 'in captivity'.
9(b)	Explain <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning) and the study by Bandura et al. (aggression). Do not refer to the sample in your answer. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the similarity, e.g., observational, lack mundane realism, quantitative data collection 4 marks for the difference, e.g., qualitative data collection, experimental design used e.g., similarity e.g. 4 marks Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques. This means that specific behaviours could be operationalised to improve validity (explanation). For example, in Fagen there was trunk down which meant the trunk was hanging loose and in Bandura gun play was pretending to shoot at an object in the room.	8	Award L1–L4 for similarity Award L1–L4 for difference For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the similarity or difference. Different aim = L1 Different species = L0 (sample) Experimental designs = 0 Sample/sampling = 0 Both from the learning approach = L2 Fagen is not a field experiment so = 0

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
9(b)	3 marks Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques. For example, in Fagen there was trunk down which meant the trunk was hanging loose/Bandura gun play was pretending to shoot at an object in the room. 2 marks Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques. For example, in Fagen there was trunk down. 1 mark Both the Fagen study and the Bandura study used observation as part of their data collection techniques <table><tr><th>Mark/Level</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.</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 are used briefly.</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></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response.</td></tr></table>	Mark/Level	Description	4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.	3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.	2	The similarity/difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity/difference is well explained but there is no study evidence.	1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.	0	No creditable response.		
Mark/Level	Description														
4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.														
3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.														
2	The similarity/difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity/difference is well explained but there is no study evidence.														
1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.														
0	No creditable response.														

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points must be about ethics. Strengths include: Qualitative data, quantitative data, reliability, validity (ecological) Weaknesses include: Ethics, field experiments, validity, generalisations Example: in detail The study was unethical as one ethical guideline they broke was informed consent as no passenger had any information about the study/agreed to take part in the study. Also, the event of watching someone stagger and fall to ground could have been psychologically stressful for the passengers. Example: brief but in context The data collected was rich in detail and directly from the P. The data could be used to help explain why the Ps were helped or did not help. For example, one participant said, 'it's for men to help'. Example: no context The sample was only from one place making generalisability difficult.	10	

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	5	- Very good evaluation including the named issue. - Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. - Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10		
	4	- Good evaluation including the named issue. - Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. - Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8		
	3	- Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue. - Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly. - Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6		
	2	- Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue. - Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. - Some points may have no context. - Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.	3–4		
	1	- Little or no evaluation. - Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial. - Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2		
	0	No creditable response.			