

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/11**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2025**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 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **24** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

3 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.

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	A creditworthy point made by the candidate A creditworthy 'what' for a generic everyday application question
	An incorrect response
	Benefit of Doubt
	Repetition of a point
	Unclear response
	The named issue in the 10-mark essay
    	Levels used for the 10-mark essay (L1–L5) Levels used for the 8-mark similarity/difference question (L1–L4)

PUBLISHED

Annotation	Meaning
	Not Answering the Question
	The blank page has been seen. An attached response has been seen.
	A creditworthy strength in the 10-mark essay. A creditworthy 'how' for a generic everyday application question
	A creditworthy weakness in the 10-mark essay.
	A creditworthy point in the 10-mark essay that is brief
	A creditworthy point in the 10-mark essay that is detailed
	A creditworthy ethical guideline in Q6(b) A relevant example in Q4

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	In the study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences), an example of a toy in the ‘wheeled’ category was a car. Identify <u>one</u> other toy that was in the ‘wheeled’ category. 1 mark for a correct toy. Wagon/truck/construction vehicle/shopping cart/dump truck.	1	If more than one response given, take first one only. Accept trolley, bin wagon, lorry.
1(b)	Outline what was meant by the behaviour ‘drag’ as used in this study. 1 mark per correct point. Moving the toy <u>along the ground</u>. With the toy <u>behind</u> the monkey.	2	List is definitive. Do not credit ‘drag the toy’. Accept ‘pulling’ as meaning ‘behind the monkey’.
1(c)	Outline what is meant by the term ‘socialisation’. 2 marks full/detailed definition. 1 mark partial/brief definition. e.g., 2 marks Socialisation is any mechanism that changes/adapts a behaviour to societal/cultural expectations. The way someone is educated/reinforced/conditioned/learns socially acceptable/typical behaviours. e.g., 1 mark The way society has made certain behaviours typical/‘the norm’. The process of conforming to roles. What society expects from a person. There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore reference to ‘social behaviour’ or ‘interacting with people’. 1 mark = changing/adapting or equivalent. 1 mark = societal/cultural norms/expectations or equivalent. (Do not accept environment as this mechanism).

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): One conclusion from the study was that when a person's responsibility is taken from them, they are willing to harm someone else. Outline <u>one</u> other conclusion from this study. 2 marks full/detailed conclusion. 1 mark partial/brief conclusion. Individuals appear to be much more obedient to an authority figure than we might expect (2 marks). People will follow/listen to an authority figure even if it means harming another person (2 marks). People find it stressful to follow destructive orders from a person in authority (2 marks). People will be obedient to an authority figure (1 mark). 26 participants pressed the 450v switch (0 marks: result). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Ignore responses that are simply results. Do not credit responses that are the same as the conclusion in the question.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	Explain <u>one</u> strength of this study. 1 mark for identifying the strength via naming or description. 1 mark for outlining the strength with an example from Milgram. e.g. The procedure was standardised so could be replicated/tested for reliability (1 mark: identification). For example, <u>all</u> participants received a 45v shock (1 mark: example). There are other creditworthy responses, including validity/credibility, debriefing of participants, collection of quantitative and/or qualitative data etc.	2	Do not credit laboratory <u>experiment</u> arguments (e.g., IV/DV cause-effect), but in a laboratory so controlled can be credited for max 1 mark. Validity by itself is not enough for the identification mark.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	From the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning): The ‘capture technique’ was used in the training of the elephants. Outline what is meant by the ‘capture technique’ as used in this study. 1 mark per correct point. 1 mark available for example from study. The trainer waits for an animal to perform a specified behaviour. This has to be spontaneous/natural. This behaviour is then marked/rewarded repeatedly. The behaviour of blow was captured from a natural exhale (from the elephant).	2	List is definitive. Spontaneous = 1 mark Reward = 1 mark Accept ‘accidental’.
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result about the mean success rate for the ‘trunk wash’ task over time. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison. 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison. e.g., 2 marks There was a general trend of the higher the number of sessions, the higher the mean percentage pass trunk washes. There was a dip in mean percentage success rates between sessions 25 and 30. e.g., 1 mark The elephants got better over time/had more success/increased over time.	2	Do not credit that 4 juveniles passed/adult failed. Do not credit the number of trials it took to pass the trunk wash. If two numbers are approximately correct (e.g., 36% up to 86%) = 2 marks.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	From the study by Perry et al. (personal space): Describe the procedure of <u>one</u> trial for Experiment 1 from when the fixation point appeared until the end of the trial. 1 mark per correct point The participant was shown a still picture. This was of a circular room. There was a figure at the centre of the room. There was an approaching figure. This came from one of eight entrances. This was a ball/friend/authority/stranger (only 1 mark for example) There was a 3s animation of the figuring approaching the centre. Ps were asked to imagine themselves at the centre of circle. They had to press the spacebar when they wanted the figure to stop. Or the trial ended when the figure collided with the 'participant'.	4	List is definitive. Do not credit fixation point as this is in the question. Do not credit that the name of the protagonist was displayed on the screen as this happened before the fixation point appeared.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): The Group 1 sample consisted of 15 participants who were all male. Identify <u>two</u> other features of the Group 1 sample. 1 mark per correct feature. Adults. Diagnosed with AS/HFA. Recruited via advertisements in magazine/volunteer sample. Similar socioeconomic class to Group 2. Similar education background to Group 2. Mean IQ 115/similar IQ for Group 4. Mean age = 29.7 years.	2	List is definitive. Age tolerance is 29–30 years. Do credit 'from the UK'.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(b)	Explain <u>one</u> strength of the revised eyes test. 1 mark for identifying the strength of the RET. 1 mark for explaining the strength using an example from the RET. e.g., Quantitative data is collected so easy to compare/is comparable (1 mark: identification). This means that the ability on the eyes test can be compared between those diagnosed with AS/HFA and those in the control groups to detect Theory of Mind (1 mark: explanation). Published so can replicate and test for reliability (1 mark: identification). This means that other researchers can use the eyes test on a different sample of AS/HFA participants to see if the same results/deficit happens (1 mark: explanation). There are other creditworthy responses.	2	Do credit responses about improvements from the original version of the eyes test. Do not credit strengths about the <u>study itself</u>, it must be about the RET.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	In the background to their study, Pozzulo et al. (line-ups) outlined the role of social factors in identification errors made by children. Outline the role of social factors in these errors. 1 mark per correct point. The experimenter/police officer might be seen as an authority figure. This makes the child feel intimidated/nervous/stressed. The child chooses to not get into trouble. The child might want to 'please' the experimenter/police officer so chooses anyway. It could be social pressure affecting identification in line-ups (rather than cognitive). The mere presentation of a line-up from an adult might make the child feel like a choice has to be made. Not selecting might indicate that the child is not willing to take part and therefore a wrong choice is made. The child might guess who the experimenter/police officer thinks is the culprit and choose them. There are other creditworthy points.	3	Do not credit findings from the study by Pozzulo. There is no identification mark available.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(b)	Two friends, Doris and Tony are discussing the ethics of the study by Pozzulo et al. (line-ups). Doris says the study is ethical, but Tony says it is <u>not</u> ethical. Outline why you think <u>either</u> Doris <u>or</u> Tony is correct, using evidence from the study. 1 mark for identifying a <u>relevant</u> ethical guideline. Up to 4 marks for explanation(s) or consequence(s) of breaking/adhering to guidelines. e.g., Doris Consent <u>for the child participants</u> is assumed (1 mark: identification) as the child's parent/guardian completed the Demographic and Cartoon Watching Form/consented on behalf of their child (1 mark: explanation). The task of watching a line-up and having to identify a cartoon character is not stressful (1 mark: explanation). Also, the children were already familiar with Dora/Diego so seeing these faces amongst others would not be seen as psychologically stressful (1 mark: explanation). e.g., Tony The children might have felt some psychological stress in the target-absent line-up (1 mark: identification). This is because we know that social pressures can impact on children, and they may have chosen under cognitive stress (1 mark: explanation). It can also be argued that there was no right to withdraw (1 mark: guideline) as participants were questioned by an adult and they may have felt like they had to answer (1 mark: explanation). There are other creditworthy arguments.	4	If both Doris and Tony feature in the answer, mark them independently and credit the highest score. If the candidate mixes up Doris and Tony (e.g. says Tony but gives an ethical based answer) or does not choose a name, then max 2 and annotate with a ? Tick–e = ethical guideline Relevant guidelines are: Doris: consent; harm/stress; debrief; confidentiality. Tony: harm/stress; consent (only award if in context of children); right to withdraw. Do not accept deception.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	The debate about individual and situational explanations relates to the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): Outline what is meant by this debate, including <u>one</u> example from the individual explanation and <u>one</u> example from the situational explanation, each from the study by Piliavin et al. 1 mark for outlining individual explanation plus 1 mark for example from Piliavin. 1 mark for outlining situational explanation plus 1 mark for example from Piliavin. e.g., individual The individual side refers to behaviours from factors within the person (dispositional) (1 mark). Some people left the critical area after the victim collapsed as they had a personality of not helping (1 mark). e.g., situational The situational side refers to behaviour from factors in the external environment (1 mark). Overall, the ill victim was helped more than the drunk victim. This could be because the drunk victim had caused the situation of collapsing themselves, which was not true for the ill victim (1 mark). There are other creditworthy examples.	4	Ignore tautological definitions. Example marks can <u>only</u> be awarded for Piliavin's study. Tick = definition Tick-e = example from Piliavin. Go with the logic of the candidate.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	Your friend, Pavel, is complaining that he cannot relax. He tells you that his job is stressful. He has come to you for advice on how to relax. Using your knowledge of the study by Hölzel et al. (mindfulness and brain scans): Outline the advice you would give to Pavel. 1 mark per piece of advice clearly based on the study by Hölzel et al. Pavel should engage in mindful yoga. With some stretching exercises/slow movement in conjunction with breathing. He can be taught to become ‘fully aware’ of his body sensations. He could begin to mentally note these feelings of stress, so he knows when he feels them. He could begin “observing” where he notices stressful stimuli. He can be encouraged to practice this for 45 minutes per day/practice at work or home. He should continue to engage in mindfulness for around 8 weeks. There are other creditworthy pieces of advice.	4	No credit for justifying advice as this is not what the question is about. Do not credit ‘mindfulness’ by itself. 1 mark max can be awarded for identification of a relevant task, e.g., MBSR class, yoga, meditation, body scan etc. Only credit any timeframe once, e.g., 8-weeks, 45 mins, long-term, daily etc. e.g., he should attend an 8-week MBSR course = 2 marks total (1 for MBSR and 1 from the timeframe). Credit descriptions of what would happen in body scanning, yoga, meditation etc.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)	Explain <u>one</u> reason for <u>one</u> piece of advice you outlined in part (a). 2 marks for full/detailed reason either based on findings of the study or knowledge of mechanisms of technique (e.g., mindfulness, meditation). 1 mark for partial/brief reason. e.g., 2 marks One result from the study showed that engaging in mindfulness increased ‘observing’ behaviour so Pavel can identify and control stressors at work, therefore, reducing stress. Meditation allows Pavel to focus on one thing at a time allowing him to reconnect/make time for himself and not let work dominate. There was an increase in grey matter in the MBSR group in areas that could control stress/emotion. e.g., 1 mark In the study by Hölzel, the effects of mindfulness were seen in the long-term. There was an increase in grey matter in the MBSR group. Meditation helps to clear stressful thoughts. Mindfulness allows you to relax/promotes relaxation.	2	The response must be linked to something mentioned in Q8(a).

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams): Describe how the EEG (electroencephalogram) was used in this study. 1 mark per correct point. Electrodes were placed next to the eyes. Electrodes were placed on the scalp. All electrode lead wires were further attached to top of the head. They were made into a single cord. To prevent entanglement/give P free movement. The EEG ran continuously (all night). The speed of paper (3 or 6 mm per sec) allowed easy recognition of eye-movements. The eye movements picked up by the EEG allowed the researcher to wake up the P at specific times (in REM or NREM)/used to identify stage of sleep the participant was in. It could measure the direction of eye movement (during dreaming).	4	List is definitive. Do not credit 'on the eyes', in the brain' or 'attached to head' (too generic). Used to detect brain waves/electrical (brain) activity/frequency and amplitude = 1 mark max.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> similarities between the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams) and one other study from the biological approach. Do <u>not</u> refer to brain measurement techniques. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the similarity (twice), e.g., research techniques used, type of data collected (quantitative/qualitative), sampling technique, ethics. e.g., similarity 4 marks Both studies collected quantitative data which allowed for direct comparisons between groups/conditions (explanation). In the Dement study, the number of times dreams were recalled in REM and NREM were recorded and compared for differences. Also, in the study by Hassett, the duration of play with wheeled and plush toys was recorded so sex differences between monkeys could be seen. 3 marks Both studies collected quantitative data. In the Dement study, the number of times dreams were recalled in REM and NREM were recorded and compared for differences. Also, in the study by Hassett, the duration of play with wheeled and plush toys was recorded. 2 marks Both studies collected quantitative data. In the Dement study, the number of times dreams were recalled in REM and NREM were recorded. 1 mark Both Dement and Hassett collected quantitative data.	8	The other studies from the biological approach are Hölzel and Hassett. Do accept Perry if about biological mechanisms. Award L1–L4 for <u>each</u> similarity. For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the similarity. Ignore responses about brain measurement techniques like EEG/MRI etc. Both investigated biology = L1 max. For Dement vs. Hölzel: Both studied brain = L0 Both used humans = L1 Repeated measures = L3 max.

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 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 ethics. Strengths include reliability (standardisation), quantitative data, validity. Weaknesses include ecological validity, ethics, generalisability, quantitative data. Example: in detail The study collected quantitative data which makes it easier to make meaningful comparisons between groups/conditions. They measured things like number of times a physical/verbal aggression was imitated. This meant there could be a direct comparison between aggressive/nonaggressive models or male/female models. Example: brief but in context (named issue) The children may have been psychologically harmed/stressed by watching an adult beat up a Bobo doll in front of them. Example: no context There was a standardised procedure meaning it could be replicated/tested for reliability.	10	

PUBLISHED

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.	

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/12**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2025**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 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **23** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

3 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.

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	A creditworthy point made by the candidate A creditworthy 'what' for a generic everyday application question
	An incorrect response
	Benefit of Doubt
	Repetition of a point
	Unclear response
	The named issue in the 10-mark essay
    	Levels used for the 10-mark essay (L1–L5) Levels used for the 8-mark similarity/difference question (L1–L4)

PUBLISHED

Annotation	Meaning
	Not Answering the Question
	The blank page has been seen. An attached response has been seen.
	A creditworthy strength in the 10-mark essay. A creditworthy 'how' for a generic everyday application question
	A creditworthy weakness in the 10-mark essay.
	A creditworthy point in the 10-mark essay that is brief .
	A creditworthy point in the 10-mark essay that is detailed .
	A relevant ethical guideline in Q4 . A creditworthy example in Q7 .

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	From the study by Milgram (obedience): State the number of participants who pressed the maximum shock level switch (450 volts). 1 mark for correct number. 26.	1	If more than one response given, take first one only.
1(b)	One example of a sign of tension shown by the participants in this study was nervous laughter. Identify <u>two</u> other signs of tension shown by participants. 1 mark per correct identification. Sweat(ing). Tremble/trembling/shaking/shivering. Stuttering. Biting lip. Groaning. Dig nails into flesh. Smiling. Violent convulsion/seizure.	2	List is definitive. Accept 'verbal comments'/they asked to stop. Do not accept shouting or nervous laughter.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(c)	Before the study, fourteen psychology students from Yale University were told about the procedure of the study. Outline what these students were asked to predict about the study. 1 mark per correct point. They were asked to reflect carefully/predict the behaviour of 100 (hypothetical) people. They had to plot the distribution of obedience based on the characteristics of the sample. They were asked what percentage of participants/how many participants would press the 450-volt switch.	2	List is definitive. Do credit 'asked at which voltage they would stop' for marking point 2. Do credit answers like 'asked to predict if people <u>would harm</u> another to obey authority' etc. for 1 mark. Do not credit any findings of these predictions

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Bandura et al. (aggression): One conclusion was that boys are more likely to imitate aggressive behaviour than girls. Outline <u>one</u> other conclusion from this study. 2 marks full/detailed conclusion. 1 mark partial/brief conclusion Witnessing an aggressive act is enough to produce aggression in the person who observed it (2 marks). Children will reproduce aggressive behaviours in the absence of an observed model/adult (2 marks) Children are more likely to imitate the aggression of a same sex model (2 marks) Girls are more likely to imitate verbal aggression (1 mark) Children will imitate aggression (1 mark) Boys showed more gun aggression (0 marks: result). There are other creditworthy conclusions.	2	Do not credit the conclusion already presented in the question. No mention of aggression = 1 mark max. For sex differences conclusions based on type of aggression, the only creditworthy response is about girls and verbal aggression for 1 mark max. Comparisons to no-model or non-aggressive model = 1 mark max as part result. Mention of 'group' or 'condition' = 0 marks (result).
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> weakness of this study in relation to the sample of participants. 1 mark for identifying the weakness related to the sample. 1 mark for outlining the weakness with an example from the study. e.g., Difficult to generalise from the sample (1 mark: identification). The sample was only from one nursery so this could make it difficult to generalise as the sample may not fully represent children in other parts of the world/different nurseries as it was a university nursery (1 mark: outlining). There are other creditworthy sample-related weaknesses.	2	Accept arguments linked to the ethics of using children for 1 mark max. Do not credit 'cannot generalise to adults'. Do award the identification of 'low generalisability' even if the example is incorrect. Accept 'cannot be applied' and 'not representative' as ID marks.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	In the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans), there were: models victims (acting drunk or acting ill) Identify <u>two</u> features of the models used in this study. 1 mark per correct feature. White. Male. Age 24-29. Wore informal/casual clothes.	2	List is definitive. Ignore reference to the victims. Do credit n=4 Do accept 'boys', 'students' and 'Caucasian' Do not accept 'adults'
3(b)	Outline <u>one</u> result in relation to the victim acting drunk before any model gave help. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison. 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison. e.g., 2 marks A white drunk victim was helped more than a black drunk victim. More people left the critical area when the drunk victim was white compared to when the drunk victim was black. More comments were made when the drunk victim was white compared to when the drunk victim was black. Same-race helping was seen more than other-race helping. e.g., 1 mark On a higher percentage of trials, a white drunk victim was helped. <u>More</u> people left the critical area when the drunk victim was white. More likely to help same-race (drunk) victim.	2	If candidate compares drunk and ill victims = 1 mark max. "Drunk received (spontaneous) help on 19 out of 38 trials = 2 marks. Responses do not need to mention 'drunk' to get credit as this is implied from the question. Ignore references to speed of helping.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	Describe how Hassett et al. followed ethical guidelines in relation to animals in their study about monkey toy preferences. 1 mark per correct point up to 4 marks 1 mark available for identifying a relevant ethical guideline. e.g., They followed the ethical guideline of housing (1 mark: identification) as the monkeys were socially housed in accordance with them being a social species (1 mark). (There was no deprivation of) the monkeys as water was continuously available/fed regularly on appropriate diet/given access to food and water. The monkeys had a 25 m x 25 m outdoor enclosure (to roam around in). The indoor enclosure was temperature-controlled (for comfort). They followed the guideline stipulated by NIH with environmental enrichment so again no deprivation. There was minimum harm as the toys chosen were not dangerous. They followed the guideline for species, and the purpose of the study was to study organisms close to humans on the evolutionary scale (used rhesus monkeys). No direct observations/observed via cameras to reduce distress. The monkeys were kept/tested in an area they were familiar with (to reduce stress). There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Ignore reference to ethical guidelines for human participants. Go with the intention of the candidate. Relevant guidelines are: Harm/distress Species Number Housing Reward/deprivation Tick-e = relevant guideline identified The candidate can score 4 marks even if a guideline is not explicitly named.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	From the study by Hölzel et al. (mindfulness and brain scans): ‘Acting with awareness’ was a factor measured by the ‘Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire’. Outline what is meant by ‘acting with awareness’ in this study. 2 marks for full outline. 1 mark for partial outline. This is focusing on current behaviour/actions instead of behaving automatically (2 marks). Focusing on current behaviour (1 mark).	2	For 2 marks there needs to be mention of: Conscious focus (opposed) to unconscious. Do not credit ‘being aware of....’ ‘Know what are doing’/thinking or equivalent = 1 mark (take as conscious/current).
5(b)	Outline <u>one</u> strength of the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire as used in this study. 1 mark for identifying the strength. 1 mark for outlining the strength via example from the study. e.g., The FFMQ generated quantitative data which allowed for statistical comparisons (1 mark: identifying), therefore, the scores could be compared before and after MBSR training to see any changes/effects of the programme (1 mark: example). The FFMQ is a standardised test for mindfulness (1 mark: identifying). There are other creditworthy strengths, including used as a baseline measure, used in other studies (reliable).	2	Do not credit general strengths about the study by Hölzel. It must be about the FFMQ. Do not credit anything being ‘easier’

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	In the background to their study, Perry et al. outlined how biological factors affect interpersonal distance (personal space) preferences. Outline how biological factors affect interpersonal distance (personal space) preferences. 1 mark per correct point. Oxytocin (may) plays a role in personal space/empathy/social bonding/social salience etc. Lesions in the amygdala appear to reduce the need for personal space. Amygdala activity in healthy individuals is correlated with feeling uncomfortable at close distances. Amygdala activation is affected by levels of oxytocin. In some contexts, oxytocin promotes any aversion to risk/envy/lack of cooperation. Oxytocin can also affect the personal space needed between self and someone perceived as attractive. There are other creditworthy responses.	3	Do not credit procedure or findings from the study by Perry. There is no identification mark available. Do accept 'healthy amygdala may prefer further interpersonal distance'
6(b)	Two friends, Alexandre and Derek are discussing the ethics of the study by Perry et al. (personal space). Alexandre says the study is ethical, but Derek says it is not ethical. Outline <u>one</u> reason why Alexandre is correct and one reason why Derek is correct. For each reason: 1 mark for evidence/relevant ethical guideline and 1 mark for explanation.	4	If the candidate mixes up Alexandre and Derek (e.g. says Derek but gives an ethical based answer) then max 1 <i>per person</i> and annotate with a ? Do not credit deception (including ID mark) for the following arguments: - Not knowing whether they were being given OT or placebo - The idea that they never had the conversation in Exp2 <u>without reference to this being distressing</u>

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(b)	e.g., Alexandre Written consent was taken from the participants (1 mark: guideline). They knew the study would be about personal space/knew they would have oxytocin (1 mark: explanation). The ethical committee at the Medical Centre/University approved the study as being ethical/required it (1 mark: alternative explanation). The task of watching someone get closer is minimising risk (1 mark: guideline). They could press the spacebar to stop the figure approaching more, protecting them from psychological stress (1 mark: explanation). e.g., Derek In experiment 2 they were told they would be chatting with another participant/ a computer would calculate an average room for them <u>and this might have been distressing</u> (1 mark: explanation). This never happened, so the Ps were deceived (1 mark: guideline) The act of intruding into someone's personal space (even if it was an animation) can still be stressful/harmful (1 mark: guideline). There was also no way of knowing if any participant would react to oxytocin (1 mark: explanation) so there was risk/potential physical harm involved (1 mark: guideline). There are other creditworthy responses.		So, only award the deception ID mark if the argument is linked to feeling stressed, otherwise = 0 If ethical guideline is the same for Alexandre and Derek, then can only award the ID mark once. However, physical and psychological harm can be awarded separately.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	The debate about individual and situational explanations relates to the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams). Outline what is meant by this debate, including <u>one</u> example from the individual explanation and <u>one</u> example from the situational explanation from the study by Dement and Kleitman. 1 mark for outlining individual explanation plus 1 mark for example from Dement. 1 mark for outlining situational explanation plus 1 mark for example from Dement. e.g., individual The individual side refers to behaviours from factors within the person (dispositional) (1 mark). All the dreams reported were unique, like throwing tomatoes at each other, showing that a person's individual personality is seen in their dreams (1 mark). e.g., situational The situational side refers to behaviour from factors in the external environment (1 mark). The participants were sleeping in a laboratory with an EEG attached to them so this scenario may have affected their ability to recall dreams/estimated time in REM (1 mark). There are other creditworthy examples.	4	Ignore tautological definitions, including “individual differences or individual factors” Example marks can <u>only</u> be awarded for Dement and Kleitman's study or related to sleep and dreaming in general. Tick-e = example mark (go with the logic/intention of the candidate). Do not credit ‘different people have different dreams’ for the example mark for the individual explanation.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	Carole, a language teacher, has noticed that her students have difficulty concentrating when listening to a recording of people talking in a second language. Her students have difficulty recalling the information from this recording. Carole needs to help her students and has come to you for advice. Using your knowledge of the study by Andrade (doodling): Outline the advice you would give to Carole. 1 mark per piece of advice clearly based on the study by Andrade. e.g. Carole could give each student a piece of paper. That has shapes on it They can colour/shade them in. There should be a margin to write notes/target information. Tell the students not to worry about being neat/their neatness (at shading). She could ask them to focus on specific pieces of information in the listening task. She must tell them that there will be a test after the listening tasks. She needs to tell them not to engage in free doodling/drawing their own doodles. Let them listen in a (dull) quiet room There are other creditworthy pieces of advice.	4	No credit for justifying advice as this is not what the question is about. Do not credit the following: ‘Doodling’, ‘doodle’ or ‘secondary task’ by itself. Scribbling. Give them a monotonous recording. Give them a <u>surprise</u> test. Allow them to draw their own doodles. Ask them to start <u>shading</u> in the <u>shapes</u> = 2 marks A different explicitly named secondary task can be awarded 1 mark (e.g., fidget toy).

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)	Explain <u>one</u> reason for <u>one</u> piece of advice you outlined in part (a). 2 marks for full/detailed reason 1 mark for partial/brief reason e.g., 2 marks One result from the study showed that the group who doodled whilst listening to a dull telephone recording, could recall more (monitored) information/(incidental) information, showing that doodling is good for concentration/recall. Doodling could avoid/avoids <u>daydreaming</u> to help concentration/aiding memory recall. A dull quiet room will not have other <u>sounds</u> so concentration should be better. Doodling can improve concentration/attention which helps improve memory recall. e.g., 1 mark In the study by Andrade, doodling aided memory recall. Doodling could avoid/avoids daydreaming. Doodling can aid concentration/information processing/attention A dull/quiet room will allow for better concentration.	2	The response must be linked to something mentioned in Q8(a). Only credit advice chosen by the candidate that is based on the study by Andrade.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia): Describe the participant used in this study. 1 mark per correct point made. (one) boy/male. 9-year-old. Hispanic/American. He was presented (by his mum) to a Child Anxiety and Phobic Program. He did <u>not</u> meet the criteria for OCD. He did meet the criteria (DSM-IV) for a phobia. He had experienced a bowl of buttons falling on him (at school). Had his phobia at 5 years of age/4 years prior to study.	4	List is definitive. Do not credit he had a phobia of buttons as this is in the question.
9(b)	Explain <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia) and the study by Bandura et al. (aggression). Do <u>not</u> refer to sampling in your answer. Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the similarity, e.g., quantitative data collection, both about learnt behaviours. 4 marks for the difference, e.g., experimental vs. non-experimental, sample, learning theory focused on.	8	Award L1-L4 for the similarity Award L1-L4 for the difference For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the similarity/difference. For similarity: Both used children = L1 Both from the learning approach/follow learning assumptions = L1

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	e.g., difference e.g., 4 marks The two studies focus on a different theory from the learning approach. Bandura focused on social learning involving imitation and observation. Saavedra focused on operant conditioning/classical conditioning whereby the boy got rewarded by his mum during the treatment of his button phobia. So, Bandura is about vicarious learning, but Saavedra is about direct 'hands-on' experiences (explanation). e.g., 3 marks The two studies focus on a different theory from the learning approach. Bandura focused on social learning involving imitation and observation. Saavedra focused on operant conditioning/classical conditioning. e.g., 2 marks The two studies focus on a different theory from the learning approach. Bandura focused on social learning involving imitation and observation. e.g., 1 mark The two studies focus on a different theory from the learning approach.		For difference: Different aims = L1 Quantitative vs qualitative = L2 max If the candidate does not identify the similarity or difference explicitly so it reads like a description of both studies = L1

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.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Pozzulo et al. (line-ups) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about ecological validity. Strengths include reliability (standardisation), quantitative data, validity, ethics. Weaknesses include ecological validity, ethics, generalisability, quantitative data.	10	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance									
10	Example: in detail The procedure was standardised so could be replicated. For example, for every participant the instructions for the line-up identification process were the same, and we know that the cartoon targets were Dora and Diego. Therefore, the study can be tested for reliability. Example: brief but in context The sample came from a participant pool at Eastern Ontario University so they might not represent other people as they could be more motivated to participate Example: no context There were controls in place so they could establish cause and effect/has internal validity <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Mark</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td> • Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective. </td><td>9–10</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td> • Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective. </td><td>7–8</td></tr></table>	Level	Description	Mark	5	• Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10	4	• Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8		
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										

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	Level	Description	Mark		
	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.			

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY**9990/13**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

October/November 2025**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 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **23** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

3 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.

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	A creditworthy point made by the candidate A creditworthy 'what' for a generic everyday application question
	An incorrect response
	Benefit of Doubt
	Repetition of a point
	Unclear response
	The named issue in the 10-mark essay
    	Levels used for the 10-mark essay (L1–L5) Levels used for the 8-mark similarity/difference question (L1–L4)

Annotation	Meaning
	Not Answering the Question
	The blank page has been seen. An attached response has been seen.
	A creditworthy strength in the 10-mark essay. A creditworthy 'how' for a generic everyday application question
	A creditworthy weakness in the 10-mark essay.
	A creditworthy point in the 10-mark essay that is brief
	A creditworthy point in the 10-mark essay that is detailed
	A creditworthy example in Q7

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	From the study by Andrade (doodling): Outline how the participants were recruited in this study. 1 mark per correct point. By opportunity sampling. The participants had just completed an unrelated experiment. They were asked if they would spend another 5 minutes helping out another study. They were members of a participant panel/volunteers.	2	List is definitive.
1(b)	Identify <u>two</u> features of the piece of paper given to the participants in the doodling condition. 1 mark per correct feature. Shapes were 1cm (in diameter). 10 shapes per row. (Alternating rows of) squares and circles. Margin down the side (to write target information). A4 size.	2	List is definitive. Accept 'same size shapes' = 1 mark
1(c)	Identify how recall of incidental information was measured. 1 mark for correct answer. (Correct) number of places (recalled).	1	Take the first answer only.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans): One conclusion was that, in a natural setting, people do offer spontaneous help to a victim in need. Outline <u>one</u> other conclusion from this study. 2 marks full/detailed conclusion. 1 mark partial/brief conclusion. e.g., A person who is 'ill' is more likely to receive help than a person who is 'drunk' (2 marks). People help ill victims more often (1 mark).	2	Do not credit conclusions about spontaneous help as this is in the question. Conclusions relating to diffusion of responsibility, the bystander effect or cost-reward are acceptable.
2(b)	Outline <u>one</u> ethical weakness of this study. 1 mark for identifying an appropriate/possible ethical issue. 1 mark for outlining the weakness using an example from Piliavin. e.g., The participants were deceived by the whole set up (1 mark). The victim was acting ill/drunk but the Ps never knew this (1 mark). As there were so many participants debriefing never happened so not everyone knew it was a fake set up/had taken part in a study (1 mark). Debriefing after the event happened would have ensured people knew it was fake (1 mark). There are other creditworthy weaknesses.	2	Do not credit a methodological weakness. Guidelines are: Deception Debriefing Harm/stress Consent Right to withdraw Privacy Confidentiality

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	The study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences) used a sample of male and female monkeys. Identify <u>two</u> features of the sample used in this study, other than sex and species. 1 mark per correct feature. Troop of 135 individuals. Lived together for more than 25 years. Lived at Yerkes Center. Matriline social structure/same natal group. 14 not used due to hormonal treatment. Age range 3 months to over 13 years. 82 potential participants. 34 monkeys used in data analysis. 39 infants not used (as interactions not coded). 53 monkeys were excluded in total.	2	List is definitive. No tolerance on numbers. Do credit information about rank if presented.
3(b)	Describe <u>one</u> result for the toy preferences of female monkeys in this study. 2 marks for the result with a meaningful comparison. 1 mark for result with no meaningful comparison. e.g., 2 marks There was only a slight increase in duration for play with a plush toy compared to a wheeled toy (for females). More female monkeys preferred wheeled toys compared to plush toys/no preference. Female monkeys played with plush toys with a longer frequency than wheeled toys. e.g., 1 mark There was only a slight increase in duration for play with a plush toy.	2	Accept results based on frequency or duration of play or % preference. No significant preference = 1 Any result compared to males = 1 mark max

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	From the study by Pozzulo et al. (line-ups): Describe how the cartoon foils were selected. 1 mark per correct point. They were selected from readily available images on the internet. They were chosen as they had a similar appearance to Dora/Diego. Similarity was based on facial structure/hair length/hair colour (only 1 mark for any of these). Three judges conducted the ratings. On 10 photographs for <u>each</u> target. The four cartoon characters receiving the highest similarity scores were used.	4	List is definitive. Do not credit what the pictures looked like (e.g., black and white; cropped) as the question is about <u>selection</u>.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	From the study by Perry et al. (personal space): One feature of the sample was that it consisted of only male participants. Identify <u>two</u> other features of the sample used in the study. 1 mark per correct feature. n=54 Undergraduates/students. University of Haifa. Age 19–32/average age 25.29 Gained course credit/volunteer sample. Normal/corrected to normal vision. No history of psychiatric/neurological conditions. 5 were left-handed.	2	List is definitive. Tolerance for average age is 25–26

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(b)	Explain <u>one</u> weakness of using animations in Experiment 1 in this study. 1 mark for identifying a weakness of using animations. 1 mark for explaining the weakness via example from the study by Perry. e.g., The use of animations lacks ecological validity/mundane realism (1 mark). The situations of an animated person approaching to measure personal space is not an everyday occurrence (1 mark). The use of animations is not a valid measure of personal space (1 mark). A person may act differently when personal space is invaded in reality compared to an animation (1 mark). There are other creditworthy weaknesses.	2	Do not credit general weaknesses of the study by Perry. It <u>must</u> be about animations.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	In the background to their study, Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia) outlined the role of disgust in childhood phobias. Outline the role of disgust in childhood phobias. 1 mark per correct point. Disgust is a feeling of aversion towards something offensive/something we fear. Disgust when interacting with fear can result in avoidance behaviour(s). Children can negatively <u>evaluate</u> a specific phobic object. This <u>evaluation</u> happens without any anticipation of threat (from the phobic object). So, as there is no fear, it must be disgust that is causing a negative evaluation. A study that measured disgust in children with a spider phobia, showed it decreased as fear decreased/showed a link between disgust and fear. They can be repulsed by a (previously) neutral stimulus.	3	List is all that is covered in the original paper but do credit other examples. Do credit 'usually triggered by a traumatic event in childhood' Do not credit examples from the boy in the study.
6(b)	Two friends, Hannah and Josh, are discussing the generalisability of the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia). Hannah says the study is generalisable, but Josh says it is <u>not</u> generalisable. Outline why you think <u>either</u> Hannah <u>or</u> Josh is correct, using evidence from the study. 1 mark per point made linked to generalisability	4	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(b)	e.g., Hannah The study used a fear/disgust hierarchy to rate the buttons. This could easily be used with other people who have different phobias. The use of positive reinforcement from his mum is useful to know. As this could be used with other children who have different phobias to help them overcome them. e.g., Josh The sample was just one (Hispanic American) boy (with a button phobia). This is rare/unique and would be difficult to generalise to other people with phobias. It might be that the results only apply to him and his <u>personal</u> experience in the classroom that caused the phobia. The experience of the bowl of buttons falling on him in a classroom is probably unique. Other children may react differently to certain buttons when they rate them on the Feelings Thermometer meaning it is subjective/less generalisable. The Imagery Exposure therapy may not generalise to people who have a more common phobia. There are other creditworthy responses.		If both Hannah and Josh feature in the answer, mark them independently and credit the highest score. For Hannah, can give credit for arguments stating mechanisms of the therapy that could be used with many other people. If the candidate mixes up Hannah and Josh (e.g., says Hannah but gives a 'is not generalisable') or does not name the friend then max 2 and annotate with a ? For Josh, 1 mark is available for stating who the study might not be generalisable to.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	The nature versus nurture debate relates to the study by Bandura et al. (aggression) Outline what is meant by this debate, including <u>one</u> example from the nature side and <u>one</u> example from the nurture side from the study by Bandura et al. 1 mark for outlining nature plus 1 mark for example from Bandura. 1 mark for outlining nurture plus 1 mark for example from Bandura. e.g., Nature Nature is about behaviours being genetically encoded and with us from birth (1 mark). Boys were more physically aggressive than girls as this could be due to them having higher levels of testosterone/due to hormones (1 mark). e.g., Nurture Nurture is about the learning of behaviours through experiences/after birth (1 mark). Participants in all conditions had already been matched on (pre-existing) aggression levels yet, for instance, male Ps were much more likely to imitate a physically aggressive male role model (1 mark). Ps were matched on levels of aggression (1 mark) and there were differences in levels of imitated behaviour depending on whether a model was aggressive or not, so learned (1 mark). There are other creditworthy examples.	4	Ignore examples that are not from Bandura. Do not accept tautological outlines, for example, nurture is about being nurtured. Tick-e = example.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	Pauline, a teacher, is helping her class of younger children to learn a new skill. The skill has a correct sequence of tasks. However, many children are getting this sequence wrong. Pauline needs to help the children and has come to you for advice. Using your knowledge of the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning): Outline the advice you would give to Pauline. 1 mark per piece of advice clearly based on the study by Fagen et al. 1 mark available for identifying a relevant primary <u>or</u> secondary reinforcer. Pauline could use a rewards-based system to get the children to learn the new skill. Every time the children get the task/part of the task correct, they get rewarded with something they desire. This could be a primary reinforcer/reward like some fruit/candy/food. She could also use a secondary reinforcer where the children can earn tokens every time they get the task correct. They could exchange the tokens for something they desire, like some extra play time. Pauline could shape the sequence needed to complete the new task/skill. This can be done by rewarding behaviours that get closer to the correct sequence. For example, they could be rewarded when the first attempt is correct but then when they get it correct two times and so on.	4	No credit for justifying advice as this is not what the question is about. The main ideas are operant conditioning including positive reinforcement, shaping, primary reinforcers, secondary reinforcers, capturing, luring, chaining. Do not credit punishment but do credit <u>do not</u> punish the children. If candidate names a task and uses that throughout answer, then credit. Do not credit classical conditioning or social learning examples. Responses such as 'shape the behaviour', 'using chaining', 'capture the behaviour' etc. cannot be awarded credit without telling <u>how</u> this would be achieved.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	Pauline could teach/instruct them each individual part of a sequence (and reward them). She could capture naturally occurring behaviours that the children show as part of the new skill. Pauline can reward the children for the correct sequence. There are other creditworthy pieces of advice		
8(b)	Explain <u>one</u> reason for <u>one</u> piece of advice you outlined in part (a). 2 marks for full/detailed reason. 1 mark for partial/brief reason. e.g., 2 marks One result from the study showed that shaping the behaviour of elephants with a sequence of behaviours lead to a successful trunk wash through secondary positive reinforcement. Operant conditioning predicts that rewards will increase the probability/encourage/motivate the children to repeat the behaviours. e.g., 1 mark In the study by Fagen, shaping the elephant's behaviour led to success. Rewards will motivate/encourage the children. There are other creditworthy reasons.	2	The response must be linked to something mentioned in Q8(a). Credit can be given to findings or theoretical arguments. Do not credit 'association'. Encourages them to continue/repeat = 2

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test): Describe the psychology being investigated. 1 mark per correct point. Creditworthy points include theory of mind, social sensitivity, reliability, validity. 1 mark available for an example from the study. e.g., Theory of Mind This refers to our ability to attribute mental states to ourselves and others. It is linked to empathy which is the ability to understand how other people are feeling/thinking. This can be done by imagining what the other person is feeling/thinking/putting ourselves in the shoes of others. It is also about how we use this knowledge to explain the actions of other people. It is also about how we use this knowledge to predict the actions of others. We use this knowledge to understand that people may have different ideas and hold different emotions to us. It can be tested using the Eyes Test where people have to judge the emotions of others' by looking at eyes only (example mark). There are other creditworthy responses.	4	Do credit descriptions of AS/HFA for 1 mark max.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> similarities between the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test) and the study by Andrade (doodling). Use the marking grid below. 4 marks for the similarity, e.g., experimental, lack mundane realism, quantitative data collection, experimental design used. e.g., similarity e.g., 4 marks Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen studies were experimental in nature. For example, both studies had IVs. In the Andrade study there were two conditions of doodling and non-doodling. In the Baron-Cohen study the IV was natural and based around if a person had been diagnosed with AS/HFA or not. Therefore, both were trying to establish cause and effect (explanation). e.g. 3 marks Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen studies were experimental in nature. For example, both studies had IVs. In the Andrade study there were two conditions of doodling and non-doodling/in the Baron-Cohen study the IV was natural and based around if a person had been diagnosed with AS/HFA or not. e.g. 2 marks Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen studies were experimental in nature. For example, both studies had IVs and measured DVs. e.g. 1 mark Both Andrade and Baron-Cohen were experimental in nature.	8	Award L1-L4 for <u>each</u> similarity For Level 4 there must be some attempt at <i>explaining</i> the similarity. Both used humans = L1 Both about cognitive psychology = L1 Both laboratory = L1 Both have good application = L3 max

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.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	Evaluate the study by Hölzel et al. (mindfulness and brain scans) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about self-reports. Strengths include: reliability (standardisation), quantitative data, validity, self-reports. Weaknesses include: ethics, generalisability, quantitative data, self-reports.	10	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance									
10	Example: in detail (named issue) The self-report collected quantitative data which makes it easier to have meaningful comparisons between groups/conditions. They Ps completed the FFMQ at two-time points (before and after MBSR or control). As a result, they could compare changes in all five measures of mindfulness for both groups of Ps to test longer-term effectiveness. Example: brief but in context The sample size was only 16 participants making it difficult to generalise beyond the sample. Example: no context There were controls in place so they could establish cause and effect/has internal validity. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Mark</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td> • Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective. </td><td>9–10</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td> • Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective. </td><td>7–8</td></tr></table>	Level	Description	Mark	5	• Very good evaluation including the named issue. • Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail. • Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10	4	• Good evaluation including the named issue. • Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth. • Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8		
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										

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
10	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.			