Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY **9990/11**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates **October/November 2022**

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 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2022

[Turn over

Generic Marking Principles

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

© UCLES 2022

Social Science-Specific Marking Principles (for point-based marking)

1 Components using point-based marking:

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

From this it follows that we:

a DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)

b DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct

c DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons …).

d DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)

e DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities

f DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).

g DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

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

3 Annotation:

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

© UCLES 2022

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**From the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams):** **State the number of participants who were 'studied intensively' in this study.** 1 mark for the correct answer. 5	**1**
1(b)	**Describe the procedure used to investigate dream recall in this study.** 1 mark per correct answer. An (ordinary) doorbell sound was used to wake participants; They were woken in REM or NREM sleep; It was placed near the bed; The participant had to speak into a recording device (next to the bed); They had to state if they had dreamed (or not); If they had, then they had to speak about the content; Sometimes an experimenter would enter the room and ask them more questions;	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**From the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia):** **Name <u>two</u> stimuli that were rated 5 or higher on the boy's Disgust/Fear Hierarchy.** 1 mark per correct answer. Hugging mom wearing large plastic buttons; Hugging mom wearing regular/medium plastic buttons; Medium coloured plastic buttons; Medium clear plastic buttons; Small coloured plastic buttons; Small clear plastic buttons;	**2**
2(b)	**Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study.** 2 marks detailed conclusion 1 mark partial/brief conclusion e.g. Disgust does play a crucial role in the development and maintenance of a (button) phobia; Imagery exposure can have a positive long-term effect on reducing distress linked to phobias (2 marks); People can be successfully treated for phobias (1 mark); He was able to wear his school uniform at follow-up (0 marks: result); There are other creditworthy responses.	**2**

© UCLES 2022

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**From the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test):** **Describe the sample for Group 1 in this study.** Adults; Male; Diagnosed with AS/HFA; N = 15; Recruited via advertisements in magazine/volunteer sample; Similar socioeconomic class to Group 2; Similar education background to Group 2; IQ 115/similar IQ for Group 4; Mean age = 29.7 years;	**3**
3(b)	**The original 'Reading the Mind in the Eyes' test had several problems. Two of these problems were:** • **the test only used 25 pairs of eyes** • **some words in the test were difficult to understand.** **State how this study solved each of these problems with the revised 'Reading the Mind in the Eyes' test.** 1 mark per correct 'resolution' Problem 1: 25 pairs of eyes = there were 36 pairs of eyes used Problem 2: some words were difficult to comprehend = a glossary (of definitions) was available	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	**From the study by Laney et al. (false memory):** **Describe the 'Memory or Belief?' questionnaire used in this study.** 1 mark per correct point. They had to respond to three items on the FHI; Including the critical item about asparagus (loved asparagus the first time you tried it); They had three choices for their answer; Specific memory of the event; Had a belief the event had happened; Positive it had never occurred; They were encouraged to explain their answer choices;	**4**

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	**Outline <u>one</u> weakness of the 'Memory or Belief?' questionnaire used in this study.** 1 mark for identifying a weakness 1 mark for linking it to the study e.g. Memories can be subjective experiences/may not contain all truths (1 mark); therefore a participant stating that they had a specific memory <u>about asparagus</u> may not be true before the false memory was implanted (reducing validity) (1 mark: link). Other creditworthy weaknesses include: restricted choices, issues/potential lack of qualitative responses, social desirability.	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):** **Describe the results in the 'no model' condition when help was given. You <u>must</u> use data in your answer.** 2 marks available for full result (with meaningful comparison) 1 mark per partial/brief result (no meaningful comparison) 1 mark for correct use of data (can be for one condition only) e.g. There were the same rates of helping in the black victim with a cane condition compared to the white victim with a cane (2 marks: comparison). This was 100% (1 mark: data); The rate of helping was higher in the white drunk victim condition compared to the black drunk victim condition (2 marks: comparison); The ill victim was more likely to be helped compared to the drunk victim (2 marks: comparison) Least help was given in the black drunk victim condition (1 mark: no comparison) Least help was given in the black drunk victim condition at a rate of 73% (1 mark: no comparison *plus* 1 mark: data); Males helped more (1 mark: no comparison); Males helped more as 90% of help came from males (1 mark: no comparison *plus* 1 mark: data) There was a tendency for same-race helping in the drunk condition (1 mark: no comparison); There are other creditworthy responses.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	**Outline <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study.** 1 mark for identifying a strength 1 mark for linking it to the study e.g. The event used had high mundane realism (1 mark). A person collapsing on a subway train is an event that can happen in the real world (1 mark); There was a high level of standardisation so replicability is high (1 mark). Victims/models were given instructions on how to act so the study can be tested for reliability (1 mark); Other creditworthy strengths include: ecological validity, sample characteristics.	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
6	**The debate about nature versus nurture relates to the study by Schachter and Singer (two factors in emotion).** **Outline what is meant by this debate. Include <u>one</u> example for nature and <u>one</u> example for nurture from the study by Schachter and Singer.** 1 mark for the nature side of argument; 1 mark for example from study 1 mark for the nurture side of argument; 1 mark for example from study e.g. definition Nature means a behaviour that we are born with/genetic/hard-wired (1 mark). Nurture means a behaviour that has been learned by an organism after birth (1 mark); e.g. examples Some participants may have reacted to the epinephrine as they were hard-wired to do so (nature); Some participants may have joined in the activities because of the environment of having the stooge act in a certain way (nurture)	**4**

Question	Answer	Marks
7	**Makena has a job creating advertisements for television. She wants to use emotion to advertise a new product and asks you for advice.** **Outline the advice you would give to Makena, using your knowledge of the study by Canli et al. (brain scans and emotions).** 1 mark per piece of evidence clearly based on the study by Canli et al. e.g. Makena could use imagery that she sees as being emotionally intense; She could show imagery for around 3 secs (each) in the advertisement; She could choose imagery for the product that has already been rated as highly arousing; She could choose imagery for the product that has already been rated as having high valence; The imagery could be randomised each time the advertisement is shown; The imagery could be chosen to link with the TV programme that the advertisements follow (or other way around);	**4**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	**Outline what is meant by the ethical guideline of 'privacy'.** 2 mark for full definition; 1 mark for partial/brief definition Participants have the right to not reveal personal details that they would not do in everyday life (2 marks); Participants have the right to ignore questions/part of a study that they are uncomfortable with (2 marks) Participants can ignore personal questions (1 mark); Don't make them reveal too much (1 mark); Not revealing people's names (0 mark: confidentiality);	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	**From the Bandura et al. study (aggression):** **Two friends, Adria and Don, are discussing this study in terms of ethics.** **Adria believes the study is ethical but Don believes the study is <u>not</u> ethical.** **Outline why you think <u>either</u> Adria <u>or</u> Don is correct, using evidence from the study.** 1 mark per point made, with: Up to 2 marks for any knowledge of relevant ethical guidelines. Up to 3 marks for explanation(s) or consequences(s) of breaking a guideline. e.g. Adria It can be argued that the study followed the confidentiality guideline (1 mark: guideline). All we know is that the children were at Stanford University Nursery and their age ranges (1 mark: explanation). It can be argued that the children were <u>protected</u> from physical harm (1 mark: guideline). This is because the Bobo Doll is designed to be hit and is soft so would not injure a child (1 mark: explanation). e.g. Don It can be argued that the study broke the ethical guideline of <u>protection</u> from psychological harm. (1 mark: guideline). The children witnessed an adult being aggressive so they may have been scared of this and did not leave the study in the same psychological state as they entered (1 mark: explanation). There was a lack of informed consent taken (1 mark: guideline). The children/parents were not asked permission to take part in the study (1 mark: explanation)	**4**

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	**Describe the psychology being investigated in the study by Milgram (obedience).** 1 mark for each correct statement Examples from the study Milgram can gain credit (max 1) e.g. The study was investigating if obedience is socialised; Testing out the situational hypothesis of the environment affecting our behaviour; Obedience is about how much we follow the orders of an authority figure; The agentic state refers to when we give up our free will for the good of the authority figure; The autonomous state refers to when we follow our own morals and are not swayed by others; In this study the effect of prods was looked at to see if people would give an electric shock to a stranger (example mark); Moral strain is experienced when we follow an authority figure but do not agree with it;	**4**

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>9(b)</td><td>

Explain <u>one</u> similarity and one difference between the study by Milgram (obedience) and <u>one</u> other study from the social approach.

4 marks available for the similarity, e.g. ethics, situational, controls, quantitative data
4 marks available for the difference, e.g. species, setting, participants

Similarity
e.g. 4 marks
Both the Milgram and Piliavin studies have ethical issues of deception. In the Milgram study, participants believed they were giving real electric shocks to a complete stranger who could not remember word pairs. In the Piliavin study, the participants were led to believe that the drunk or ill victim was actually in need of help.

e.g. 3 marks
Both the Milgram and Piliavin studies have ethical issues of deception. In the Milgram study, participants believed they were giving real electric shocks to a complete stranger who could not remember word pairs

e.g. 2 marks
Both the Milgram and Piliavin studies have ethical issues of deception as in both participants never knew that the scenarios were fake.

e.g. 1 mark
Both the Milgram and Piliavin studies had ethical issues.

<table>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Descriptor</td><td>Mark</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples</td><td>4 marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR
both studies used briefly</td><td>3 marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>The similarity/difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR
The similarity/difference is well explained but there is no study evidence</td><td>2 marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples</td><td>1 mark</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditworthy material</td><td>0 marks</td></tr>
</table>

</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

Question	Answer	Marks
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 reliability.** Strengths include: validity (internal), reliability, quantitative data Weaknesses include: validity (external), generalisability, ethics **Level 4 (8–10 marks)** • Evaluation is comprehensive. • Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. • Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. • Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material. **Level 3 (6–7 marks)** • Evaluation is good. • Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. • Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. • Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material. **Level 2 (4–5 marks)** • Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. • Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. • Analysis is limited. • Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material. **Level 1 (1–3 marks)** • Evaluation is basic. • Answer demonstrates little organisation. • There is little or no evidence of analysis. • Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No response worthy of credit.	**10**