CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

PSYCHOLOGY **9990/12**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates **October/November 2024**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

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

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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).

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th><th>Guidance</th></tr>
<tr><td>10</td><td>
<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>
<tr><td>3</td><td>• 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.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>• 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.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2024