www.dynamicpapers.com

Cambridge International AS & A Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

PSYCHOLOGY **9990/12**

Paper 1 Approaches Issues and Debates **October/November 2018**

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2018

www.dynamicpapers.com

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 2018

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**From the Pepperberg study (parrot learning):** **State <u>one</u> question that Alex the parrot was asked during the training phase of the study.** 1 mark for correct answer What's same? What's different?	**1**
1(b)	**Probes trials were done as part of the study.** **Give an example of an object that would be presented at the same time as a blue wooden triangle, during a Probes trial.** 1 mark for a correct example e.g. Yellow wooden triangle; Blue wooden square etc.	**1**
1(c)	**Outline <u>one</u> ethical guideline that would have been important for Pepperberg to consider when designing this study.** 1 mark for naming the guideline and 1 mark for description e.g. Replacement (1 mark). The research team need to have considered alternatives like video footage (1 mark). Numbers (of animals) (1 mark). The research team need to use the minimum amount of animals necessary to fulfil the aim/it was only one parrot in the Pepperberg study (1 mark). Replacement (1 mark). The research team should consider using footage from wild/zoos as evidence or computer simulations (1 mark). Deprivation (1 mark). The research team should not withhold food/basic needs to test social behaviour (1 mark).	**2**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Describe the theory that Baron-Cohen et al. were testing with their 'Reading the Mind in the Eyes' Test.** 1 mark for correct point x3 Theory of Mind (1 mark) This refers to our ability to attribute mental states to ourselves and others; These can be desires, emotions etc.; The person can put themselves in the position of someone else; It is also about how we use this knowledge to explain and predict the actions of other people; We use this knowledge to understand that people may have different ideas and hold different emotions to us;	**3**
2(b)	**Identify <u>one</u> problem with the original 'Reading the Mind in the Eyes' Test, as identified by Baron-Cohen et al.** 1 mark for identifying one of the problems. Forced choice of two items; Basic **and** complex mental states; 'Eye direction'; More female pairs (of eyes); Two choices semantic opposites; Comprehension problems/no glossary; Ceiling effect; Too narrow range of scores	**1**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Outline the procedure used in the Andrade study for a participant who was in the doodling condition.** 1 mark per correct point x4 They were recruited after completing a different/unrelated study; They were taken into a visually dull room; They were asked to listen to a tape recording of a telephone message; (Whilst listening) they were asked to shade in the squares and circles (on a piece of paper given to them); They were told it does not matter how neat/how quickly as it is to relieve the boredom; They had been instructed to write down the names of the party-goers; After a minute of talking with the experimenter they were then asked to write down the names of the party-goers or the places; They had not been told about the test on places/it was a surprise test.	**4**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	**Describe the task that chimpanzees needed to solve in the Yamamoto et al. study (chimpanzee helping).** 1 mark per correct point x2 A chimpanzee had to select and transfer an appropriate tool to another chimpanzee (1 mark) so he/she could solve a task to obtain juice (reward) (1 mark).	**2**
4(b)	**Outline <u>one</u> way in which this study has real world application for children.** 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. Could be useful for teachers (1 mark). They can teach children about altruism/empathy by creating a similar task for children to complete (1 mark). They could show footage from the study to show children how helping behaviour is 'good' (alternative 1 mark). We can improve children's social interactions/helping skills by using a targeted game (1 mark). Children can be taught about altruism/empathy (1 mark)/we can educate children to give help even when it is not asked for (1 mark).	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
5	**Describe the procedure used by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams) to collect data about dream recall.** 1 mark per correct point x4 An (ordinary) doorbell sound was used to wake participants; 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; The awakenings were done in REM/nREM sleep.	**4**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	**Describe <u>two</u> assumptions of the learning approach, using a different example for each assumption.** 1 mark per assumption, 1 mark per example (x2) e.g. Social Learning helps to explain changes in behaviour (1 mark). A child may watch an adult being aggressive and then copy that behaviour (1 mark). Stimulus-Response can explain behaviour (1 mark). In Classical Conditioning a dog may salivate after a bell has been rung (1 mark). We learn through operant conditioning/by consequence (1 mark). If a dog is given a treat to learn how to sit it is likely to repeat the behaviour (1 mark).	**4**
6(b)	**Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the Bandura et al. study supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions of the learning approach.** 1 mark – partial answer, 1 mark – full answer e.g. Boys were more likely to imitate physical aggression from a male model (1 mark). This supports the idea of SLT as the boys paid attention to the role model/imitated them/the behaviour (1 mark). The girls reproduced verbal aggression after observing a female model being verbally aggressive (1 mark).	**2**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	**From the Schachter and Singer study (two factors in emotion):** **Identify the sampling technique used in this study.** 1 mark for correct answer Volunteer/self-selected;	**1**
7(b)	**Describe how the sample was recruited in this study.** 1 mark per correct point x3 e.g. The study was advertised to students who were part of a participant pool; They were volunteers from introductory (psychology) classes / at Minnesota University; They were to receive (two) extra points; All (volunteers) were cleared with the Student Health Service; This was to ensure no harmful effects.	**3**
7(c)	**Outline <u>one</u> strength of the sampling technique as used in this study.** 1 mark for strength, 1 mark for linking it to the study Volunteers tend to be more motivated and therefore are less likely to drop out of the study (1 mark). Therefore, the participants were more likely to agree to the injection part of the study (1 mark). As they were volunteers there was no issue around giving informed consent (1 mark).	**2**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	**Two friends, Amar and Bo, are discussing the Milgram study (obedience) in terms of the debate about individual and situational explanations.** **Outline the debate about individual and situational explanations in psychology.** 1 mark for the individual side of the debate, 1 mark for the situational side of the debate e.g. The individual side refers to behaviours from factors within the person (dispositional) (e.g. personality) The situational side refers to behaviour from factors in the external environment (e.g. home life)	**2**
8(b)	**Bo believes the Milgram study supports the individual side of the debate but Amar believes it supports the situational side of the debate.** **Outline why you think <u>either</u> Amar <u>or</u> Bo is correct using evidence from the study.** 1 mark per point made x4 e.g. Amar All of the participants went to 300 V as a minimum voltage (1 mark). This could be due to the situation of having prods to keep them going to this level of volts (1 mark). The majority of participants obeyed the authority figure (to 450 V) (1 mark). This could be due to the situation of having an authority figure/man in lab coat watching them (1 mark) e.g. Bo All of the participants went to 300 V as a minimum voltage (1 mark). This could be due to a core personality people have which makes them obedient (to a certain point) (1 mark). Not all participants obeyed to the level of 450 V / some panicked / some remained calm (1 mark). This shows that different people reacted differently which is individual (1 mark).	**4**

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	**In the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans), there were a number of confederates playing different roles.** **Outline the roles of the confederates in this study.** 1 mark for each correct point x4 The females (confederates) sat in the adjacent area (to record data); The males (confederates) acted as if they were 'drunk' or 'ill' in the critical area; The confederate (victim) had to collapse/fall over; One of the males acted as a model and helped the victim (depending on the condition); The model was positioned in either the adjacent or critical area; One female (confederate) counted the number of individuals/total who helped/race, sex of helper; The other female (confederate) coded the race/sex/location of people in the adjacent area.	**4**

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Explain what psychologists have learned about bystander behaviour using <u>two</u> results from the Piliavin et al. study.

e.g.
The (small) correlation between group size and helping behaviour was positive (rather than negative); People in groups of seven or more were consistently faster at responding than those in groups of 3. The correlation should have been negative as when group size increases, helping should decrease (if diffusion of responsibility was happening); Speed of helping should *decrease* with *increased* group size (if diffusion of responsibility was happening)

e.g.
In the no model present trials, 100% of the passengers came to help the victim who had a cane; This was irrespective of race of victim. This shows that people are willing to help someone who is perceived as being 'ill'; Therefore, people are likely to help others who look like they *need* help (and the problem is not self-inflicted).

<table>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Criteria for each result</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour;
The result presented has no meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>The result presented has a meaningful comparison but there is no attempt at explanation;
The result presented is not clear but there is an implicit attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour</td><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>The result presented has no meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditworthy answer</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

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

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question	Answer	Marks
10	**Evaluate the Laney et al. study (false memory) in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of quantitative data.** Strengths include: quantitative data, reliability, standardisation, application Weaknesses include: use of questionnaires, ecological validity, generalisability, ethics	**10**

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.

© UCLES 2018