



# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**9990/01**

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

**For examination from 2024**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Specimen**

---

This document has **18** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

**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 descriptions for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptions 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 descriptions.

**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 descriptions in mind.

**Social Sciences-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. Corrosion/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.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p>From the study by Fagen et al. (elephant learning):</p> <p><b>Name the type of conditioning being investigated.</b></p> <p>Operant (conditioning).</p>	1	Do not accept positive reinforcement as the question is about conditioning
1(b)	<p><b>Outline how 'session times' were measured in this study.</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct point made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assistant timed the session to the nearest minute;</li> <li>• It started from when the first cue was offered;</li> <li>• It ended after the elephant's response to the last cue offered.</li> </ul>	2	
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p><b>From the study by Hassett et al. (monkey toy preferences):</b></p> <p><b>Outline the aim of the study.</b></p> <p>Award 2 marks for a detailed aim. Award 1 mark for a partial aim.</p> <p>Example: To investigate whether sex differences in toy preferences of (rhesus) monkeys were the same as those in the toy preferences of human children (2 marks). To investigate sex differences in toy choice in monkeys (1 mark). To investigate toy choice (0 marks). To investigate toy preferences in monkeys (0 marks) [repetition of stem].</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	<p><b>Name <u>two</u> features of the sample used in the study.</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Rhesus</u> monkeys; (monkeys = 0 marks)</li> <li>• Multi-sex group;</li> <li>• Whole group lived together for 25+ years;</li> <li>• Housed at Yerkes;</li> <li>• 135 in total social group/61 females (potential participants)/21 males (potential participants);</li> <li>• Final numbers: females n = 23/males n = 11.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>Describe the psychology that is being investigated in the study by Bandura et al. (aggression).</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct ‘psychology’ point described. Award 1 mark for an example from the study by Bandura et al.</p> <p>Creditworthy ‘psychology’ includes: social learning theory, frustration-aggression, delayed imitation. There are other creditworthy aspects.</p> <p>Example: Social Learning Theory is being investigated which centres around observing and imitating behaviours; People pay attention to a role model; They retain this information in their memory; They must feel like they are capable of imitating the behaviour; They must feel motivated to want to imitate the behaviour/feel they will get rewarded for imitation;</p> <p>Aggression can be physical (hitting) and verbal (shouting);</p> <p>Delayed imitation is when someone witnesses a behaviour at one time point but only reproduces that behaviour at a different time point; In the study by Bandura et al. this was seen when the children imitated behaviours in the final room (1 mark: example).</p> <p>There are no identification marks e.g. social learning theory (0) aggression (0) [repetition of stem].</p>	5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4(a)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> assumptions of the cognitive approach.</b></p> <p>Two marks are available for each assumption. Award 2 marks for a full answer for each assumption. Award 1 mark for a partial answer for each assumption.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> Information is processed through the same route in all humans: input – process – output, in a similar way to how information is processed by a computer (2 marks). Information is processed through the same route in all humans: input – process – output (1 mark).</p> <p><b>Example:</b> People have individual differences in their cognitive processing such as attention, language, thinking and memory. These processes can also help to explain behaviour and emotion (2 marks). People have individual differences in their cognitive processing (1 mark).</p> <p><b>Example:</b> Behaviour and emotions can be explained in terms of the role of thinking (cognitive) processes like attention, memory and language (2 marks). Behaviour can be explained in terms of processes like memory/language (1 mark).</p>	4	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4(b)	<p><b>Explain how <u>one</u> finding from the study by Baron-Cohen et al. (eyes test) supports <u>one</u> of the assumptions of the cognitive approach that you have described in part (a).</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for a result/conclusion that is relevant to an assumption. Award 1 mark for explaining how it supports an assumption explicitly (not by name only: a relevant concept needs to be mentioned).</p> <p>Example: The AS/HFA group scored significantly lower on the Eyes Test (compared to the other three groups) (1 mark). This shows that differences between the groups can be explained by cognitions/thinking processes, in this case, Theory of Mind (1 mark).</p> <p>The AS/HFA group scored significantly lower on the Eyes Test (compared to the other three groups) (1 mark). This clearly shows that differences between people can be explained by how they process information/via cognitions (1 mark).</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p><b>Studies in social psychology can be applied to train military personnel.</b></p> <p><b>Suggest how the procedure of the study by Milgram (obedience) could be applied to help with this training. Your suggestion <u>must</u> be ethical.</b></p> <p>Award 2 marks for aspects of procedure that are useful for training military personnel. Award 2 marks for applying it to the scenario.</p> <p>Example: The experimenter wearing an authoritative uniform appeared to affect obedience (1 mark). Therefore, better obedience to orders might be achieved if authority figures dress in a uniform that portrays hierarchy/authority (1 mark).</p> <p>The prods ensured that the participant stayed on task throughout the study (1 mark). Therefore, a set of 'sayings' or a 'protocol' could ensure that soldiers follow the orders correctly (1 mark).</p> <p>Get people in authority to give orders to soldiers (1 mark). Have a uniform (for officers) that shows authority to the soldiers (to make them obey) (1 mark).</p> <p>We can encourage soldiers to be autonomous (1 mark). So that they can challenge destructive obedience by resisting [35% did] (1 mark).</p> <p>0 marks for just describing Milgram then stating 'the military should do this'.</p>	4	The suggestion must be ethical. Unethical responses should not be credited.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6(a)	<p>In the study by Dement and Kleitman (sleep and dreams), the procedure that the researchers first used to measure participants' estimations of REM sleep duration was unsuccessful and had to be revised.</p> <p>Describe how the researchers first attempted to measure participants' estimations of REM sleep duration.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants were woken at different increments of time (in REM);</li> <li>• They were then asked to estimate the time they had been dreaming;</li> <li>• To the nearest minute;</li> <li>• They were not given a fixed choice.</li> </ul>	2	
6(b)	<p>Describe the revised procedure used to measure participants' estimations of REM sleep duration.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants were woken at either 5 or 15 mins after the onset of REM;</li> <li>• They were then asked to choose if they had been dreaming for 5 or 15 mins.</li> </ul>	2	
6(c)	<p>Explain <b>one methodological weakness of this study</b>.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying the weakness. Award 1 mark for explicitly linking the weakness to the study.</p> <p>Example: The study lacks ecological validity (1 mark). This is because the participants had to sleep in a laboratory attached to an EEG machine (1 mark explicit link).</p> <p>The study lacks mundane realism (1 mark). This is because the participants were woken up to the sound of a doorbell and asked to recall any dream (1 mark explicit link).</p> <p>Note: Weakness must be methodological. Do not credit ethics.</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7(a)	<p><b>Outline the debate about individual and situational explanations in psychology.</b></p> <p>1 mark for the individual side of argument. 1 mark for the situational side of argument.</p> <p>Example: 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).</p>	2	
7(b)	<p><b>Two friends, Aarav and Kyra, are discussing the study by Andrade (doodling) in terms of the debate about individual and situational explanations.</b></p> <p><b>Aarav believes this study supports the individual explanation but Kyra believes this study supports the situational explanation.</b></p> <p><b>Outline why you think <u>either</u> Aarav <u>or</u> Kyra is correct, using evidence from the study.</b></p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for explaining why it supports the individual <b>or</b> situational explanation. Award up to 2 marks for evidence from the Andrade study.</p> <p>Example: Aarav (individual) It supports the individual side of the debate as everyone doodled in different ways, maybe based on their personality type (1 mark: explanation); There was a wide variety in the amount of doodles (someone doodled 100 items) (1 mark: evidence). People who are labelled as extraverts may need to do more than one thing at once to help stimulate themselves and concentrate better (1 mark: explanation). There was also a large range (3–110) of shapes that were shaded in the doodling group (1 mark: evidence).</p> <p>Example: Kyra (situational) Andrade had made sure that everyone was bored so that the situation caused them to doodle/ concentrate more when doodling (1 mark: explanation); the task itself may be have brought about an improvement in concentration as doodling helped them focus more. (1 mark: explanation) The doodling group did recall more correct names than the control group (1 mark: evidence). Plus there were more participants in the doodling group scoring maximum on the monitoring task compared to the control group (1 mark: evidence).</p>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p><b>Simone is a student who never uses a spoon to eat with at lunchtime because he has a phobia of spoons.</b></p> <p><b>Suggest how Simone could be helped to overcome his phobia of spoons, using your knowledge of the study by Saavedra and Silverman (button phobia).</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct piece of advice given based on <i>any</i> element of the study (does not have to be explicit).</p> <p>Example:            Simone might be asked if he can remember any negative experiences with spoons;            This will enable Simone to identify a potential cause to help him to reverse the experience;            Simone could be asked to rate different spoons on a Fear/Disgust Hierarchy;            Whichever has the lowest fear/disgust rating can be presented to Simone;            Simone can be rewarded for being able to touch or use the spoon;            Simone's feelings can be measured using a Feelings Thermometer.</p>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	<p><b>Describe what was recorded by the female observers in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans).</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One noted race/sex/location of passengers in the critical area / adjacent areas / in the carriage;</li> <li>• She also counted the number of passengers in the critical area / in the carriage;</li> <li>• She also counted the total number of people who came to help the victim;</li> <li>• She recorded the race/sex/location of every helper;</li> <li>• Another observer recorded the latency time of the first helper;</li> <li>• She also recorded the latency time of help <i>after</i> the model began to help (if necessary);</li> <li>• Both noted comments made by the passengers;</li> <li>• Spontaneous/elicted comments from passengers.</li> </ul>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p><b>Explain one similarity and one difference between the study by Piliavin et al. and one other core study from the social approach.</b></p> <p>Use the marking grid below. Award up to 4 marks for the similarity, e.g. ethics, situational, controls, quantitative data. Award up to 4 marks for the difference, e.g. setting, participants, use of a stooge.</p> <p>Similarities (with Milgram) Example: 4 marks Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies have ethical issues of deception. In the study by Milgram, participants believed they were giving real electric shocks to a complete stranger who could not remember word pairs. In the study by Piliavin, the participants were led to believe that the drunk or ill victim was actually in need of help.</p> <p>Example: 3 marks Both the Piliavin and Milgram 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.</p> <p>Example: 2 marks Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies have ethical issues of deception as in both, participants never knew that the scenarios were fake.</p> <p>Example: 1 mark Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies had ethical issues.</p> <p>Differences (with Perry) Example: 4 marks The studies used stooges in different ways. Piliavin used a human stooge to fake a collapse with them being either ill or drunk / used a model to go and help the stooge after a certain time period, so the participants did not know a stooge was being used. In the study by Perry, the participants 'met' the animated stooge in various rooms/scenarios until they felt the stooge was invading personal space.</p>	8	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance																		
9(b)	<p>Example: 3 marks The studies used stooges in different ways. Piliavin used a human stooge to fake a collapse with them being either ill or drunk / used a model to go and help the stooge after a certain time period, so the participants did not know a stooge was being used.</p> <p>Example: 2 marks The studies used stooges in different ways. Piliavin used a human stooge to fake a collapse with them being either ill or drunk / Perry used an animated stooge.</p> <p>Example: 1 mark The studies used stooges in different ways.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="616 647 1099 1939"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.</td> <td>4</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> <td>3</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</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable response.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.	4	3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.	3	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.	2	1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.	1	0	No creditable response.	0		
Level	Description	Marks																			
4	The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.	4																			
3	The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies are used briefly.	3																			
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.	2																			
1	The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using the studies as examples.	1																			
0	No creditable response.	0																			

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
10	<p><b>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 generalisations.</b></p> <p>Use the table below to mark candidate responses to this question.</p> <p>Strengths include: reliability, standardisation, validity (internal), use of brain scans. Weaknesses include: use of questionnaires, validity (external), sample, ethics.</p> <p>Example: named issue (in detail) The sample only had right-handed people in it. This could make generalisations difficult. This is because left-handed people may use their brain differently to right-handed people when undertaking mindfulness activities. Therefore, the findings about brain changes as a result of mindfulness may only apply to right-handed people.</p> <p>Example: evaluation point (brief but in context) The sample only had right-handed people in it. This could make generalisations difficult.</p> <p>Example: no context The study followed a standardised procedure making it easier to replicate.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="893 645 1380 1937"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good evaluation including the named issue.</li> <li>• Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.</li> </ul> </td> <td>9–10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good evaluation including the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.</li> </ul> </td> <td>7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is mostly effective.</li> </ul> </td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good evaluation including the named issue.</li> <li>• Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.</li> </ul>	9–10	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good evaluation including the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.</li> </ul>	7–8	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is mostly effective.</li> </ul>	5–6	10	
Level	Description	Marks													
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good evaluation including the named issue.</li> <li>• Thoroughly addresses both strengths and both weaknesses in detail.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.</li> </ul>	9–10													
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good evaluation including the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses strengths and weaknesses but may include three or four points. The majority of the points are in depth.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.</li> </ul>	7–8													
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly appropriate evaluation but may not include the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses either two strengths or two weaknesses in detail or one of each in detail or all four briefly.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is mostly effective.</li> </ul>	5–6													



Question	Answer			Marks	Guidance
	Level	Description	Marks		
10	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak evaluation and may not include the named issue.</li> <li>• Addresses either a strength or a weakness. Evaluation points are brief. Some points may have no context.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is sometimes appropriate.</li> </ul>	3–4		
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little or no evaluation.</li> <li>• Discussion of strengths and weaknesses is absent or superficial.</li> <li>• Selection of evidence is limited.</li> </ul>	1–2		
	0	No creditable response.	0		

**BLANK PAGE**