



MARKSCHEME

May 2010

PSYCHOLOGY

Higher Level

Paper 1

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

SECTION A**Paper 1 section A markbands**

In applying the markbands the concept of “best fit” should be used: a response that meets most of the statements in a particular band, but not necessarily all, can still be awarded marks in the markband. The markband that best fits the response should be determined first. Then, by reference to the markband above and the markband below, the mark should be determined.

Markband

- 7 to 8** The demands of the question are addressed effectively within a logical structure. The argument is clearly supported by appropriate knowledge and understanding from the perspectives. The answer contains appropriate analysis but there may be minor omissions. At the top of this markband the demands of the question are addressed effectively, in a focused and logical structure. Arguments are supported by appropriate knowledge and understanding, and analysis.
- 5 to 6** At the bottom of this markband the question is addressed. The answer contains accurate knowledge and understanding but is mainly descriptive with some implicit analysis that is not sufficiently related to the question. There is a basic structure to the answer. At the top of this markband the demands of the question are addressed, mainly within a logical structure. The response is sufficiently accurate, relevant and adequate to support a sound answer. Analysis may not be well developed.
- 3 to 4** The question is partially addressed, with limited accurate, relevant and factual knowledge and understanding. There is an attempt to structure the answer but it is not sustained throughout the answer.
- 1 to 2** There is an attempt to answer the question, but knowledge and understanding of the perspective is limited, often inaccurate and of marginal relevance to the question.
- 0** If the answer does not achieve the standard described in markband 1 to 2, a mark of 0 should be recorded.

Biological Perspective

1. **Outline *one* strength and *one* limitation of the biological perspective in explaining *one* psychological or social question.** [8 marks]

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands when marking this question.

A social or psychological question appropriate to a biological explanation should be identified. There is no need for responses to distinguish between psychological and social questions. Such questions could include aggression, gender differences, stress, depression or anxiety.

Award [7 to 8 marks] for responses that clearly outline one appropriate strength and one limitation of the biological perspective in explaining a relevant psychological or social question.

Award [4 to 6 marks] for an appropriate explanation of a social or psychological question. One relevant strength and one relevant limitation are identified, but outlines offered lack precision.

Award [1 to 3 marks] where a psychological or social question from the biological perspective is stated, but the associated strength and limitation lack clarity. Responses that offer strengths and limitations related to the perspective as a whole should be awarded marks in this range.

Award up to a maximum of [4 marks] for an appropriate explanation of a social or psychological question from the biological perspective where only a strength or a limitation is outlined.

Cognitive Perspective

2. **Explain *one* theoretical explanation of human behaviour from the cognitive perspective.** **[8 marks]**

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands when marking this question.

Candidates have a wide range of cognitive explanations from which to select one. The syllabus includes the following theoretical explanations from the cognitive perspective: perceptual set, conformity, cognitive dissonance, memory. Other theoretical explanations are equally suitable and can include models such as the information processing approach.

Award **[7 to 8 marks]** for responses offering a well-structured explanation of human behaviour from the cognitive perspective.

Award **[4 to 6 marks]** for responses that offer a limited explanation of human behaviour from the cognitive perspective.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for responses offering a basic description of human behaviour from the cognitive perspective.

Learning Perspective

3. **Explain *one* contribution of the learning perspective to the *scientific* study of behaviour.** [8 marks]

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands when marking this question.

Contributions should be related to the scientific study of behaviour within the learning perspective. Research studies may be used to illustrate the contributions, but they are not necessary.

Contributions could include:

- reliance on empirical data to support/generate theories;
- focus on observable, recordable, data;
- typical use of quantitative data (but qualitative data are also used);
- control of variables in observational and experimental research (in experiments, manipulation of an independent variable);
- intention to generalize from studies to wide populations (including animal to human generalization).

Award [7 to 8 marks] where a contribution, clearly related to the scientific study of behaviour, has been accurately explained, using appropriate technical language.

Award [4 to 6 marks] where a contribution has been accurately explained but is not sufficiently related to the study of scientific behaviour.

Award [1 to 3 marks] for responses that offer a contribution from the learning perspective unrelated to the scientific study of behavior, *e.g.* classical or operant conditioning.

Humanistic Perspective**4. Describe *one* research study from the humanistic perspective.****[8 marks]**

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands when marking this question.

Responses could make reference to studies such as Maslow's (1954) studies on self-actualization, Coopersmith's (1967) on self-esteem, Chodorkoff's (1954) on self-perception, Aaronson & Mettee (1968) on congruence, Aronoff (1967) on hierarchy of needs. Candidates should describe aspects of the research study, *e.g.* aim, how the research was conducted, findings.

Award **[7 to 8 marks]** for an accurate and clear description of one research study that is relevant to the humanistic perspective.

Award **[4 to 6 marks]** for a description of a research study from the humanistic perspective that is reasonably clear but may have some inaccuracies.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for a very basic description of a research study that is relevant to the humanistic perspective.

No marks should be awarded for a description of humanistic theories or research methods unless these contain an explicit and relevant research study.

SECTION B**Paper 1 section B markbands**

In applying the markbands the concept of “best fit” should be used.

A response that meets most of the statements in a particular band, but not necessarily all, can still be awarded marks in the band.

The band that best fits the response should be determined first. Then, by reference to the band above and the band below, the mark should be determined.

Markband

- 17 to 20** The demands of the question are addressed effectively in a focused and logical structure. Arguments are supported by appropriate knowledge and understanding and in-depth analysis. Evaluation is balanced and well-developed. Cultural, ethical, gender or methodological considerations are an integral part of the response.
- 14 to 16** The demands of the question are addressed effectively within a structured framework. The argument is supported by appropriate knowledge and understanding from the perspectives. The answer contains appropriate analysis, but there may be minor omissions. Evaluation is clear and applied appropriately. Cultural, ethical, gender or methodological considerations are present and appropriate to the question.
- 11 to 13** The demands of the question are addressed mainly within a structured framework. The answer contains accurate knowledge and understanding. Some limited analysis is offered. Evaluation is limited or may not be well developed. Cultural, ethical, gender or methodological considerations are present and appropriate to the question.
- 8 to 10** There is a basic structure to the answer. The question is addressed. The answer contains accurate knowledge and understanding but is mainly descriptive. There may be minimal reference to cultural, ethical, gender or methodological considerations appropriate to the question.
- 6 to 7** There is an attempt to structure the answer but it is not sustained throughout the answer. The question is partially addressed, with limited accurate, relevant and factual knowledge and understanding. There may be minimal reference to cultural, ethical, gender or methodological considerations appropriate to the question.
- 4 to 5** There is little sense of structure in the answer. Although there is an attempt to answer the question, knowledge and understanding of the perspectives is limited, often inaccurate and of marginal relevance to the question. There is no reference to cultural, ethical, gender or methodological considerations.
- 1 to 3** There is almost no organizational structure. There is very little or no understanding of the question, nor evidence of knowledge of the perspectives. The answer consists of no more than a few relevant facts.
- 0** If the answer does not achieve the standard described in mark band 1 to 3, a mark of 0 should be recorded.

5. Evaluate *two* research methods (*e.g.* experiments, case study) used in the biological perspective. [20 marks]

Refer to the paper 1 section B markbands when awarding marks.

The methods used in research from the biological perspective cover a very wide range, both quantitative and qualitative. Candidates are expected to discuss research methods such as, experiments, correlational studies, interviews, case studies or questionnaires. Evaluation of these methods can be at many levels, *e.g.* appropriateness for the method, effectiveness in producing valid and reliable data, comparison (*e.g.* of effectiveness, ease of use, cost) with other methods, or cultural issues considered in their use. Ethical considerations are likely to be of high importance, as in the use of animals in studies.

If specific techniques such as double-blind trials, fMRI or PET scanning are evaluated this must be done in the context of the experimental method (experiment, observation) to attract marks.

Award [14 to 20 marks] where two research methods from the biological perspective are thoroughly evaluated and supported by empirical research studies.

Award [8 to 13 marks] for mainly descriptive accounts of two relevant research methods, with limited evaluation. The two research methods may be only implicitly related to the biological perspective.

Award [1 to 7 marks] for responses that offer limited description of two research methods with little or no evaluation. Responses that evaluate research methods in general without reference to the biological perspective should be awarded marks in this range.

Award up to a maximum of [10 marks] where only one research method is evaluated.

6. **Explain the extent to which free will and determinism relate to the cognitive perspective.** [20 marks]

Refer to the paper 1 section B markbands when awarding marks.

Free will implies that we choose to act in certain ways, whereas determinism implies not being able to choose, as our actions are caused by influences beyond our control. Candidates may give more sophisticated explanations of determinism (*e.g.* highlighting the idea of predictability, due to behaviour occurring in a regular, systematic way, or discussing the various meanings of “cause”, which relate to the distinction between “hard” and “soft” determinism) or of free will (*e.g.* whether it refers to having a choice, not being forced to do something, or acting in an involuntary way).

The extent to which these concepts are shown to relate to the cognitive perspective will probably depend in large measure on how well they are explained. A case can be made for the cognitive perspective to be very deterministic, if the distinction between internal and external behaviours is minimized; on the other hand, the idea of conscious mental life implies that many actions are free and voluntary, thus indicating free will at work.

Award [14 to 20 marks] for responses discussing the extent to which the concepts of determinism and free will relate to the cognitive perspective. Answers in this category should demonstrate clear understanding of the concepts of determinism and free will. Such responses are unlikely to argue for either complete determinism or complete free will. Elements of each (but with probable “weighting” in one direction or the other) are expected.

Award [8 to 13 marks] for responses that provide limited discussion of the link between determinism or free will and the cognitive perspective. Responses in this range may not adequately address “the extent to which” element of the question, but should at least give some indication of whether the cognitive perspective is characterized by determinism or free will.

Award [1 to 7 marks] for responses in which the concepts of free will and determinism are poorly or inadequately understood (statements like “determinism is where behaviour is determined” cannot be given much credit). Responses in this band will also show very weak links to the cognitive perspective, and will not substantially answer the question about the degree of determinism or free will involved.

7. Evaluate one or more applications of *one* theory from the learning perspective. [20 marks]

Refer to the paper 1 section B markbands when awarding marks.

Areas of application could include education, work or therapy. Answers can embrace a range of applications with relatively less depth to each, or could focus in depth on just one application.

Award **[14 to 20 marks]** where a clear, comprehensive evaluation of one or more appropriate applications are provided.

Award **[8 to 13 marks]** where a descriptive account of one of more applications is provided but with a limited evaluation.

Award **[1 to 7 marks]** where a superficial description of one or more applications is provided with no evaluation.

Award up to a maximum of **[3 marks]** for answers that describe a theory but do not provide an application.

8. Evaluate the influence of historical *or* cultural conditions on the humanistic perspective. [20 marks]

Refer to the paper 1 section B markbands when awarding marks.

A broad range of historical/cultural conditions can be relevant in response to this question, including:

- historical events (*e.g.* the Second World War);
- the “zeitgeist” (social, political and cultural climate) of the United States in the post-war period (*e.g.* the emphasis on competitive individual achievement, through, for example, education, patriotism, international relations, the media);
- philosophy and literature (especially European existentialism);
- reaction to the assumptions, theories and applications (especially to therapy) of other perspectives;
- the backgrounds of the theorists (*e.g.* the influences of religion, psychodynamic training, war experiences).

Responses should discuss at least two relevant historical or cultural conditions. Examiners can expect a depth versus breadth tradeoff. Responses may focus on the beginnings of the perspective or later developments that have influenced the evolution of the perspective.

Award [**14 to 20 marks**] for responses that effectively evaluate the influence of more than one cultural and historical condition on the influence on the humanistic perspective.

Award [**8 to 13 marks**] for responses that identify some relevant conditions, but offer only limited evaluation of their influence on humanistic psychology. The link between the perspective and the conditions may only be implicit.

Award [**1 to 7 marks**] for responses that identify relevant conditions but do not evaluate their influence on the humanistic perspective.
