



Markscheme

May 2018

Psychology








Higher level and standard 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 the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation	Short cut
	Unclear	
	Incorrect Point	
	Good Response/Good Point	
IR	Irrelevant	
AQ	Answers the Question	
CKS	Clear Knowledge Shown	
NAQ	Not Answered Question	
	Apply to blank pages	
	On-page comment text box (for adding specific comments)	
	Highlight (can be expanded)	
TNCE	Theory is Not Clearly Explained	
CON	Contradiction	
DEV	Development	
D	Description	
DET	Relevant Detail	
EG	Example	
EVAL	Evaluation	
EXC	Excellent Point	
GP	Good Point	
	Wavy Underline Tool	
NE	Not Enough	
VL	Very Limited	
WKAR	Weak Argument	

You **must** make sure you have looked at all pages. Please put the  annotation on any blank page, to indicate that you have seen it.

Section A

Biological level of analysis

1. Describe **one** ethical consideration related to **one** study at the biological level of analysis. **[8]**

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands below when awarding marks.

The command term “describe” requires candidates to give a detailed account of one ethical consideration related to one study at the biological level of analysis.

The ethical consideration may be positive (what guidelines were followed) or negative (what guidelines were not followed).

Ethical considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- obtaining informed consent
- avoiding harm or suffering of participants
- the use of animals as subjects
- the use of deception
- maintaining anonymity
- the right to withdraw
- the need for debriefing.

The focus of the response should be on the ethical consideration and not on the description of a study.

If a candidate describes more than one study, credit should only be given to the first study.

If a candidate describes more than one ethical consideration, credit should only be given to the first consideration. Candidates may be awarded marks if describing more than one ethical consideration, as long as the additional consideration(s) are used to clarify the description of the first – for example, explaining deception as part of a description of informed consent.

If a candidate describes an appropriate study, but there is no link to an ethical consideration, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[3]**.

If a candidate describes an ethical consideration but does not refer to an appropriate study, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[4]**.

Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	There is an attempt to answer the question, but knowledge and understanding is limited, often inaccurate, or of marginal relevance to the question.
4–6	The question is partially answered. Knowledge and understanding is accurate but limited. Either the command term is not effectively addressed or the response is not sufficiently explicit in answering the question.
7–8	The question is answered in a focused and effective manner and meets the demands of the command term. The response is supported by appropriate and accurate knowledge and understanding of research.

Cognitive level of analysis

2. With reference to **one** study, describe how **one** particular research method is used at the cognitive level of analysis. **[8]**

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands below when awarding marks.

The command term “describe” requires candidates to give a detailed account of how one particular research method is used in one study at the cognitive level of analysis.

Description of how the method is used might refer to key features of the method as well as how the method was used in one study. For example, experimental studies may identify the sampling and allocation procedures, the independent and dependent variables, and/or the way in which extraneous variables were controlled.

If a candidate describes one research method and one study but does not explicitly link the study to how the research method is used, up to a maximum of **[6]** should be awarded.

If a candidate describes one appropriate study without reference to one research method, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[3]**.

If a candidate addresses how one research method is used but does not refer to one appropriate study, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[4]**.

If a candidate describes more than one research method, credit should be given only to the first description.

If a candidate refers to more than one study, credit should be given only to the first study.

Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	There is an attempt to answer the question, but knowledge and understanding is limited, often inaccurate, or of marginal relevance to the question.
4–6	The question is partially answered. Knowledge and understanding is accurate but limited. Either the command term is not effectively addressed or the response is not sufficiently explicit in answering the question.
7–8	The question is answered in a focused and effective manner and meets the demands of the command term. The response is supported by appropriate and accurate knowledge and understanding of research.

Sociocultural level of analysis

3. With reference to **one** study, describe **one** error in attribution. **[8]**

Refer to the paper 1 section A markbands below when awarding marks.

The command term “describe” requires candidates to give a detailed account of one error in attribution with reference to one study.

Appropriate attribution errors may include but are not limited to:

- fundamental attribution error (Ross *et al.* (1977); Jones and Harris (1967))
- defensive attribution bias (Walster (1966); Brickman *et al.* (1975))
- actor–observer bias (Storms (1973); Nisbett *et al.* (1973))
- illusory correlation (Hamilton and Gifford (1974))
- self-serving bias (Johnson *et al.* (1964); Lau and Russel (1980))
- modesty bias (Fahr, Dobbins and Cheng (1991); Kashima and Triandis (1986))

If a candidate describes an appropriate study without describing one error in attribution, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[3]**.

If a candidate describes one error in attribution without making reference to a relevant study, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[4]**.

If a candidate refers to more than one study, credit should be given only to the first study.

If a candidate describes more than one error in attribution, credit should be given only to the first error in attribution described. Candidates may be awarded marks for describing more than one type of error in attribution, as long as the additional errors are used to clarify the description of the first.

Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	There is an attempt to answer the question, but knowledge and understanding is limited, often inaccurate, or of marginal relevance to the question.
4–6	The question is partially answered. Knowledge and understanding is accurate but limited. Either the command term is not effectively addressed or the response is not sufficiently explicit in answering the question.
7–8	The question is answered in a focused and effective manner and meets the demands of the command term. The response is supported by appropriate and accurate knowledge and understanding of research.

Section B assessment criteria**A — Knowledge and comprehension**

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	The answer demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding that is of marginal relevance to the question. Little or no psychological research is used in the response.
4–6	The answer demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding relevant to the question or uses relevant psychological research to limited effect in the response.
7–9	The answer demonstrates detailed, accurate knowledge and understanding relevant to the question, and uses relevant psychological research effectively in support of the response.

B — Evidence of critical thinking: application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	The answer goes beyond description but evidence of critical thinking is not linked to the requirements of the question.
4–6	The answer offers appropriate but limited evidence of critical thinking or offers evidence of critical thinking that is only implicitly linked to the requirements of the question.
7–9	The answer integrates relevant and explicit evidence of critical thinking in response to the question.

C — Organization

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The answer is organized or focused on the question. However, this is not sustained throughout the response.
3–4	The answer is well organized, well developed and focused on the question.

Section B

4. Examine **one** evolutionary explanation of behaviour.

[22]

Refer to the paper 1 section B assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to consider one evolutionary explanation of behaviour in a way that uncovers the assumptions of evolutionary theory related to behaviour.

Evolutionary theory is based on assumptions such as, but not limited to, the following:

- the basic principles of natural selection (adaptation)
- human behaviours may be inherited
- the mechanism of sexual selection.

Candidates may address one or more assumptions in responding to this question.

Behaviours that may be addressed include, but are not limited to:

- human mating behaviours (Buss, 1990)
- emotional behaviour (for example, disgust, Fessler, 2006; universality of emotional expressions, Ekman and Friesen, 1971)
- dysfunctional behaviour (for example, depression, Andrews and Thompson, 2009; phobias, Seligman, 1971)
- altruism (Dawkins, 1976).

Research that refers only to genetics without a clear link to one evolutionary explanation of behaviour should not receive credit.

In order to respond to the command term “examine”, candidates may refer to:

- underlying assumptions
- evidence in support of the explanation
- strengths or limitations of the explanation
- contrary explanations of behaviour.

Candidates may address one behaviour in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of behaviours in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

5. Discuss the reliability of **one** cognitive process. [22]

Refer to the paper 1 section B assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to give a considered and balanced review of the reliability of one cognitive process. Cognitive processes may include: memory, perception, or decision-making.

Responses may include, but are not limited to:

- that human memory is reconstructive and remembering is not simply retrieving a fully encoded event (Loftus and Palmer, 1974; Bartlett, 1932)
- that human memory may be reliable (Yuille and Cutshall, 1986; Brown and Kulik, 1977)
- the influence of emotion on memory (Brown and Kulik, 1977)
- the impact of environmental stimuli on perception (carpentered world hypothesis)
- the role of heuristics in decision-making may lead to errors in judgement (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974).

Discussion of the reliability of the cognitive process may include, but is not limited to:

- degree of empirical support
- contrary findings or explanations
- methodological and/or cultural considerations
- application to real life, for example, eye witness testimony.

Whichever cognitive process is selected, the focus of the response should be on a discussion of its reliability.

If the reliability of more than one cognitive process is discussed, credit should be given only to the first cognitive process.

6. Discuss social identity theory.

[22]

Refer to the paper 1 section B assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of social identity theory.

Responses should present, with reference to relevant studies, the key concepts of the social identity theory such as:

- social categorization (ingroup/outgroup)
- social identification
- social comparison
- positive distinctiveness.

Studies related to social identity theory may include but are not limited to:

- Tajfel's studies on social groups and identities
- Sherif *et al.*'s Robbers Cave study (1961)
- Cialdini *et al.*'s Basking in Reflected Glory study (1976)
- Abrams's study of the role of social identity on levels of conformity (1990)
- Maass's study of the role of social identity on violence (2003).

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- the effectiveness of the theory in explaining social identity and inter-group behaviour
 - the productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
 - methodological, cultural and gender considerations
 - contrary findings or explanations
 - applications of the theory.
-