



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2010**

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**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 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. Explain *one* strength of *one* study from the biological perspective.

[8 marks]

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

Candidates can address the question in several ways: strengths could include methodology, such as control of variables, application of findings, advancements in technology, development of knowledge, ethics. These strengths should be made explicit, not implicit. The focus should be on the strength, not the study.

A broad range of studies is available, including experiments, correlations, case studies, observations.

The answer should focus on the explanation of the strength, not the description of the study.

Award [7 to 8 marks] for a response that explicitly explains one strength of one study.

Award [4 to 6 marks] where the appropriate strength is described but not fully explained.

Award [1 to 3 marks] where the study is described but the explanation of the strength is not explicit.

**Cognitive Perspective**

2. Describe how *one* theory or study from the cognitive perspective has been applied to *one* psychological or social question. *[8 marks]*

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

It is not necessary for candidates to describe their chosen theory beyond the detail required to describe how it has been applied to explain one psychological or social question. Neither is it necessary for candidates to identify whether the question is psychological or social.

A wide variety of psychological or social questions or issues may be made applicable to this question; examples in the guide include aggression, gender differences or stress. Other issues such as eyewitness testimony, depression, amnesia, or therapy may also be relevant as long as the response focuses on the application of a cognitive theory/explanation to the question or issue.

Award *[7 to 8 marks]* for a response that identifies a relevant theory or study and appropriately describes how it has been applied to one psychological or social question.

Award *[4 to 6 marks]* for a response that describes a relevant theory or study, but fails to make clear how this has been applied to one psychological or social question.

Award *[1 to 3 marks]* for a response that provides a limited account of a cognitive theory or study but makes little or no attempt to apply this to a psychological or social question.

**Learning Perspective**

3. **Explain how *one* historical or cultural condition has affected the development of the learning perspective.** **[8 marks]**

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

No distinction or qualification needs to be made between historical and cultural conditions. Among other conditions, the influence of developments in science, pre-existing psychological perspectives and the practicality of Western societies could be considered relevant in response to this question. In all cases a brief but explicit link should be made between a relevant historical or cultural condition and the development of the perspective. The phrase “development” can be taken to mean either the initial rise of the perspective or subsequent influences as it continued to evolve; both of these approaches are acceptable.

Award **[7 to 8 marks]** where responses explicitly explain how an identified, relevant historical or cultural condition affected the development of the learning perspective.

Award **[4 to 6 marks]** where an appropriate condition is described, but the explanation of its effect on the development of the learning perspective is not made clearly. Responses may be overly descriptive, but relevant.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for rudimentary responses that demonstrate some understanding of the development of the learning perspective but make no attempt to explain the impact of the condition.

If more than one historical or cultural condition is explained, credit should only be given to the first.

**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 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**

- 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 markband 1 to 3, a mark of 0 should be recorded.

4. **Explain how historical or cultural considerations may affect interpretation of behaviour from the biological perspective.** **[20 marks]**

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

Cultural and historical considerations in this context should be interpreted quite broadly by examiners. Since “considerations” is in the plural, it is important that at least two of these should be mentioned, although more considerations may be included. The fewer considerations presented, the greater the detail required.

Differences in the interpretation of behaviour according to culture should be explained. For example, the behaviour of some people who have schizophrenia who react openly to images that are created in their own minds, is received with some element of fear in Western cultures. In certain Asian cultures the same behaviour may be perceived as conferring an honour upon the person involved. The interpretation of behaviour may also reflect the cultural context and schemas of individuals involved. The wild behaviour of some European youths in city centres is often viewed with alarm by older citizens but accepted as relatively normal by the peer group of young people.

Award **[14 to 20 marks]** for well-developed explanations of how historical or cultural considerations may affect biological perspective interpretations of behaviour.

Award **[8 to 13 marks]** for limited explanations of how historical or cultural considerations may affect biological perspective interpretations of behaviour.

Award **[1 to 7 marks]** for superficial explanations of how cultural considerations affect biological perspective interpretations of behaviour, or for descriptions of relevant historical or cultural considerations without reference to their impact on interpretation of behaviour.

Award up to a maximum of **[3 marks]** for a general description of the perspective.

If only one historical or cultural consideration is explained, award up to a maximum of **[10 marks]**.



5. With reference to empirical studies from the cognitive perspective, discuss strengths *and* limitations of *two* research methods (e.g. verbal protocols, case studies, experiments).

[20 marks]

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

The focus of the response should be on evaluation of two research methods illustrated by relevant research studies, rather than evaluation of the studies themselves. A range of examples of psychological studies may be appropriately chosen to illustrate relevant research methods, such as Loftus's experiments, Newell and Simon's verbal protocols, Neisser's case studies of John Dean's testimony, diary studies or computer simulations, *etc.* Studies on animal behaviour researching topics such as cognitive maps, perceptual development or problem solving may also be appropriate. Examples selected must clearly be from the cognitive perspective or focus on cognitive aspects of behaviour.

Examples of some strengths of research methods in the cognitive perspective:

**Experiments**

- rigorous control by the researcher is possible
- can be replicated
- cause-effect relationship can be established

**Case studies**

- possibility to investigate behaviour which could not possibly be engineered in research laboratories
- high ecological validity

**Diary studies**

- high ecological validity

Examples of some limitations of research methods in the cognitive perspective:

**Experiments**

- lack of ecological validity in experiments conducted in artificial settings
- reductionism

**Case studies**

- problems with generalization
- participant variables

**Diary studies**

- problems with self-report
- social desirability influences what the participant records in the diary

Award [14 to 20 marks] for responses characterized by balanced consideration of both strengths and limitations of two relevant research methods, clearly illustrated by research studies.

Award [8 to 13 marks] for descriptive responses with limited discussion of strengths and limitations, or for descriptions of research methods with limited and unbalanced discussion.

Award *[1 to 7 marks]* for responses that amount to limited and general description of research methods with minimal reference to cognitive studies, or that offer detailed description of empirical studies rather than research methods.

Responses considering strengths and limitations of only one research method should be awarded up to a maximum of *[10 marks]*.

Responses which only discuss strengths or only discuss limitations should be awarded up to a maximum of *[10 marks]*.

**6. Explain the extent to which the concept of free will relates to the learning perspective.** **[20 marks]**

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

This question might prove challenging as learning perspective theories are generally not thought of as illustrating much free will. Various types of determinism are more prevalent within this perspective. That being said, the question asks for an examination of the “extent to which” free will is related to the perspective. Responses could very well focus on how many learning perspective theories and studies ignore or discount the role of free will. In such cases, responses may also discuss determinism in order to illustrate the explanation of free will. It should be noted, however, that in order to earn high marks the response must stay close to the topic of free will.

Topics within the learning perspective that may be argued to show some degree of free will could include:

- latent learning (cognitive maps)
- vicarious learning
- self-efficacy

Responses could also argue about the apparent lack of free will associated with classical and operant conditioning.

Award **[14 to 20 marks]** for well constructed responses that clearly explain the extent to which free will is relevant or not within this perspective.

Award **[8 to 13 marks]** for limited, but appropriate explanation of the relevance of free will to this perspective. The issue of the “extent” is addressed, but this is limited and may not be fully integrated into the response.

Award **[1 to 7 marks]** for rudimentary commentary about free will within this perspective. While the comments may be relevant, they are not explained and may be disjointed. Responses focusing only on determinism, rather than free will, should be limited to marks in this range.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for general comments about the learning perspective which are not related to the concept of free will.

---