



MARKSCHEME

May 2011

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 IB Cardiff.*

SECTION A

Biological level of analysis

1. Explain how *one* hormone influences human behaviour.

[8 marks]

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

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account of how the chosen hormone influences a chosen human behaviour. Responses should make a clear link between the function of the hormone and human behaviour.

A number of different hormones could be chosen, including: adrenaline, cortisol, melatonin, testosterone, estrogen, oxytocin.

Any aspect of human behaviour (*e.g.* aggression, depression, stress, sexual interest) is acceptable as long as the response focuses on how the hormone influences the particular behaviour.

Examples of how hormones influence human behaviour could be the influence of cortisol on memory, oxytocin on attachment, testosterone on aggression, or melatonin on sleep patterns. Responses that address the influence of neurotransmitter such as dopamine, serotonin, GABA and acetylcholine should not be awarded any marks. Where a neurotransmitter and hormone are chemically the same (*e.g.* noradrenaline) answers should make it clear that they are explaining the hormonal function.

Responses should address just one hormone’s influence, and where candidates have provided more than one example, credit should be given only to the first response.

Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The answer does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 to 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 to 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 to 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. Describe *one* research study which has investigated schema theory.

[8 marks]

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

The command term “describe” requires candidates to give a detailed account of a study related to the schema theory. This description may include the aim, procedure, results and conclusion of the study.

Examples of studies which could be used include:

- Brewer and Treyens (1981) tested the influence of schemas on memory.
- Bartlett (1932) – War of the Ghosts.
- Bachen, McLoughlin, and Garcia (1999) tested Bem’s (1981) gender schema theory by examining college students’ behavioural expectations of male and female teachers.

High markband responses should clearly relate the conclusion of the study to schema theory. No marks should be awarded for responses that describe only schema theory without reference to a study.

Where candidates have described more than one study, credit should be given only to the first response.

Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The answer does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 to 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 to 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 to 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. Outline two errors in attribution.

[8 marks]

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

The command term “outline” requires candidates to give a brief account or summary of two errors in attribution.

Candidates can choose from a large number of attribution errors including fundamental attribution error or correspondence bias, just-world hypothesis, illusory correlation, self-serving bias, in-group bias or the halo effect.

Where candidates have outlined more than two examples of errors in attribution, credit should be given only to the first two responses.

Where candidates have outlined one example of an error in attribution, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[4 marks]**.

Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The answer does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 to 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 to 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 to 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 answer does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 to 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 to 6	The answer demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding relevant to the question or uses relevant psychological research to limited effect in the response.
7 to 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 answer does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 to 3	The answer goes beyond description but evidence of critical thinking is not linked to the requirements of the question.
4 to 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 to 9	The answer integrates relevant and explicit evidence of critical thinking in response to the question.

C — Organization

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

SECTION B

- 4. Discuss ethical considerations related to research conducted into genetic influences on behaviour.** *[22 marks]*

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 ethical issues related to research conducted into genetic influences.

Possible research could include: Bouchard (1990), Minnesota Twin Study, or Plomin and Petrill’s (1997) study on IQ.

Discussions could be based around:

- how the study has been conducted in terms of ethical issues such as informed consent, confidentiality, psychological harm, right to withdraw and deception
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied, including the possible abuse of findings.

Candidates may discuss a relatively small number of ethical considerations in greater depth or a greater number in less depth, thereby demonstrating a breadth of understanding. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Responses focused on research conducted on animals should be awarded the full range of marks.

5. To what extent do social *or* cultural factors affect *one* cognitive process? [22 marks]

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

The command term “to what extent” requires the candidate to consider the merits or otherwise of the argument regarding the influence of social or cultural factors on one cognitive process.

The aim of the essay is to produce an informed conclusion, whereby opinions and judgments are presented clearly and supported with appropriate evidence and sound argument.

Some factors which may be used include, but are not limited to:

- education
- memory strategies in different cultures
- strategies to develop dual attention skills through video game training
- cultural differences exist in the susceptibility of making fundamental attribution error: people from individualistic cultures are prone to the error while people from collectivistic cultures commit less of it (Miller, 1984; Markus and Kitayama, 1991)
- perception – cross-cultural differences in the perception of illusions, depth perception and size constancy.

Responses should address just one cognitive process, and where candidates have provided more than one, credit should be given only to the first response.

Candidates may discuss a relatively small number of social or cultural factors in greater depth or a greater number of social or cultural factors in less depth, thereby demonstrating a breadth of understanding. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Where candidates have considered both social and cultural factors, credit should be given only to the first response.

6. Discuss factors influencing conformity.

[22 marks]

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 factors influencing conformity. More than one factor should be addressed.

There are a number of factors influencing conformity that can be discussed, including:

- culture
- groupthink
- risky shift
- minority influence
- group size.

Individual factors could include Crutchfield’s conforming personality theory (1956) that argues that personality factors influence whether or not an individual will conform.

In a meta-analysis, Bond (2005) found differences in the effect of group size based on the type of social influence. Specific research on the influence of unanimity and accuracy, cohesion, confidence, gender, status, cultural norms, among others could be cited.

Candidates may discuss a relatively small number of factors in greater depth or a greater number of factors in less depth, thereby demonstrating a breadth of understanding. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

If factors influencing obedience, rather than conformity, are discussed, no marks should be awarded for this. Responses discussing Stanford Prison Study should not be awarded marks unless they clearly address the influence of societal roles on conformity.
