

# 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. Describe how **one** social or cultural factor affects **one** cognitive process. **[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 social or cultural factor affects one cognitive process.

As the concepts of social and cultural factors are arguably very much related, a distinction is not necessary in the response.

Cognitive processes may include but are not limited to:

- memory
- perception
- attention
- language
- decision-making.

Appropriate factors include, but are not limited to:

- the impact of culture on schemas and memory (Bartlett, 1932)
- the effect of poverty on attention, working memory and perception
- the effects of social identity on the formation of flashbulb memories
- the role of schooling in memory strategies (Cole and Scribner, 1974)
- the impact of environmental stimuli on perception (carpentered world hypothesis)
- the role of short-term and long-term orientation on decision-making (Chen, 2005).

Additional factors may include institutionalization, deprivation and stereotypes/stereotype threat.

If a candidate describes more than one social or cultural factor, credit should be given only to the first factor.

If a candidate addresses more than one cognitive process, credit should be given only to the first process.

If a candidate describes a social or cultural factor making no explicit link to a cognitive process, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[3]**.

### 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**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
<b>0</b>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
<b>1–3</b>	There is an attempt to answer the question, but knowledge and understanding is limited, often inaccurate, or of marginal relevance to the question.
<b>4–6</b>	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.
<b>7–8</b>	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

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
<b>0</b>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
<b>1–3</b>	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.
<b>4–6</b>	The answer demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding relevant to the question or uses relevant psychological research to limited effect in the response.
<b>7–9</b>	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

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

### C — Organization

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

## Section B

4. To what extent does genetic inheritance influence behaviour? [22]

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

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the contribution of genetic inheritance on behaviour.

In responding, a candidate may choose a single behaviour, or they may choose a number of behaviours. The term “behaviour” may be considered broadly and could include schizophrenia, depression, obesity, intelligence, aggression and sexual orientation.

Candidates may use examples of inheritance from family, twin and adoption studies that look at concordance rates, or they may choose to look at studies of specific genes. Both approaches are equally acceptable. Candidates may also choose to address gene expression and gene x environment interactions.

It may be appropriate and useful for candidates to address sociocultural and/or cognitive factors in order to address the command term “to what extent”. It would also be appropriate to look at the strengths and limitations of genetic evidence.

Examples of relevant studies include, but are not limited to:

- Heston’s (1966), Gottesman’s (1991) and Kety *et al.*’s (1975) studies examining the role of genetic inheritance in schizophrenia
- Kendler *et al.* (2006), Caspi *et al.* (2003) and Nurnberger and Gershon (1982) on the role of genetic inheritance in depression
- Garn *et al.* (1981) and Stunkard *et al.* (1990) on the role of genetic inheritance in obesity
- Bouchard *et al.* (1990), Scarr and Weinberg (1977), and Plomin and Petrill (1977) on the role of genetic inheritance in intelligence.

If a candidate makes reference to research from evolutionary psychology, the focus of the response must be on how genetic inheritance may influence the behaviour.



5. Discuss **one** theory of how emotion may affect **one** cognitive process. **[22]**

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

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one theory demonstrating the influence of emotion on one cognitive process.

Responses may focus on any cognitive process that is affected by emotion, such as attention, perception, memory or decision-making.

Examples of theories include, but are not limited to:

- Brown and Kulik’s flashbulb memory theory
- Bower’s theory of state-dependent cues
- DaMasio’s Somatic Marker Hypothesis

Discussion of the selected theory includes, but is not limited to:

- degree of empirical support
- methodological considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- contrary findings or explanations
- validity of the concepts
- application and/or usefulness of the empirical findings.

If a candidate discusses more than one theory, credit should be given only to the first discussion, unless the other theory or theories are clearly used to evaluate the main theory; for example, used to illustrate the strengths and/or limitations of the main theory.

6. Discuss the use of **two** compliance techniques. **[22]**

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of two compliance techniques. Although the response must address two techniques the discussion does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Compliance techniques that are addressed may include, but are not limited to:

- reciprocity (Lynne & McCall, 1998; Tiger & Fox, 1989)
- foot-in-the-door (Petrova, 2007; Sherman, 1980; Freedman & Fraser, 1966)
- door-in-the-face (Gueguen & Meineri, 2011; Cialdini, 1975)
- low-balling (Burger & Cornelius, 2003; Palak, 1980).

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- efficacy of the technique
- levels of compliance affected by factors such as liking, authority, *etc*
- the role of cognitive dissonance
- the need for social acceptance
- the role of goal gradients
- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- contrary findings or explanations.

If a candidate discusses more than two compliance techniques, credit should be given only to the first two compliance techniques.

If a candidate discusses only one compliance technique, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[5]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[4]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

---