



MARKSCHEME

November 2004

PSYCHOLOGY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

*This mark scheme 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 authorisation of IBCA.*

SECTION A

Biological Perspective

- 1. Outline historical or cultural conditions that have given rise to the biological perspective.**

[8 marks]

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

The deliberate inclusion of “or” in this question should ensure that candidates have the option to address either historical or cultural conditions. There is no need for candidates to distinguish between historical and cultural conditions. Several contributions, which may be seen to have influenced the rise of the biological perspective, have been made by various relevant figures in psychology that could include: Darwin, Crick and Watson, Freud, Mendel and Pavlov. The rise of science, the scientific method, positivistic concepts derived from philosophy, the increasing accuracy of diagnostic tests and subsequent treatment are all areas that candidates may use.

Since an outline is required, high quality summaries of relevant conditions should attract high marks providing that these are related to the rise of the biological perspective. However some answers may also include elements of discussion and these also may be awarded high marks.

Weaker responses may show a lack of awareness of what is meant by historical and cultural conditions. They may also find it difficult to apply relevant factors in an appropriate manner.

Cognitive Perspective

2. Choose *one* cognitive research study that could be considered to be controversial.

(a) Outline the method used in the chosen study.

[4 marks]

Expect a wide variety of studies but selected examples must be clearly from the cognitive perspective. Many candidates will probably choose to focus on use of non-human animals, and are likely to offer an example from research into, for example, perceptual development, or problem-solving. However, any study explicitly focusing on the acquisition, reproduction, storage and transformation of information may be successfully used.

Award *[3 to 4 marks]* for an accurate summary of a relevant study.

Award *[1 to 2 marks]* for a summary of the method of a relevant study lacking in clarity or accuracy.

(b) Explain why the study is considered controversial.

[4 marks]

The justification of the controversial label will depend on the study chosen.

Award *[3 to 4 marks]* for a clear justification of the controversial nature of the research study.

Award *[1 to 2 marks]* for a justification of the ‘controversial’ label that lacks clarity.

Learning Perspective

3. (a) Describe *one* study in which environmental factors contribute to explanations of behaviour within the learning perspective. **[4 marks]**

Candidates should clearly indicate at least one specific environmental factor investigated in the study. A range of research from traditional behaviourist theory would be acceptable, such as many of Skinner's studies using pigeons or rats, Watson's Little Albert study, Thorndike's puzzle box experiments, etc.

Award **[3 to 4 marks]** for responses that clearly and accurately describe a study in which environmental factors were found to have contributed in explaining the behaviour.

Award **[1 to 2 marks]** where the study described investigated the contribution of environmental factors to behaviour but the candidate does not clearly or explicitly identify these factors.

Studies described that do not investigate the role of environmental factors on behaviour should be awarded **[0 marks]**.

- (b) Explain how the findings of the study described in part (a) have helped psychologists to understand behavioural change. **[4 marks]**

Award **[3 to 4 marks]** for responses that explicitly link the findings from the study described in part (a) to behavioural change. Indicative content will depend on choice of study in part (a) but could include higher order conditioning, shaping, chaining, etc.

Award **[1 to 2 marks]** for responses that do not explicitly give an explanation of behavioural change, to the findings of the study described in part (a).

Humanistic Perspective

4. (a) Outline *two* assumptions of the humanistic perspective. [4 marks]

There are several assumptions that are common to theorists within the humanistic perspectives such as:

Belief in the uniqueness of the individual

Focus on conscious awareness and “experiencing” as the basis for “knowing”

Intrinsic goodness of the person

Freedom of choice

Emphasis on the promotion of personal growth and self-direction.

There may be other assumptions mentioned such as search for meaning which although more specific to certain theorists may be considered applicable to the general framework of humanistic psychology.

The two assumptions should be outlined clearly for maximum marks.

Award [2 marks] for an appropriate assumption clearly and accurately outlined.

Award [1 mark] for an outline of an appropriate assumption lacking in clarity.

Outline of relevant theories without a clear linkage to assumptions should be awarded a maximum of [1 mark].

(b) Evaluate *one* of the assumptions outlined in part (a). [4 marks]

Candidates should present a balanced evaluation of the chosen assumption. Assumptions are understood as the basis for further reasoning and are often related to philosophical concerns. Areas of evaluation may relate, for example to the accuracy of biographical data on which assumptions of intrinsic goodness may be based. Validity and reliability of self-reports used to understand self-awareness by Rogers may be questioned. Subjectivity/ intersubjectivity as the basis for “knowing”, cultural relativity of values and similar judgments can be discussed. Award marks in the higher bands for an informed evaluation. A maximum of [2 marks] is available for only either strengths **or** limitations, however detailed.

SECTION B

- 5. Discuss strengths *and* limitations of research methods used within the biological perspective. [20 marks]**

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

The syllabus is helpful in providing students with a partial list of appropriate methods including correlational studies, double - blind trials, experiments, case studies and questionnaires. Candidates could well justify other research methods, especially from qualitative research (e.g. diaries, focus groups). However examiners should not award credit for answers based on medical or surgical procedures unless these are explicitly embedded in a research method.

Candidates who use depth rather than breadth of studies are equally capable of receiving high marks.

Cultural, ethical or gender considerations could well provide examples on which candidates base their answers. There could also be a discussion of determinism and reductionism in addition to claims that findings from investigations with animals are not always easily transferable to humans.

High quality essays should consider strengths as well as limitations of the methods chosen. If only one of these two factors is addressed, such essays should be marked out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**. The plural use of ‘methods’ in the question means that at least two methods should be considered. **[10 marks]** should be the maximum if only one method is used.

Weaker answers are likely to have a superficial content or lack sufficient consideration of strengths and limitations.

6. **Assess the extent to which *one* concept or model of information processing has helped in understanding cognition.** **[20 marks]**

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

Candidates are being asked to measure and judge the merits and quality of a concept or model of information processing in understanding cognition. An appropriate starting point could be a definition of cognition, with an indication of the type of cognitive processing, *e.g.* memory, perception, problem-solving, *etc.* to be discussed in the response. Many candidates are likely to focus on the limitations of computer metaphor based models for explaining human behaviour. However, a balanced argument should include reference to both strengths and limitations. Expect detailed and accurate description of a model or concept in an essay meriting the awarding of marks in the top band, with support for assessment of usefulness being derived from empirical studies which refer to cultural, ethical, gender **or** methodological considerations where appropriate. Answers offering only detailed description of a relevant concept or model and ignoring the ‘assess’ command term should attract a maximum of **[10 marks]**.

Mid band **[6 to 13 marks]** responses will probably be characterized by basic knowledge of an appropriate model or concept and a limited attempt at assessment of its usefulness in the understanding of cognition, including minimal evaluation.

Award marks in the lowest bands **[0 to 5 marks]** for answers offering only a superficial account of a relevant concept or model, with no attempt at evaluation or assessment.

7. (a) **Some research studies within the learning perspective are seen as ethically contentious. With reference to such research studies, describe relevant ethical considerations.** **[8 marks]**

Award **[6 to 8 marks]** for description of relevant ethical considerations that relate to empirical studies of the learning perspective. Some ethical considerations that might be described could include the treatment of non-human animals, the use of children, *etc.*

Award **[3 to 5 marks]** for unbalanced accounts of two relevant ethical considerations. This mark band would also be appropriate when information on one of the two ethical considerations accurately responds to the question, but the other does not or when only one ethical consideration is provided.

Award **[1 to 2 marks]** for basic identification of relevant ethical issues.

- (b) **To what extent have ethical considerations affected the interpretation of behaviour from a learning perspective?** **[12 marks]**

Refer to the scaled paper 1 section B markbands below when marking this part of the question.

Award **[9 to 12 marks]** for answers that thoroughly justify and accurately describe the extent to which ethical considerations have affected the interpretation of behaviour from a learning perspective. Candidates earning marks in this range might also frame their argument in terms of the time period in which some studies were carried out. Codes of ethics have evolved over time and during the time in which some studies were carried out researchers may not have faced any ethical problems. Retrospectively, using a current set of ethical guidelines, the studies may be interpreted differently.

Award **[4 to 8 marks]** when candidates come to a justified conclusion, however the justification provided might be less accurate and less thorough than in a top band response.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for candidates providing basic information with little relevance and less accuracy. Essays with a weak, although relevant, statement of extent should earn marks in this range. Material that is repeated from part (a) and lacks focus on the question in part (b) should be awarded **[0 marks]**.

Markband

- 0** If the answer does not achieve the standard described in mark band 1-3, a mark of 0 should be recorded.
- 1-2** 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.
- 3-4** There is an attempt to structure the answer but it is not sustained throughout 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.
- 5-6** 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.
- 7-8** 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.
- 9-10** 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.
- 11-12** 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.

- 8. Examine the contribution and current standing of the humanistic perspective as an alternative to the scientific study of behaviour. [20 marks]**

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

The current standing of the humanistic perspective varies in different parts of the world. It is likely that examiners will get an array of viewpoints. Rogers himself was aware of the passionate debate that his reformation of psychological science brought into the academic world.

Candidates may refer to the clear distinction that this perspective draws between animals and humans and how experimental controls are set aside to make room for a more “ecological” and ideographic approach. References may also be made to the fact that many humanistic research studies are correlational in nature. Candidates may refer to subjectivity and relativism as unscientific and “soft,” as compared to the analysis of the systematic study of behaviour. The arguments posed by Eysenck attempting to refute claims of effectiveness may be contrasted to Rogers’s followers and Roger’s own outcome studies supporting his theories and findings. Biological predispositions are not relevant to the perspective and the current emphasis on biological determinants may be brought into the discussion.

Candidates are not expected to uncritically accept the humanistic perspective but criticism should be informed. Answers in the top bands *[14 to 20 marks]* will refer to both sides of the argument in considering the current standing of humanistic perspective and could refer to assumptions and interrelations of the issues.

Answers in the mid band are likely to be imbalanced. Award a maximum of *[10 marks]* to one-sided arguments.

Answers in the lower bands *[0 to 5 marks]* will fail to develop an argument or will simply include related content without addressing the question directly.
