



Markscheme

November 2015

Psychology

Higher level and Standard level

Paper 2

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 Assessment Centre.

Paper 2 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. |

Abnormal psychology

1. Explain **two** etiologies of **one** disorder from **one** of the following groups:

- anxiety disorders
- eating disorders.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account, including causes, of one disorder.

Etiology refers to the cause(s) or origins of an abnormal condition.

Anxiety disorders may include, but are not limited to:

- phobias
- PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder)
- OCD (obsessive-compulsive disorder).

Eating disorders may include, but are not limited to:

- anorexia
- bulimia
- binge eating disorders.

The two etiologies explained could be from different levels of analysis or the same level of analysis.

Examples of how candidates may show evidence of critical thinking could include:

- analysis of the methodology and/or ethical considerations
- application of empirical support in relation to a given problem or issue
- using evidence from studies that support or disconfirm a theory, model or concept
- analysis of the interaction between biological, cognitive and cultural factors
- addressing the issue of universality versus cultural differences
- questioning the direction of cause and effect.

If a candidate explains the etiology of a disorder which is neither an anxiety nor eating disorder (for example, schizophrenia, ADHD or depression) then the response should be awarded **[0 marks]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[3 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization.

If a candidate explains more than two etiologies, credit should be given only to the first two explanations. However, in some cases, candidates may use other etiologies in order to demonstrate critical thinking relevant to the two main etiologies addressed in the response. This approach is acceptable and should be awarded marks.

If a candidate explains etiologies of more than one disorder, credit should be given only to the first disorder.

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

2. To what extent do **one or more** biological factors influence abnormal behaviour?

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the contributions of biological factors influencing abnormal behaviour.

Anxiety disorders, affective disorders and eating disorders will most likely be presented. It is, however, acceptable to use other examples of disorders or abnormal behaviours.

Biological factors could, for example, include:

- brain damage
- the role of genes
- biochemical factors (eg hormones and neurotransmitters).

Candidates could choose to provide a general response on the extent to which biological factors influence abnormal behaviour or they could provide a response discussing the extent to which biological factors influence one specific disorder.

Candidates may examine one biological factor in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may examine a number of biological factors in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address cognitive and/or sociocultural factors in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

3. Discuss psychological research (theories and/or studies) relevant to validity and reliability of diagnosis.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of psychological research related to various aspects of validity and reliability of diagnosis.

Anxiety disorders, affective disorders and eating disorders will most likely be presented. It is, however, acceptable to use other examples of disorders or abnormal behaviours.

Although a discussion of psychological research on both validity and reliability is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks. The terms “validity” and “reliability” need to be consistently and appropriately used throughout the response.

Theories and studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Cooper’s (1972) study on inter-rater reliability in the UK and USA
- Rosenhan *et al.*’s (1973) study on validity of diagnosis
- Nicholls *et al.*’s (2000) correlational study of inter-rater reliability across several diagnostic systems.

Candidates may refer to Szasz’s criticism (in *The Myth of Mental Illness: foundations of a theory of personal conduct* (1961)) of the validity of the term “mental illness” as long as the focus of the response is on the process of diagnosis.

Discussion of the selected research may include but is not limited to:

- methodological considerations
- the use of classification systems
- cultural and gender considerations
- the accuracy and clarity of concepts of disorders
- contrary findings or explanations.

Candidates may discuss a relatively small number of theories and/or studies in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or a greater number of theories and/or studies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

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

If a candidate discusses only “validity” or only “reliability” the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[5 marks]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[4 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization.

Developmental psychology

4. Evaluate **one** theory **or** study relevant to developmental psychology.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal by weighing up the strengths and limitations of one theory or one study relevant to developmental psychology. Although a discussion of both similarities and differences is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Candidates should address research on the topics covered in the psychology guide *ie* cognitive development, social development (attachment and resilience), and identity development (adolescence and gender roles).

Research may include but is not limited to:

- a theory or study on cognitive development (eg Piaget, Vygotsky, Kohlberg, Bruner)
- identity research (eg Erikson, Marcia, Elkind, Coleman)
- research on attachment (eg Bowlby, Ainsworth, Hazan and Shaver)
- a theory or study on resilience (eg Cyrulnik, Werner)
- a gender role theory or study (eg Kohlberg, Bem, Mead).

Responses may also focus on a general theory such as social learning theory, psychodynamic theory or evolutionary theory. Both approaches are equally acceptable as long as these theories are relevant to developmental psychology.

Evaluation of the selected research should be the focus of the answer and may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- contrary findings or explanations
- the productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
- the applications of the empirical findings.

If a candidate evaluates more than one theory or study, credit should be given only to the first evaluation. Candidates may address other research (theories/studies) and be awarded marks for these as long as they are clearly used to evaluate the main research addressed in the response.

If a candidate discusses only strengths or only limitations, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[5 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization. Up to full marks may be awarded for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension.

5. Discuss **one or more** potential effects of deprivation and/or trauma in childhood on later development.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of the potential effects of deprivation and/or trauma in childhood on later development. Candidates may address deprivation and/or trauma experiences and they do not have to specifically identify them as deprivation or trauma situations.

Research may include, but is not limited to:

- Rutter (1981) and Rutter *et al.* (2001)
- Case study of Genie
- Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis
- Cockett and Tripp’s (1994) study on long-term attachment deprivation effects
- Cyrulnik’s theory of resilience
- Koluchova’s case study showing the possibility to reverse the effects of deprivation
- Tedeschi and Calhoun’s (2004) theory on the positive aspects emerging from the struggle with trauma.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- traditional deterministic theories of deprivation
- methodological and ethical considerations
- research dealing with how resilience and protective factors reduce the impact of deprivation or trauma in childhood
- biological, cognitive or sociocultural factors in relation to potential effects of deprivation or trauma in childhood on later development.

Candidates may make reference to animal studies as part of their response, and credit should be awarded for this as long as they relate the findings to human development.

Candidates may discuss one or a small number of potential effects of deprivation/trauma in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of potential effects of deprivation/trauma in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

6. To what extent does physical change influence the development of identity during adolescence?

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the merits or otherwise of the argument that physical change during adolescence influences identity development. Candidates should highlight how physical change affects the formation of identity and specify that there are other contributing factors in the development of identity.

Relevant content may provide an outline of the emergence of primary and secondary sexual characteristics and address how those changes affect identity formation during adolescence.

Responses may include, but are not limited to:

- the difficulty of generalizing the psychological effects of physical changes: these effects depend on the timing of puberty and they differ in boys and girls
- the development of identity is influenced by the interaction of biological, cognitive and social factors and is not dominated by biology
- culture is also a strong determinant in self-perception and body shape perception
- researchers have expressed doubt that puberty’s effects on development of identity are as strong as once believed.

Responses may refer to research such as:

- Simmons and Blyth’s cultural ideal hypothesis
- Mead’s cross-cultural research on gender role development
- studies on the timing of puberty and its impact on body image, self-esteem and behaviour: Jones (1965), Blyth, Bulcroft and Simmons (1981), Brooks-Gunn and Paikoff (1993).

Candidates who do not make any explicit reference to the link between physical change during adolescence and identity can be awarded up to up to **[6 marks]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to **[6 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization.

Candidates who address only “physical change during adolescence” or only “development of identity” can be awarded up to **[4 marks]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to **[3 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization.

Health psychology

7. Discuss **two** prevention strategies for obesity.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of the chosen prevention strategies.

Prevention strategies aim to change an individual’s lifestyle by targeting healthier eating, more exercise or both. Prevention strategies could include, but are not limited to:

- government intervention programmes, such as requiring labelling of all food products or imposing zoning laws for better access to healthy food markets (Ashe *et al.*, 2003)
- campaigns promoting healthy eating (Golan *et al.*, 1998)
- exercise awareness campaigns (Huhman *et al.*, 2005)
- national health campaigns, such as the British Nutrition Foundation’s eatwell plate which emphasizes healthy eating (2007).

Discussion may include but is not limited to:

- cultural and gender considerations
- empirical findings
- appropriateness of the strategies
- the effectiveness of combining strategies.

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

If a candidate discusses more than two prevention strategies, credit should be given only to the first two. Candidates may address other strategies and be awarded marks for these as long as they are clearly used in the discussion of one or both of the two main strategies addressed in the response.

8. Evaluate **two** examples of psychological research (theories and/or studies) relevant to health psychology.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal of two examples of research relevant to health psychology by weighing up the strengths and the limitations of either studies and/or theories. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Candidates should address research on the topics covered in the psychology guide *ie* stress, addiction, substance abuse, obesity, and health promotion.

Theories may include, but are not limited to:

- Theories related to stress (GAS, fight or flight, cognitive appraisal model)
- Theories of health promotion (health belief model, theory of reasoned action, theory of planned behaviour).

Studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Speisman *et al.*'s (1964) study on the role of appraisal in stressful situations
- Evans and Kim (2007) examined the role of stress and long-term exposure to poverty in childhood
- Shapiro (1998) examined mindfulness-based stress reduction as a coping mechanism for exam stress
- Stahre *et al.*'s (2007) study examining the effectiveness of cognitive behavioural therapy on weight loss
- Stunkard *et al.*'s (2002) study investigating the role of genes and weight.

Evaluation of research may include but is not limited to:

- methodological, cultural, ethical or gender considerations
- the applications of the empirical findings
- the productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
- comparison to other research
- contrary findings or explanations.

If a candidate discusses only strengths or only limitations, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[5 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization. Up to full marks may be awarded for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension.

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

If a candidate evaluates more than two examples of research, credit should be given only to the first two. Candidates may address other examples of research and be awarded marks for these as long as they are clearly used in the evaluation of one or both of the two main examples of research addressed in the response.

9. Discuss **one or more** strategies for coping with stress.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of one or more strategies for coping with stress.

Relevant strategies (including models and techniques) may include, but are not limited to:

- problem-focused and emotion-focused strategies (Lazarus and Folkman, 1975, 1988)
- forms of cognitive behavioural therapy such as stress inoculation training (Meichenbaum, 1985)
- social support groups/networks (Brown and Harris, 1978)
- mindfulness-based stress reduction strategies (Kabat-Zinn, 1979)
- Candidates may also address ineffective or unhealthy coping strategies, such as drug taking, alcohol abuse, smoking, overeating, or the use of defence mechanisms.

Discussion of the strategies may include the following points:

- research supporting or refuting the effectiveness of these strategies
- presenting possible methodological, ethical or cultural considerations of the research referenced relating to the coping strategy
- a comparison and/or contrast of the two strategies.

Candidates may discuss one strategy in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or a greater number of strategies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Evaluate **one or more** theories and/or studies on factors influencing bystanderism.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal of research (theories and/or studies) related to factors influencing bystanderism by weighing up strengths and limitations of the research. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

In choosing psychological research related to factors influencing bystanderism, candidates may choose to focus either on research that examines why people become bystanders, or why individuals choose *not* to be bystanders, or a combination of both. If a candidate discusses one or more theories, the candidate is not required to include studies to back up their argument.

Theories may include, but are not limited to:

- diffusion of responsibility
- pluralistic ignorance
- deindividuation.

Studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Piliavin *et al.* (1969)
- Latané and Darley (1968)
- Levine *et al.*'s (1990) cross-cultural study.

Evaluative comments may include, but are not limited to:

- strengths and limitations of the selected research
- application of findings
- methodological, cross-cultural, gender and ethical considerations
- productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
- comparison to other research
- contrary findings or explanations.

Candidates may evaluate one theory/study in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may evaluate a larger number of theories/studies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

If a candidate discusses only strengths or only limitations, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[5 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization. Up to full marks may be awarded for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension.

11. Examine the role of communication in maintaining relationships.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to consider the role of communication in human relationships in ways that uncover the relationship between communication and maintaining relationships.

Relevant studies and/or theories may include, but are not limited to:

- gender-based communication styles (Tannen, 1990)
- the importance of self-disclosure (Altman and Taylor’s social penetration theory, 1973)
- the role of micro-expressions (Gottman and Levinson, 1986)
- attributional styles (Bradbury and Fincham, 1990).

Responses may address issues such as, but not limited to:

- cultural biases in research
- difficulties of carrying out research on communication styles
- ethical concerns when conducting research.

Descriptions of research on communication that do not demonstrate the role of communication in maintaining relationships should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4 marks]** for criterion A, knowledge and understanding, up to a maximum of **[3 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization.

12. Discuss **one or more** sociocultural explanations of the origins of violence.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of the chosen sociocultural factor(s) and the origins of violence.

Responses may include, but are not limited to, discussion of:

- social identity theory (for example, Maass, 2003)
- social learning theory (for example, Bandura, 1961)
- negative social schemas (for example, Bradshaw, 2004)
- subculture of violence theory (Nisbett and Cohen, 1996).

Discussion of the sociocultural explanation may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural and gender considerations
- empirical findings that support or refute the explanation
- comparison/contrast to other explanations.

Although the main focus of the response should be on sociocultural explanations, cognitive and biological explanations are acceptable as part of a balanced response.

Candidates may discuss one sociocultural explanation of the origins of violence in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may examine a larger number of sociocultural explanations of the origins of violence in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Sport psychology

13. Explain the role of goal-setting in the motivation of individuals engaged in sport.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account, including reasons or causes, related to the role of goal-setting in the motivation of individuals engaged in sport.

Relevant concepts, studies, and theories could include, but are not limited to:

- achievement goal theory (for example, Duda and Hall, 2001)
- the role of outcome, performance, and process goals (for example, Steinberg *et al.*, 2000)
- Duda *et al.* (1998) on the relationship between goals and perception of success in children engaged in sport
- Smith (1994), SMART – components of effective goal setting
- Elliot and Dweck (1988) on ego orientation versus task orientation
- Locke and Latham (1981, 2006) on the role of goal-setting in regulating performance and increasing self-efficacy.

Examples of how candidates may show evidence of critical thinking could include:

- analysis of the methodology and/or ethical considerations
- application of empirical support in relation to a given problem or issue
- using evidence from studies that support or disconfirm a theory, model or concept
- addressing the issue of universality versus cultural differences
- questioning the direction of cause and effect.

Candidates may explain theories and/or studies but they are not required to explain both a theory and a study related to goal-setting in the motivation of individuals engaged in sport.

Descriptions of research on goal-setting in motivation without a link to motivation in sport should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4 marks]** for criterion A, knowledge and understanding, up to a maximum of **[3 marks]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2 marks]** for criterion C, organization.

14. To what extent does the role of coaches affect individual and/or team behaviour in sport?

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the merits or otherwise of how the role of the coach affects individual and/or team behaviour.

Coaches can have a positive or negative effect on the athletes they coach. Candidates may consider topics such as the role of the coach in regard to the motivation of the athlete, self-efficacy, goal-setting, the role of feedback in improving performance, the role of coaches in team cohesion, and the role of coaches’ expectations in the performance of athletes.

Candidates may adopt another approach and discuss the difficulties of assessing the influence of coaches. This approach could include discussion of the difficulty in isolating variables, the problem of generalizability (transference) or the general subjectivity of this type of research.

Both approaches may be mixed in a response.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Garcia-Bengochea (2003) on peers’ versus coaches’ effect on athlete motivation
- Jowett and Cockerill (2003) on coaches’ characteristics and successful Olympic swimmers
- Duda and Pensgaard (2002) on improving intrinsic motivation
- Chase *et al.* (1997) on coaches’ sense of self-efficacy and team performance
- Slavin (1995) on facilitating a community of cooperative learners
- Horn and Lox (1993) on the role of coaches’ expectations on athlete performance.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address personality characteristics, financial motivations, peer influences, *etc* in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

15. Discuss **one or more** effects of drug use in sport.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of the effects of drug use in sport. Effects may contribute positively and/or negatively to an athlete’s performance.

Effects of drug use may include, but are not limited to:

- physical effects such as quicker healing from injury, weight gain, liver/kidney damage, increased risk of heart damage/stroke, weakened tendons
- psychological effects such as increased aggression, increased risk of mental illness, mood swings (including “roid rage” as a result of steroid use)
- addiction and withdrawal symptoms
- masculinization and feminization of athletes
- enhanced performance
- the masking of pain, leading to greater injury.

Studies related to effects of drug use in sport could include, but are not limited to:

- Liv *et al.* (2008) on unclear results of use of human growth hormone on athletic performance
- McGrath and Cowan (2008) on drug use in sport including effect on performance and detrimental effects
- Tokish *et al.* (2004) on performance and side effects of performance enhancing drugs
- Pope and Katz (1988) on steroid use and increased mood disorders
- Yates *et al.* (1992) on steroid use and increased aggression
- Brower *et al.* (1991) on steroid use leading to addiction.

Candidates may discuss one effect in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may discuss a larger number of effects in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.
