

Markscheme

May 2018

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 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.

Paper 2 assessment criteria

A — Knowledge and comprehension

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

C — Organization

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

Abnormal psychology

1. Discuss concepts of normality and abnormality.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review that includes various concepts of normality and abnormality.

Concepts of normality and abnormality may include, but are not limited to:

- the mental health criterion/model
- the statistical criterion/model
- abnormality as mental illness (medical model)
- the psychoanalytic explanation of the concept of abnormality
- the cognitive explanation of the concept of abnormality
- deviation from social and cultural norms.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cross-cultural issues
- gender biases
- supporting or contradicting evidence
- the issue of labelling
- changing norms on perceptions of normality (for example, changing views on homosexuality or political dissent)
- difficulties in defining normality/abnormality
- difficulties in diagnosing normality/abnormality.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Rosenhan and Seligman (1984) – seven criteria of abnormality
- Jahoda (1958) – six characteristics of mental health
- Szasz (1962) – mental disorders as “problems in living”
- Bolton (1999) – cultural issues in overdiagnosis.

Although studies illustrating difficulty in diagnosis (*eg* Rosenhan) may be marginally relevant to the question, the response must be focused on the broader issue of normality versus abnormality in order to be awarded the full range of marks.

Candidates may discuss a small number of explanations of normality and abnormality in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of explanations of normality and abnormality in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

2. Discuss the use of **one or more** examples of an eclectic approach to treatment.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one or more examples of an eclectic approach to treatment.

An eclectic approach to treatment refers to instances where the therapist selects treatments and strategies from a variety of current approaches. Responses may refer to an eclectic treatment in general or an eclectic treatment for specific disorders. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Many examples of eclectic approaches to treatment are available, for example:

- Sharp *et al.*'s (1999) study of drug therapy combined with cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT)
- Pampallona's (2004) analysis of the relative effectiveness of drug therapy versus combined treatment
- Elkin *et al.*'s (1989) study of the relative effectiveness of interpersonal therapy (IPT), CBT, drugs and placebo
- McDermut *et al.*'s (2001) study of group therapy versus CBT.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- strengths of each separate approach are combined so that potential limitations of a specific approach are decreased
- the overall treatment is tailored to the specific needs of the client
- it provides flexibility in treatment (for example, many patients suffer from several disorders at the same time)
- overall efficacy (lower relapse rates)
- treatment can be complex for one clinician to manage
- there are very few empirical studies on long-term effectiveness and more research is needed
- methodological, cultural and ethical considerations
- comparing the effectiveness of an eclectic approach to treatment to a singular approach.

Candidates may discuss one example of an eclectic approach to treatment in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or a greater number of examples of an eclectic approach to treatment in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

If a candidate compares and evaluates two separate treatment methods without addressing the eclectic approach then the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[5]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

3. Explain, with reference to psychological research, **two** etiologies of **one** anxiety, affective **or** eating disorder.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account, including causes, of two etiologies of one disorder. The two etiologies explained could be from different levels of analysis or the same level of analysis. Although the question asks for two etiologies, the response does not need to be evenly balanced.

Anxiety disorders may include, but are not limited to: phobias, PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder) or OCD (obsessive-compulsive disorder). Eating disorders may include, but are not limited to: anorexia, bulimia or binge eating disorders. Affective disorders may include, but are not limited to: major depression, bipolar disorder or seasonal affective disorder (SAD).

Examples of how candidates may show evidence of critical thinking could include, but are not limited to:

- analysis of the methodology and/or ethical considerations related to the studies
- application of empirical support in relation to the causes of the disorder
- using evidence from studies that support or disconfirm the explanation/etiology of one disorder
- 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, affective nor eating disorder (for example, schizophrenia, or ADHD) then the response should be awarded **[0]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

If a candidate approaches this question without referring to a specific disorder, then the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4]** 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.

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]** 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.

Developmental psychology

4. Examine 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 “examine” requires candidates to consider the relationships between deprivation and/or trauma in childhood and later development. Candidates may address deprivation and/or trauma experiences but they do not have to specifically identify them as deprivation or trauma situations.

Research may include, but is not limited to:

- Rutter *et al.*'s (2001) and Rutter's (1981) studies on the consequences of deprivation
- 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.

In order to respond to the command term “examine”, candidates may refer to:

- research explaining 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
- traditional deterministic theories of deprivation
- research showing that deprivation or trauma may lead to positive growth
- short-term versus long-term effects of deprivation or trauma
- methodological and ethical considerations.

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

5. Evaluate **one or more** examples of psychological research (theories and/or studies) into adolescence.

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 or more theories or studies into adolescence. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Relevant theories may include, but are not limited to:

- Erikson’s identity theory
- Coleman’s focal theory
- Baethge’s cultural theory
- Lewin’s field theory.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Marcia’s studies on the different types of identity status
- Mead’s anthropological studies
- Rutter et al.’s studies on the relationships between adolescents and their parents
- Steinberg’s studies on parent–adolescent conflicts
- Condon’s (1987) study challenging the cross-cultural validity of Erikson’s theory
- Ferron’s (1997) cross-cultural study on body image in adolescence.
- studies related to teenage brain development.

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to:

- appropriateness of concepts in explaining adolescence
- appropriateness of explanation of individual differences
- cultural and gender considerations
- methodological considerations
- supporting and contradicting evidence
- the productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
- the applications of the research
- relevance of stage versus continuous development.

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

Theories such as those advanced by Piaget and Vygotsky may be presented for discussion. However, the focus must be on the period of adolescence in order to be awarded the full range of marks.

6. To what extent does attachment in childhood play a role in the formation of relationships later in life?

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the influence that attachment in childhood has on relationships later in life.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address the fact that there is no clear evidence of direct causality between attachment in childhood and formation of relationships later in life in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Pratt and Norris (1994) – positive correlation between early attachment relationships and reports of current social relationships
- Hazan and Shaver (1987) – similarities between romantic love as experienced by adults and the characteristics of attachment
- Rossi and Rossi (1990) – people who grew up in cohesive families tended to establish positive relationships with their own partners
- Sternberg and Beall (1991) – many adults find that their relationships vary: with one partner, they experience an insecure bond, but with the next a secure one
- Bowlby’s research on how maternal deprivation can affect an individual later in life.

Responses referring to research with animals, such as Harlow’s studies with rhesus monkeys, are relevant but must be linked to attachment in humans. Responses that do not explicitly make any link to human behaviour should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

Responses that focus only on descriptions of research on attachment in childhood (such as Ainsworth) with no link to the formation of relationships later in life should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

Health psychology

7. Discuss physiological and/or social aspects of stress.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of physiological and/or social aspects of stress.

Candidates can use research that deals with either or both the physiological and social aspects of stress.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Kiecolt-Glaser *et al.*'s (1984) study on how exam stress influences the immune system
- Steptoe and Marmot's (2003) Whitehall study on the relationship between workplace stress and the risk of heart disease
- Sapolsky (2005) on the influence of social hierarchy on primate health
- Fernald and Gunnar's (2008) or Evans and Kim's (2007) studies on the relationship between poverty and stress
- Taylor *et al.*'s (2000) study on gender differences in stress
- O'Driscoll and Cooper's (1994) study on coping with work-related stress.

Discussion may include but is not limited to:

- cultural and gender considerations
- conditions under which stress may be observed and/or measured
- methodological concerns in measuring aspects of stress
- risk factors associated with socio-economic status.

Responses may discuss either physiological or social aspects of stress or may discuss both aspects of stress. Either approach is equally acceptable.

Candidates may address a smaller number of physiological and/or social aspects of stress in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of physiological and/or social aspects of stress in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Responses referring to research with animals, such as Callhoun's study of the effects of crowding on rats, are relevant but must be linked to human behaviour.

8. Examine one or more models and/or theories of health promotion.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to consider one or more models/theories in a way that uncovers the assumptions of the models/theories, and relationships between the models/theories and health promotion.

Models/theories may include, but are not limited to:

- the health belief model (HBM)
- the stages of change model
- any of the various public health promotions such as the VERB (2002–2006), TRUTH (1998–1999), tips from former smokers (2012), ACT against AIDS (2011), HEART campaign (Zambia 1990s–2000).

Examination of the chosen models and/or theories may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural or gender considerations
- ethical considerations
- application of the empirical findings
- competing theories or studies
- the difficulty of assessing the effectiveness of the health promotion with regard to models/theories.

Studies may be used to illustrate or provide evidence for specific models and/or theories of health promotion, but the focus of the response must be on addressing the actual model and/or theory of health promotion in order to be awarded the full range of marks.

9. To what extent do biological factors influence health-related behaviour?

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the influence of biological factors on health-related behaviour.

Stress, obesity, substance abuse, and other health-related behaviours are equally acceptable for answers to the question. Candidates may approach health-related behaviour as a whole or use specific examples of health-related behaviour. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Biological factors may include, but are not limited to:

- evolutionary explanations
- genetic predisposition
- the biological effects of drug treatment for addictive behaviour
- the neurobiology of food addiction (for example, Volkow *et al.*, 2002).

Each factor that is identified should be connected to health-related behaviour. Where this connection is not made, no marks should be awarded for the mere listing or description of biological factors.

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

Candidates may address a small number of biological factors in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of biological factors in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Discuss **one or more** social and/or cultural origins of attraction.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one or more social/cultural explanations for the origin of attraction.

Social/cultural origins of attraction may include, but are not limited to:

- Proximity factor – proximity increases chances for interaction which in turn increases familiarity. Mere exposure effect is enough to increase liking (Zajonc, 1968)
- Cultural factors play a role in inducing attraction (for example, Buss et al., 1990) - values of chastity, youth, good financial prospects are differently rated in different parts of the world.
- Reciprocity - people tend to like others who reciprocate their liking
- Balance theory - emphasizes people’s desire to maintain a consistent state, also predicts the emergence of reciprocity, at least for people who are more like themselves
- Reward theory – we are often more inclined to spend time with people who make us feel good or offer some kind of social status or benefits.
- Social exchange theory – we unconsciously weigh the rewards and costs of being in a relationship. If a relationship is to last it should be profitable for both partners (Nye, 1979)
- Similarity (for example social class, cultural background, religion, ethnicity).

Discussion of social/cultural explanations of attraction may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological considerations
- gender considerations
- supporting or contradictory empirical evidence
- alternative explanations of attraction, such as biological and/or cognitive.

Candidates may address one or a small number of social/cultural origins of attraction in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of social/cultural origins of attraction in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

11. Evaluate **two** examples of research (theories and/or studies) investigating the role of communication in maintaining relationships.

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 investigating the role of communication in maintaining relationships by weighing up the 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.

Examples of research may include, but are not limited to:

- gender or cultural differences in communication patterns (for example, Tannen, 1990)
- the role of attribution in relationships (for example, Bradbury and Fincham, 1992)
- the value of disclosure (for example, social penetration theory)
- the role of communication of emotions in maintaining relationships (for example, Gottman and Levenson, 1986)
- studies on marital satisfaction (for example, Fincham, 2004).

Evaluation of the research may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative explanations
- the productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
- the applications of the empirical findings.

If a candidate evaluates more than two examples of research, credit should be given only to the first two examples of research. However, candidates may discuss other theories/studies and be awarded marks for this as long as these theories/studies are clearly used to evaluate the two main examples of research addressed in the response.

If a candidate evaluates only one theory/study, 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.

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

12. To what extent do sociocultural factors influence human relationships?

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the contribution of sociocultural factors that affect human relationships.

Candidates may address one or all areas of the option: social responsibility, interpersonal relationships and/or violence.

Factors which may be addressed include, but are not limited to:

- gender and cultural norms (for example, the role that culture plays in the formation and maintenance of relationships, violence, or perception of attractiveness)
- proximity
- modelling
- social identity
- similarity
- familiarity.

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

Candidates may consider a small number of sociocultural factors in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may consider a larger number of sociocultural factors in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Studies may be used to illustrate or to provide evidence for factors influencing human relationships, but the focus of the response must be on addressing the actual sociocultural factors which influence human relationships in order to be awarded the full range of marks.

Sport psychology

13. Evaluate **two or more** techniques for skill development used in sport.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal of two or more techniques used for skill development in sport by weighing up the strengths and limitations of each technique. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Techniques for skill development may include, but are not limited to:

- massed practice vs. distributed practice (e.g. repetition), for example Wickelgren (1981); Fitts and Posner (1967); Singer (1965)
- mental imagery research, for example Issac (1992); Baroga (1973); Rushall (1970)
- research on self-talk, for example Araki et al. (2006); Landin and Herbert (1999); Martin et al. (1995).

Evaluation of the selected techniques may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural or gender considerations
- empirical findings
- conditions under which the findings may be applied
- comparison to other techniques
- methodological considerations
- the effectiveness of the techniques.

Candidates may evaluate two techniques in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may evaluate a larger number of techniques to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

If a candidate only evaluates one 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.

14. To what extent does the role of coaches influence 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 contribution of the coach’s role in affecting individual and/or team behaviour in sport.

Coaches can have a positive or negative effect on the athletes they coach.

Candidates may consider topics such as, but not limited to:

- the role of the coach with 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
- the role of coaches’ expectations in the performance of athletes.

Candidates may 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.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address the role of other factors related to individual and/or team behaviour in sport such as personality characteristics, financial motivations, peer influences, team cohesion, etc. in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

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 (1965) on facilitating a community of cooperative learners
- Horn and Lox (1993) on the role of coaches’ expectations on athlete performance
- Alfermann et al. (2005) on coaches’ influence on skill development in athletes.

15. Discuss **one or more** models/theories of burnout in sport.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one or more models/theories of burnout in sport. Candidates may discuss models/theories related to causes of burnout in sport and/or prevention of burnout in sport.

Models/theories on burnout include, but are not limited to:

- Smith’s (1986) cognitive affective model
- Meichenbaum’s (1985) stress inoculation theory (SIT)
- Raedeke’s (2002) study of role conflict and other factors of burnout
- Maslach and Jackson’s (1984) model of burnout.

If a response addresses models and/or theories of burnout that address behaviour in general without explicit reference to behaviour in sport, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.
