



MARKSCHEME

November 2014

PSYCHOLOGY

Higher 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. To what extent do cognitive factors *or* sociocultural 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 cognitive or sociocultural factors influencing abnormal behaviour.

Cognitive factors may include, but are not limited to:

- negative cognitive schemas influencing depression
- distorted weight-related schema influencing bulimia
- intrusive memories influencing panic reactions in PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder) patients.

Sociocultural factors may include, but are not limited to:

- vulnerability models
- cross-cultural differences influencing body dissatisfaction
- socialization differences leading to different symptoms of PTSD.

The focus of the response should be on the cognitive factors or sociocultural factors influencing abnormal behaviour. However, it is appropriate and useful for candidates to address other factors (including biological factors) in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

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

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

2. Discuss gender variations in the prevalence of *one or more* disorder(s).

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of gender variations in the prevalence of one or more disorder(s).

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- the effect of oestrogen on the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis (HPA) in response to stress (Pasquali, 2012)
- vulnerability models/life stressors (*eg* Brown and Harris, 1978)
- bias in diagnosis (Caplan, 1995)
- gender norms (Brown and Harris, 1978)
- cognitive styles (*eg* Nolen-Hoeksema, 1994).

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural considerations
- role of historical context
- methodological considerations
- empirical evidence
- comparison of validity of arguments.

Candidates may discuss a small number of gender variations in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of gender variations in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

3. Evaluate the use of an eclectic approach to treatment.

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 an eclectic approach to treatment. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

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.

Candidates may claim clinicians have realized that often one type of treatment is not enough. Many examples of eclectic approaches to treatment are available: for example, for severely depressed individuals combining CBT (cognitive behavioural therapy) and drug therapy is a popular choice; Sharp *et al.* (1999) found that in a study of depressed individuals, the most significant treatment gains were seen in a combination of drug therapy and CBT.

Strengths of the eclectic approach may include, but are 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)
- lower relapse rates.

Limitations of the eclectic approach may include, but are not limited to:

- too complex for one clinician to manage
- difficult to empirically study its effectiveness
- using too many approaches may reduce the effectiveness of each individual approach.

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.

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

Developmental psychology

4. Examine how *one or more* biological factors influence human development.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to consider how biological factors affect human development in a way that uncovers the interrelationships of this issue.

Responses may refer to biological factors including, but not limited to:

- the effects of maturation of the nervous system and cognitive development
- Waber’s (2007) MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) studies of normal brain development
- the role of neuroplasticity in brain development
- the role of stress hormones on faulty development
- the role of sex hormones
- Bowlby’s theory that attachment is innate.

Evidence of critical thinking may be provided by candidates in the following ways:

- discussing the issue of reductionism
- asserting that human development is the result of complex interactions between biological, sociocultural and cognitive factors
- evaluation of empirical research
- methodological and ethical considerations.

Although the focus of the answer should be on biological factors, candidates may discuss how cognitive and sociocultural factors interact with biological factors. Biology and experience are assumed to act together to produce the normal course of development (*eg* when examining the influence of gender on human development, candidates could assert the presence of an interaction between sociocultural and biological factors).

Candidates may address one biological factor in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address more than one biological factor in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

5. Evaluate *one* theory of cognitive development.

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 of cognitive development. 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:

- Piaget’s theory of cognitive development
- Vygotsky’s theory of cognitive development
- Kohlberg’s cognitive theory of moral judgement
- information-processing approach to cognitive development
- Bruner’s theory of cognitive development
- neurobiological theories of cognitive development.

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

- methodological, cultural and gender considerations
- controversies related to stages versus continuous process
- the accuracy and falsifiability of the concepts
- productivity of the theory in generating psychological research
- applicability of the theory such as its impact on educative practice or work
- supporting and contradicting evidence.

If a candidate evaluates more than one theory, credit should be given only to the first evaluation. However, candidates may address other theories and be awarded marks for these as long as they are clearly used to evaluate the main theory addressed in the response.

A discussion of attachment theory or other theories that are not cognitive in nature should not be awarded marks.

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.

6. Discuss *two* strategies to build resilience.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review that includes a range of arguments, factors or hypotheses of two strategies building resilience, which is the ability to overcome adversity.

Candidates may refer to factors associated with resilience such as caring and supportive relationships within the family, skills in communication and problem-solving, the capacity to make realistic plans and take steps to carry them out, education, and relationships with pro-social adults.

Strategies may include, but are not limited to:

- social programmes for youth such as Head Start or the Big Brothers Big Sisters programme (Tierney *et al.*, 1985)
- programmes dealing with parental education (for example, social learning theory) (Sanders *et al.*, 2002)
- developing skills to protect and promote well-being, for example, CBT (cognitive behavioural therapy) and social skills training
- stress inoculation training
- programmes to develop psychological strengths (for example, anger management).

Relevant discussion may highlight that:

- resilience is a complex concept and it is important to put forward multiple ways of promoting it
- strategies building resilience should consider that a child’s ability to build resilience is dependent on their age and stage of development
- these programmes may reflect cultural differences: a person’s culture might have an impact on how he or she communicates feelings and deals with adversity
- being resilient does not guarantee that young people will always have happy and productive lives.

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

If a candidate discusses only one 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.

Health psychology

7. Examine factors related to overeating and the development of obesity.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to consider how different factors are related to overeating and the development of obesity in a way that uncovers the interrelationships of this issue.

Factors may include, but are not limited to:

- physiological factors – for example, genetic predisposition, the role of dopamine, neurobiological explanation of food addiction
- psychological/cognitive factors – for example, low self-esteem, distorted body image, pessimistic thinking patterns, cognitive restraint
- sociocultural factors – for example, sedentary lifestyle, high-fat diet, coping with poverty.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Stunkard *et al.*'s (1990) study of identical twins reared apart – genetic factors accounted for 66–70 % of the variance in their BMI (body mass index)
- Theory of compulsive overeating – food craving is related to secretion of dopamine in the brain's reward circuit
- Volkow *et al.*'s (2002) fMRI (functional magnetic resonance imaging) study investigating the brains of 10 obese individuals – scanning indicated that obese participants had the same deficiency in dopamine receptors as drug addicts
- Restraint theory – this theory suggests that due to either external triggers or emotional experiences a person is more likely to experience a lack of control that leads to overeating
- Jeffery (2001): an increasingly sedentary way of life promoted by too much television viewing, and/or the preference for travelling in cars or buses leads to more people suffering from the results of obesity.

Higher quality responses will probably argue that overeating and development of obesity are the result of complex interactions between biological, cognitive and/or sociocultural factors.

Candidates may address a small number of factors related to overeating and the development of obesity in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of factors related to overeating and the development of obesity in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

8. Discuss physiological aspects of 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 physiological aspects of stress.

Physiological aspects of stress may include, but are not limited to:

- the role of the brain in the development of stress and the mechanisms that exist in the brain that seek to minimize stress (Hegel *et al.*, 1989)
- adrenal responses to environmental stressors
- the role of cortisol on hippocampal cell loss
- the role of cortisol depletion on PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder)
- the connection between stress and the immune system
- the link between stress and heart disease.

Research may include, but is not limited to:

- Cannon’s fight or flight theory (1914)
- Selye’s general adaptation syndrome model (1956)
- Kiecolt-Glaser *et al.*’s (1984) natural experiment to investigate whether the stress of an important exam had an effect on the body’s immune functioning
- Vogelzangs *et al.*’s (2010) study on the link between high stress hormone levels and increased cardiovascular mortality.

Candidates may legitimately consider psychological or social aspects of stress in order to offer evidence of critical thinking, provided this is related to the question.

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

9. Evaluate treatments for substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour.

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 the treatments used for substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Responses are not required to make a distinction between “substance abuse” and “addictive behaviour”. Also the question is phrased in such a way that candidates may offer an evaluation of treatments for only substance abuse, or only addictive behaviour or both. All responses are equally acceptable.

Treatments may include, but are not limited to:

- secondary prevention strategies
- nicotine replacement therapy
- drug treatment
- MBSR (mindfulness-based stress reduction)
- combination treatment (for example, offering Zyban and providing group-based cessation treatment)
- group therapies (for example, Alcoholics Anonymous).

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Davis *et al.*'s (2007) study on effectiveness of MBSR
- Hughes's (1993) research on the effectiveness of nicotine replacement therapy
- Jorenby *et al.*'s (1999) study on the effectiveness of nicotine patches and Zyban in smoking cessation.

Candidates may consider a small number of treatments for substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may consider a larger number of treatments for substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour 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.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Discuss factors influencing bystanderism.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of factors influencing bystanderism.

Bystanderism can be defined as the tendency of a person not to intervene despite awareness of another person’s need.

Factors may include, but are not limited to:

- Latané and Darley’s (1968) research which looked at the role of the number of people available to help (diffusion of responsibility) as well as the informational social influence (pluralistic ignorance)
- cognitive dissonance and arousal (Piliavin, 1981)
- the costs versus benefits of helping (Piliavin *et al.*, 1969)
- personality and/or social norms (Oliner and Oliner, 1989)
- cultural norms (Levin, 1990).

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural considerations
- role of historical context
- methodological considerations
- empirical evidence
- arguments for the existence of altruism
- application of programmes to promote prosocial behaviours (*eg* Zimbardo’s heroism project).

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

11. Explain the role that culture plays in the formation and maintenance of relationships.

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, of why culture plays an important role in the formation and maintenance of relationships.

Candidates do not need to distinguish between the formation and maintenance of relationships, as the two are so closely linked.

Evidence of critical thinking may be provided by candidates in the following ways:

- Analysing how and/or why factors within and/or between cultures affect relationships.
- Discussing interaction between biological and cultural factors.
- Evaluation of relevant research.
- Discussing the role of the individualistic–collectivistic dimension. For example, individualistic cultures focus on individual choice and romantic love whereas collectivist cultures often emphasize arranged marriages.
- Analysing the difference between continuous versus discontinuous cultures. Continuous societies show a concern for heritage and tradition, whereas discontinuous cultures focus on youth and progress, and change is seen as important and inevitable.
- Asserting that equity is not a universal value in relationships.
- Debating universality – for example, evolutionary theory suggests there are some universals in the formation and maintenance of relationships.

Studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Yelsma and Athappilly’s (1988) comparative study of Indian arranged marriages and American love marriages
- Levine *et al.*’s (1995) study on the role of love in the establishment of marriage
- Buss’s (1994) cross-cultural study of relationships
- Canary and Dainton’s (2003) study of Korean relationships
- Ahmad and Reid’s (2008) study of communication styles in arranged marriages.

12. Evaluate psychological research (theories and/or studies) relevant to the origins of attraction.

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 studies and/or theories relevant to the origins of attraction. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Theories and/or studies include, but are not limited to:

- the role of neurotransmitters (Fisher, 2004) and hormones
- evolutionary explanations (Buss, 1996)
- the role of self-esteem
- social exchange theory (Kelley and Thibaut, 1959)
- proximity theory
- the role of cultural norms.

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

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

Candidates may evaluate a small number of studies and/or theories in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may evaluate a larger number of studies and/or theories 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.

Sport psychology

13. Explain relationships between team cohesion and performance.

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 for relationships between team cohesion and performance.

The word “team” should be interpreted to include sports in which all team members participate at the same time (for example, football) or in which team members participate one at a time (for example, track and field).

Studies include, but are not limited to:

- Locke and Latham (1985) on the value of process goals and their potential to enhance team performance
- Slater and Sewall (1994) on the bidirectional relationship between team cohesion and performance
- Gould *et al.* (1999) on US Olympic teams’ cohesiveness and performance
- Grieve *et al.*’s (2000) study on the unidirectional relationship of team cohesion and performance
- Carron *et al.*’s (2002) study on the positive effect of team cohesion on performance
- Ingham *et al.*’s (1974) study on “social loafing” as a result of team cohesion.

Evidence of critical thinking may be provided by candidates in the following ways:

- gender and/or cultural factors
- analysis of negative and/or positive effects
- bidirectionality
- factors other than team cohesion that influence performance
- evaluation of relevant research.

Candidates may explain a small number of relationships between team cohesion and performance in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of relationships between team cohesion and performance in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

14. Discuss research (theories and/or studies) relating arousal and/or anxiety to performance.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of how arousal and/or anxiety may affect performance in sport.

Candidates do not have to distinguish between arousal and anxiety in their responses.

Research suggests that the relationship between arousal/anxiety and performance in sport is multi-dimensional and complex. Cognitive, emotional and physical factors combine in various ways to produce various performance outcomes.

Research may include, but is not limited to:

- Yerkes and Dodson’s (1908) inverted-U hypothesis
- Oxendine’s (1970) study on level of arousal and optimal performance in different sports
- Baumeister’s (1984) explicit monitoring theory and “choking”
- Fazy and Hardy’s (1988) study on cognitive anxiety and “choking”
- Hanin’s (1997) optimum arousal theory
- Klavora’s (1998) study on pre-game anxiety and optimal performance
- Gucciardi and Dimmock’s (2002) study on overthinking and performance deterioration.

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

15. Discuss athlete response to stress and/or chronic injury.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered and balanced review of athlete response to stress and/or chronic injury.

Candidates may focus their responses on stress alone, chronic injury alone, or address both topics in their answers. Candidates may consider how stress and chronic injury may interact, and this is also a valid approach to the question.

Research may include, but is not limited to:

- Williams *et al.* (1991) on stress, reduction of attention, and injury
- Anderson and Williams (1999) on negative life-events, stress and injury
- Cramer *et al.* (2000) on stress and impaired healing
- Smith *et al.* (2000) on stress, muscle tension and injury
- Perna *et al.* (2003) on stress, sleep disturbances, and impaired healing.

In regard to chronic injury, research may include, but is not limited to:

- Hardy and Crace’s (1990) application of Kubler-Ross’s model to rehabilitation
- Nixon (1992) on coping in a sport “culture of risk”
- Brewer’s (1994) critique of the Kubler-Ross model
- Petipas and Danish (1995) on identity loss in response to injury
- Shuer *et al.* (1997) on avoidance coping
- Udry *et al.*’s (1997) information-processing model of injury response
- Wiese-Bjornstall’s (1998) cognitive appraisal model and coping.

If a candidate addresses only general theories/models of stress without linking them to athlete response, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3 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.
