

Markscheme

November 2016

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.

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 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 sociocultural factors influencing abnormal behaviour.

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

Discussion may include, but is not limited to, the relevance of sociocultural factors for etiology, diagnosis and treatment.

Sociocultural factors may include, but are not limited to:

- sociocultural stressors
- media influences
- cross-cultural differences influencing body dissatisfaction
- the link between poverty and mood disorders
- differences in socialization which may produce different symptoms in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

Relevant research may include but is not limited to:

- Zhang’s (1998) study of mood disorders in China
- Jacobs’ (1998) investigation of Indian women in Great Britain
- Kleinman’s (1982) study of neurasthenia in China
- Jenkins-Hall and Sacco’s (1991) study of ethnicity bias in diagnosis.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address other factors (including biological and/or cognitive factors) in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”. Higher quality responses will probably argue that for most psychological disorders, the onset and development of the disorder is a result of complex interactions between biological, cognitive and/or sociocultural factors.

Candidates may consider a smaller number of 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 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.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cross-cultural issues
- gender biases
- supporting or contradicting evidence
- the issue of labelling
- historical perspectives on changing norms on 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”.

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.

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. 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.

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 long-term effectiveness
- using too many approaches may reduce the effectiveness of each individual approach
- cost.

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.

Developmental psychology

4. Discuss **one** example of psychological research (theory or study) into adolescence.

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 theory or one study related to adolescence.

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.

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

- appropriateness of concepts in explaining adolescence
- problems in explaining 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
- stage versus continuous development.

If a candidate discusses more than one theory or study, credit should be given only to the first theory or study. However, candidates may address other theories or studies and be awarded marks for this as long as these theories or studies are clearly used to discuss the main theory or study addressed in the response.

5. 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.

In order to respond to the command term, it is appropriate and useful for candidates to highlight that on one hand, research has found several indications of associations between attachment in childhood and relationship development in later life and on the other hand, there is no clear evidence of direct causality between attachment in childhood and formation of relationships later in life.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Pratt and Norris (1994) – the more positive earlier attachment relationships, the more positive reports on 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 focus only on descriptions of research on attachment in childhood with no link to the formation of relationships later in life (such as Ainsworth) should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4]** for criterion A, knowledge and understanding, up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

6. Analyse cultural variation in gender roles.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “analyse” requires candidates to bring out (emphasize) the essential aspects of cultural variation in gender roles.

Responses may address how sociocultural factors such as media, stereotypes, ethnic and cultural experiences, peer, school and parental roles influence gender roles. It is appropriate to address cross-cultural differences in gender roles related to behaviour such as aggression, workplace roles/status, parenting behaviour, domestic work, and so on.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Eagly’s social role theory
- Bandura’s social learning theory
- gender schema theory
- Money’s theory on gender roles
- Mead’s (1935) anthropological study
- Best *et al.*’s (1977) cross-cultural study on gender stereotypes
- Cuddy *et al.*’s (2010) study on how gender stereotypes are shaped in different cultures with participants attributing positive traits to men
- Smith and Lloyd’s (1978) experiment on the perception of gender.

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

- evidence from studies concerning the existence of cultural variation in gender roles
- the methodological and/or ethical considerations of research
- whether sociocultural influences create gender differences or merely accentuate them
- whether differences between males and females are purely social constructs or a result of biological differences
- differences between collectivistic versus individualistic societies
- interaction between biological, cognitive and cultural factors.

Candidates may present one analysis of cultural variation in gender roles in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may present a number of analyses of cultural variation in gender roles in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Health psychology

7. To what extent do cognitive factors influence health-related behaviour (stress, substance abuse, addictive behaviour, overeating and/or obesity)?

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 influence of cognitive factors on health-related behaviour.

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

Candidates may approach health-related behaviour as a whole or use specific examples of health-related behaviour. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Responses may include, but are not limited to:

- social self-preservation theory
- cognitive restraint theory
- the use of cognitive-behavioural therapy
- the health belief model
- cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1956)
- self-perception theory (Bem, 1967).

Studies that relate to cognitive factors may include, but are not limited to:

- Kamen and Seligman (1987) who suggest that attributional style might predict health levels later in life
- Greer’s (1979) study connecting beliefs and physiology.

Factors that are identified should be directly related to health-related behaviour. If a candidate only addresses cognitive factors in general, without linking them to health-related behaviour, 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.

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

8. Evaluate one or more treatments for obesity.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal of one or more treatments for obesity by weighing up the strengths and the limitations of each. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Treatment choices include, but are not limited to:

- the behavioural programme developed by Stuart and Davis (1972) for a clinical setting
- cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) combined with dieting (eg Beck, 2005)
- the psycho-social method proposed by Blair-West (2007) that combines goal setting, diet, physical activity and cognitive awareness
- drug treatments such as appetite suppressants and lipase inhibitors
- surgical procedures such as gastric bypass and gastric banding
- treatments such as Weight Watchers.

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

- cultural and gender considerations
- empirical findings
- ethical considerations
- conditions where the treatments may be employed
- comparison to other treatment methods.

Candidates may address one treatment in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may address a larger number of treatments in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

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

Responses that only address prevention strategies 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.

9. Evaluate one or more models and/or theories of health promotion.

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 models or theories of health promotion. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

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 (1998–99), tips from former smokers (2012), ACT against AIDS (2011), HEART campaign (Zambia 1990s–2000).

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural or gender considerations
- ethical considerations
- the productivity of the model or theory in generating psychological research
- application of the empirical findings
- competing theories or studies
- cognitive dissonance theory.

Candidates may address one model or theory in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may address a larger number of models and/or theories in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

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.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Evaluate psychological research relevant to strategies for reducing violence.

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

There are a number of different strategies that candidates may refer to. A strategy is any plan of action or a programme for reducing violence.

Examples of psychological research relevant to strategies for reducing violence may include, but are not limited to:

- Olweus’s (1993) longitudinal study on the effect of Olweus’s bullying prevention program (OBPP) on bullying
- metropolitan area child study (MACS), 2002 – longitudinal study on the effectiveness of a community-based strategy
- Aronson’s (1979) jigsaw classrooms research
- Wilson and Kelling’s (1982) broken windows theory
- Feshbach and Feshbach (1982) on the effect of empathy training on reducing violence
- Ferguson *et al.*’s (2007) meta-analysis of effectiveness of school based programmes.

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

- ethical considerations
- methodological considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- the effectiveness of the strategies
- supporting and contradicting evidence
- the applications of the empirical findings.

Candidates may evaluate a small number of theories and/or studies relevant to strategies for reducing violence in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may evaluate a larger number of theories and/or studies on the effectiveness of strategies for reducing violence in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

11. Discuss one or more biological origins of attraction.

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 biological explanations for the origin of attraction.

Responses may include, but are not limited to:

- the role of neurotransmitters (eg Fisher, 2004) and hormones
- evolutionary explanations (eg Buss, 1996; mechanisms of attraction in the brain, eg findings suggesting the hypothalamus triggers physiological arousal; the influence of pheromones eg Wedekind’s sweaty T-shirt study)
- studies on male ritual behaviour in animals.

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

- contradictory findings
- methodological considerations
- gender considerations
- empirical evidence
- alternative explanations of attraction, such as social and/or cognitive
- relevance of animal research.

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

12. Explain why relationships may change or end.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account, including reasons and causes, as to why relationships may change or end.

Candidates do not have to differentiate between relationships that change or end to gain high marks.

Candidates may address different types of relationships, for example, romantic relationships, marriages, friendship, family relationships.

Responses may address how factors such as predisposing personal factors, intimacy, commitment or similar/different interests can influence if relationships may change or end.

As part of their explanation, candidates should outline the theories/studies that underpin these explanations, evaluate their effectiveness, or discuss their application in different relationships.

Explanations may include, but are not limited to:

- social exchange theory
- equity theory
- patterns of accommodation
- attachment styles
- Sternberg’s triangular (triarchic) theory of love.

Evidence of critical thinking may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

- analysis and application of research
- a discussion of cultural differences
- a discussion of gender differences.

Studies could include, but are not limited to:

- Flora and Segrin (2003) on the role of perception of the relationship
- Duck *et al.* (1988) on the role of age differences in couples
- Duck (1992) on the role of socio-economic differences in couples.

Candidates may address a small number of explanations of why relationships may change or end in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of explanations of why relationships may change or end in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Sport psychology

13. Evaluate **two or more** theories of motivation 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 theories of motivation used in sport psychology by weighing up the strengths and the limitations of each. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Theories of motivation in sport include but are not limited to:

- cognitive evaluation theory (Deci, 1975)
- achievement motivation needs theory (McClelland and Atkinson, 1961)
- Intrinsic motivation (Ashford *et al.* 1993)
- extrinsic motivation (Smith *et al.* 1979)
- self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977)
- competence motivation theory (Harter, 1978)
- Murray’s need for achievement (1938)
- fear of failure (Atkinson and Litwin, 1960)
- self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan).

Evaluation may include but is not limited to:

- strengths and weaknesses of the theories
- practical applications and efficacy of the various theories
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- studies that are used to support or refute the theories.

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

If a candidate discusses only strengths or only limitations of theories of motivation in sports, the response should be awarded 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 understanding.

If a candidate evaluates only one theory of motivation, 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 only evaluates theories of motivation but does not apply them to sport psychology, 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.

14. Discuss the use of **two or more** techniques for skill development 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 two or more techniques used for skill development in sport.

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

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

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- theories that underpin these techniques
- an evaluation of their effectiveness
- an application in different sports
- comparison between different techniques.

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

If a candidate discusses only 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.

15. Evaluate one or more examples of psychological research relevant to sport psychology.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

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

Relevant psychological research may include, but is not limited to:

- goal setting behaviour (Hochstetler *et al.* 1985)
- arousal and anxiety as they are related to performance (eg inverted U theory)
- relationships between team cohesion and performance and the role of the coach (Chase *et al.* 1997)
- athlete response to stress and/or chronic injury (Anderson and Williams, 1999)
- burnout in sport (Smith, 1986; Gould *et al.* 1996).

Evaluation of the selected 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 applications of the empirical findings.

Candidates may evaluate one or a small number of studies/theories to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may evaluate a larger number of studies/theories 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]** 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.
