

Markscheme

May 2017

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.

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation
	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 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. Contrast **one** individual approach (psychological, **not** biomedical) and **one** group approach to the treatment of **one** disorder.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “contrast” requires candidates to give an account of differences between one individual approach and one group approach to the treatment of one disorder.

Expect a range of different approaches to treatment to be offered in response to the question. Individual treatments could include, but are not limited to: systematic desensitization, cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT), and person-centred therapy. Group approaches could include, but are not limited to: group cognitive therapy, group mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT), or family therapy.

Responses could contrast:

- the effectiveness of the two approaches to treatment
- the role of the therapist
- appropriateness for different cultural contexts
- ethical considerations
- gender differences
- cost in time and money
- strengths and limitations of the approaches to treatment.

If a candidate contrasts the use of one individual approach and one group approach to the treatment of more than one disorder, credit should be given only to the part of the response relevant for the first disorder.

Candidates may address the use of one individual approach and one group approach to the treatment of a general disorder (for example, an eating disorder) or a more specific type of disorder (for example, anorexia/bulimia). Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Possible disorders likely to be addressed are major depressive disorder, anorexia and bulimia, but other disorders are equally acceptable.

Although the focus of the question is on individual and group approaches, candidates may, as part of the response, include reference to a combination of biomedical and other approaches. However, contrasting a biomedical approach with either an individual approach or a group approach to treatment is not appropriate.

If a candidate contrasts the use of one individual approach and one group approach to treatment but does not refer to a specific disorder, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4]** for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[5]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

If a candidate compares and contrasts the use of one individual approach and one group approach to treatment rather than contrasting, the response should be awarded up to full credit for criterion A, knowledge and comprehension, up to a maximum of **[5]** for criterion B, critical thinking, and up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C, organization.

If a candidate only compares the use of one individual approach and one group approach to treatment rather than contrasting, the response should be awarded up to full credit 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 only describes and evaluates one approach to treatment with no specific reference to another approach to treatment, 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.

2. To what extent do biological factors influence abnormal behaviour?

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the contribution of biological factors influencing abnormal behaviour. It may be appropriate and useful for candidates to address the influence of other factors (for example, environmental factors) in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

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 include, but are not limited to:

- the role of genes (for example, correlational studies related to eating disorders)
- hormones (for example, the cortisol theory of depression)
- neurotransmitters (for example, the serotonin hypothesis)
- evolutionary theories (for example, preparedness with phobias).

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 address one or 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.

3. Discuss **one or more** cultural considerations in diagnosis.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of cultural considerations relevant to diagnosis.

Discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- how different cultures define abnormality
- classification systems may be culturally biased
- difference in prevalence rates across cultures
- changes in culture over time
- symptoms may be culturally determined
- emic versus etic approaches to diagnosis
- culture-bound syndromes
- “over-pathologizing” due to lack of understanding of different cultural norms.

Candidates may discuss one cultural consideration in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of cultural considerations in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

The focus of the response must be on cultural considerations in diagnosis. If cultural considerations related to abnormal psychology in general, or treatment of specific disorders, are addressed, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** 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 diagnosis but makes no reference to cultural considerations (for example, provides a general response about validity and reliability of diagnosis with no link to culture) 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.

Developmental psychology

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

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to consider how sociocultural factors affect human development in a way that uncovers the interrelationships between sociocultural factors and human development.

Sociocultural factors influencing human development may include, but are not limited to:

- the influence of culture on cognitive development (for example, Vygotsky, 1978; Cole and Scribner, 1974)
- the effect of poverty on cognitive development (for example, Krugman, 2008; Schoon *et al.*, 2002)
- the influence of culture on gender roles (for example, Cuddy *et al.*, 2010; Best *et al.*, 1977; Mead, 1935)
- the influence of sociocultural factors in attachment (for example, Van Ijzendor and Kroonenberg, 1988)
- the role of contextual factors (family, school, neighbourhood, community and culture) on resilience (for example, Love *et al.*, 2005).

Responses must focus on the sociocultural influence and must make a clear link between the selected sociocultural factor(s) and human development. However, candidates may address biological and/or cognitive factors and be awarded marks for these as long as they are clearly used to clarify the sociocultural influence on human development.

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

5. Examine the relationship between physical change and development of identity during adolescence.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “examine” requires candidates to uncover the assumptions and interrelationships between physical change and identity development during adolescence.

Relevant content may provide an outline of the emergence of primary and secondary sexual characteristics then show how that affects identity formation during adolescence, such as:

- Simmons and Blyth (1987) – the cultural ideal hypothesis
- Ferron (1997) - cultural differences in the way adolescents view bodily changes
- Mead’s cross-cultural theory
- studies on the timing of puberty and its impact on body image, self-esteem and behaviour: Brooks-Gunn and Paikoff (1993); Blyth, Bulcroft and Simmons (1981); Jones (1965).

The examined points may include, but are not limited to:

- the difficulty of generalizing the psychological effects of physical changes – they 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.

The answer should focus on the link between physical changes and identity development. It should examine the fact that physical changes have psychological ramifications that contribute to an adolescent’s sense of self.

If a candidate only addresses development of identity or only addresses physical change in adolescence, the response 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.

6. Evaluate **one** theory of cognitive development.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands 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 assimilation/accommodation model
- Vygotsky’s contextual approach to cognitive development
- Bruner’s theory
- information-processing approach to cognitive development
- neurobiological explanations.

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to:

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

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.

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.

Although attachment theory is actually a factor in social rather than cognitive development, a candidate may be able to make a direct link between attachment and cognitive development. When this direct link has been made, 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.

Health psychology

7. Evaluate **two** strategies for coping with stress.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal by weighing up the strengths and limitations of two strategies used to cope with stress. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

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.

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

- research supporting or refuting the effectiveness of these strategies
- presenting possible methodological, ethical or cultural considerations
- a comparison and/or contrast of strategies.

If only one strategy is evaluated, 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.

If a candidate evaluates more than two strategies, credit should be given only to the first two evaluations. 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 general issues related to stress and does not address strategies, 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.

8. Discuss **two or more** factors related to overeating and the development of obesity.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of the factors related to overeating and the development of obesity.

It is not necessary for candidates to make a distinction between overeating and obesity.

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
- 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 indicating that obese participants had the same deficiency in dopamine receptors as drug addicts
- restraint theory – 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 leads to more people suffering from the results of obesity.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural and ethical considerations
- empirical evidence and related methodological factors
- interaction between biological, cognitive, and sociocultural factors.

Candidates may discuss two factors related to overeating and the development of obesity in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss 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.

If a candidate discusses only one factor, 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.

9. Explain **two or more** factors related to the development of substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account of factors related to the development of substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour, including reasons or causes.

Candidates do not need to distinguish between factors related to either substance abuse or addictive behaviour.

Relevant factors may include, but are not limited to:

- parental influence (Bauman *et al.*, 1990)
- peer pressure (Unger *et al.*, 2001)
- genetic and biological factors (Overstreet, 2000; Heath and Madden, 1995)
- role of advertising and marketing (Chen *et al.*, 2005; Charlton *et al.*, 1997)
- personality traits (Stein *et al.*, 1987)
- cognitive factors such as expectancies regarding the effects of substances (Hansen *et al.*, 1991; Brown *et al.*, 1980).

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

- analysis of the methodology and/or ethical considerations
- degree of empirical support
- analysis of the interaction between biological, cognitive and cultural factors
- questioning the direction of cause and effect.

Candidates may explain two factors related to the development of substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may explain a larger number of factors related to the development of substance abuse and/or addictive behaviour in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

If a candidate explains only one factor, 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.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Explain cross-cultural differences in prosocial behaviour.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account, including reasons, for cross-cultural differences in prosocial behaviour.

Cross-cultural differences may include, but are not limited to:

- cultural and societal norms
- different socialization processes in an individual’s upbringing
- cultural dimensions (for example, individualism versus collectivism).

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Whiting’s (1979) research on the role of extended family
- Bond and Leung’s (1988) research on in-group bias
- Levine *et al.*’s (2001) studies on cultural differences in helping behaviour
- Whiting and Whiting’s (1975) research into altruism levels in children from industrialized and non-industrialized countries
- Miller *et al.*’s (1990) study examining cultural norms and moral values on social responsibility.

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

- analysis of the methodology and/or ethical considerations
- application of empirical support in relation to a given problem or issue
- alternative explanations of prosocial behaviour
- addressing the issue of universality (for example, kin selection theory) versus cultural differences.

Candidates may use a small number of cross-cultural differences in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may use a larger number of cross-cultural differences in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

11. Discuss the role of communication in maintaining relationships.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of the role of communication in maintaining human relationships.

Relevant studies and/or theories related to the role of communication in maintaining human relationships may include, but are not limited to:

- the importance of self-disclosure (Altman and Taylor’s social penetration theory, 1973)
- the role of micro-expressions (Gottman and Levinson, 1986)
- relationship maintenance through communication (Canary and Dainton, 2003)
- marital type and communication (Weigel and Ballard-Reisch, 1999)
- attributional styles (Bradbury and Fincham, 1990)
- gender-based communication styles (Tannen, 1990).

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural biases in research
- methodological considerations
- gender differences in communication
- difficulties of carrying out research on communication styles
- ethical concerns when conducting research
- application of research to enhance positive communication in relationships.

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]** 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.

12. Discuss the effectiveness of **two** strategies for reducing violence.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of two strategies for reducing violence.

A strategy is any plan of action or a programme for reducing violence. It is appropriate for candidates to address models, studies and theories related to strategies for reducing violence.

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

- a community based strategy (for example, MACS (Metropolitan Area Child Study), 2002; Olweus, 1993)
- group treatment programs, such as the Duluth model (for example, Robertson, 1999)
- zero tolerance anti-bullying programmes (for example, Boccanfuso and Kuhfeld, 2011)
- research into jigsaw classrooms against bullying (for example, Aronson, 1979)
- empathy training (for example, Feshbach and Feshbach, 1982)
- computer based strategies to improve empathy (for example, Figueiredo *et al.*, 2007).

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

- cultural, gender and ethical issues
- methodological issues
- long-term versus short-term effectiveness
- the difficulties in assessing the effectiveness of a strategy (*eg*, defining “effectiveness”, lack of research in this area)
- contrary and/or supporting findings or explanations.

If a candidate discusses more than two strategies for reducing violence, credit should be given only to the first two discussions. However, candidates may address other strategies for reducing violence 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 for reducing violence, 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.

Sport psychology

13. To what extent do sociocultural factors influence behaviour in sport?

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the contribution of sociocultural factors on behaviour in sport. It may be appropriate and useful for candidates to address biological and/or cognitive factors in sport in order to respond to the command term “to what extent.”

Responses could address individual behaviour or team behaviour in sport. Sociocultural factors could include, but are not limited to:

- culture and motivation in sport (Guest, 2007)
- Western bias in motivational theory (Fontayne, 2001)
- the role of culture on cohesion (Williams, 1999)
- social learning theory’s role in drug use in sport (Anshel, 1998)
- patterns of attribution in varying cultures (Lee, 1996)
- cultural values and level of aggression (Segal et al., 1997)
- social facilitation (Allport, 1920) versus social inhibition (Bond and Titus, 1983)
- drive Theory (Zajonc, 1965)
- social loafing and diffusion of responsibility (Hardy and Latane, 1988).

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

14. Explain relationships between team cohesion and performance.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands 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
- Boone *et al.*’s (1997) study on individual’s perceptions of a team.

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
- bi-directionality
- factors other than team cohesion that influence performance
- evaluation of relevant research.

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

15. Discuss **two or more** reasons for using drugs in sport.

Refer to the paper 2 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of two or more reasons for using drugs in sport.

The question is specifically asking about *reasons* for using drugs in sport. Discussion of addiction or drug abuse is not the focus of the question. Candidates may address both licit and illicit use of drugs in sport. A discussion of blood doping in sport is an appropriate topic for use in a response.

Reasons for using drugs in sport include, but are not limited to:

- improvement of performance
- prolong a career in sport
- more rapid recovery from injury
- stress reduction
- pain reduction
- increase attractiveness
- peer pressure.

Discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- gender differences
- bi-directionality
- cultural variations
- empirical findings that support or refute the reasons for using drugs in sport.

Relevant research includes, but is not limited to:

- Shermer’s (2008) application of game theory (*eg* prisoner’s dilemma) to drug usage in sport
- Anshel (1998) on the role of social learning theory in drug use in young athletes
- Whitehead *et al.* (1992) on steroid use in US male high school students
- Newman and Newman (1991) on the role of conformity in steroid use by Canadian adolescent athletes.

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

If a candidate discusses only one reason, 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.
