



MARKSCHEME

November 2012

PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES

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.*

Candidates should answer two questions, each chosen from a different topic. If two essay questions are chosen from the same topic, only the best essay will contribute to the final grade.

Paper 2 markbands: The following bands must be used in conjunction with the paper-specific markscheme that follows.

0:	The candidate does not achieve the standard described in markband 1–3.
1–3:	There is very limited understanding of the question. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge is inadequate, usually inaccurate and has little relevance to the question. The essay seems to lack any plan and is badly organized. Points are presented as isolated pieces of information bearing little relation to each other or to the question. Arguments, analysis and discussion are absent.
4–5:	There is limited understanding of the question. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge shows serious limitations. Knowledge is frequently inaccurate and often not relevant to the question. There is some attempt to plan and organize the essay, but it is very basic. Argument, analysis and discussion are very limited.
6–7:	There is some understanding of the question. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge is limited, sometimes inaccurate and not always relevant. There are some attempts to put together an answer with relevance to the question. Planning and organization of the essay is meagre. Arguments, analysis and discussion are limited.
8–10:	The question is generally understood. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge is satisfactory, although not all knowledge is accurate or directly relevant. Planning and organization are sufficient. Most of the discussion is presented in narrative form. There is limited argument and analysis. The answer shows some evidence of ability to exercise critical judgment.
11–13:	There is adequate understanding of the question. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge is sufficient, generally accurate and directly relevant. Planning and organization are usually effective. The answer largely avoids narrative and shows a thoughtful and critical approach.
14–16:	There is a good understanding of the question. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge is satisfactory, accurate and directly relevant. Planning and organization are effective. The answer shows a clear ability to exercise critical judgment.
17–20:	There is excellent understanding of the question. The ability to exercise skills and knowledge is impressive, highly accurate, directly relevant and effective. The essay is well planned and elegantly organized. The candidate has a well-developed ability to construct coherent and convincing arguments. At the upper end of this markband, the candidate’s work shows a confidence and assurance in the handling of evidence and a well-developed and critical sense of judgment.

Topic 2: Social conflict

1. **With reference to theories drawn from social psychology, discuss to what extent prejudice and discrimination are inevitable consequences of individual personality traits.**

Candidates are asked to argue whether personality factors are more convincing in explaining prejudice and discrimination than environmental or group membership factors. For personality theories, they are likely to refer to Adorno et al.'s "authoritarian personality" and Rokeach's "ideological dogmatism". For environmental and group membership factors they are likely to refer to Davis's "relative deprivation", Sherif's "realistic conflict theory" and Tajfel's "social identity theory". Successful responses are not likely to completely dismiss one set of theories, and will argue how the three theoretical approaches are not entirely mutually exclusive.

If only one set of theories is used, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague generalizations and limited knowledge of theory/theories

[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts of theory/theories, with limited analysis

[11–13 marks] for satisfactory discussion, and some critical analysis of theory/theories,

[14–16 marks] for a well-balanced and well-argued discussion and critical analysis of a range of theories

[17+ marks] for organized, insightful, well-balanced discussion and critical analysis of a range of theories.

2. **“Conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth.” To what extent do you agree with this statement? You should refer to theories drawn from social psychology, and to specific examples, in your answer.**

Candidates are asked to explore how conformity works and how it might pressure people into compliance (“jailer of freedom”) and could potentially make whole groups of people stick to traditions, preventing progress (“enemy of growth”). Candidates are likely to refer to examples, such as Nazi Germany and Sherif's and Asch's conformity experiments, to support their argument.

Candidates should give arguments for and against the statement, but they should not be penalized if their answers focus heavily on the one or the other. If arguments are entirely one-sided, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague descriptions of conformity, without clear response to the statement and with minimal or no use of social psychology or examples

[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with poor or one-sided evaluation of the statement, with limited reference to either social psychology or specific examples

[11–13 marks] for satisfactory attempts at evaluating the statement with some use of social psychology and specific examples

[14–16 marks] for well-argued evaluation of the statement, with good use and analysis of social psychology and specific examples

[17+ marks] for a highly effective and convincing evaluation of the statement, with wide-ranging and analytical use of social psychology and specific examples.

- 3. With reference to theories drawn from social psychology, explain the phenomenon of human aggression, and why it is an important topic of study. Use examples to support your answer.**

Candidates are asked to explain aggression using the various theories from social psychology about the phenomenon. They should critically assess these theories to assess their explanatory power. Examples would be Dollard et al.'s "frustration-aggression hypothesis", Bandura's "social learning theory" and Lorenz's "instinct theory". Examples can be used to further explain the theories and/or why it is an important topic of study.

If no theory is used, or if only one part of the question is addressed (i.e. only the phenomenon of human aggression is addressed, or only why it is an important topic of study), mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague generalizations

[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts of theories, with limited attempts at explanation, and few or no examples, some of which may not be relevant

[11–13 marks] for satisfactory explanation, supported by some analysis of theories, and mainly relevant examples

[14–16 marks] for well-argued explanations supported by focused discussion and analysis of theories and relevant examples

[17+ marks] for thoughtful, valid explanations supported by in-depth discussion and analysis of theories and relevant examples.

Topic 4: Transforming conflict

4. With reference to specific examples, analyse the difficulties of establishing positive peace in post-conflict societies.

It is likely that candidates start with a definition of positive peace, which may be defined as “the absence of violence, both direct and structural, thus removing any obstacle preventing people from reaching their full potential” or in alternative ways.

Candidates are asked to refer to specific examples to analyse the difficulties societies encounter when dealing with a violent past to work towards positive peace. They are likely to refer to tribunals, such as those in Cambodia and Yugoslavia and truth and reconciliation commissions, such as those in South Africa and Sierra Leone.

If only one example is used, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague generalizations with little attempt at answering the question

[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with little attempt at analysis of the difficulties, and few or no examples

[11–13 marks] for satisfactory, sometimes insightful, attempts at analysis of the difficulties, with one or two relevant examples

[14–16 marks] for clearly argued, usually insightful, analysis of the difficulties, supported by relevant, specific examples

[17+ marks] for clear, in-depth, insightful analysis of the difficulties, supported by a broad variety of relevant, specific examples.

5. With reference to recent development in international law, evaluate the following statement: “Genocide is the responsibility of the entire world”.

Candidates are expected to explore the tension in international law between the notion of sovereignty of states and the Responsibility to Protect doctrine which states that if countries are unable or unwilling to protect its citizens, the international community should be allowed to intervene, if necessary militarily. Candidates are likely to give examples, such as Libya and Rwanda.

Candidates should give arguments for and against the statement, but they should not be penalized if their answers focus heavily on the one or the other. If arguments are entirely one-sided, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague generalizations about genocide, without clear response to the statement

[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with little attempt at analysing the statement or reference to development in international law

[11–13 marks] for a satisfactory, well-argued attempt at analysing the statement with appropriate reference to development in international law

[14–16 marks] for effective, well-balanced, analysis, in support of and against the statement, with appropriate reference to development in international law

[17+ marks] for a highly effective and convincing response to the statement, based on well-balanced, and insightful analysis, with appropriate reference to development in international law.

6. With reference to specific examples, analyse the strengths and weaknesses of non-violent protest.

Although this essay relies on the use of specific examples, the very successful responses will almost certainly contain a theoretical underpinning, such as Gene Sharp’s “theory of power” and the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi. The essays are very likely to start with a definition of non-violent protest. Examples could be the American civil rights movement, the Egyptian revolution during the Arab Spring and Gandhi’s struggle for Indian independence.

Candidates should refer to both strengths and weaknesses, but they should not be penalized if their answers focus heavily on the one or the other. If only successes or weaknesses are discussed mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague generalizations without clear reference to specific examples

[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with minimal analysis or reference to specific examples

[11–13 marks] for satisfactory attempt at analysis, supported by some theoretical underpinning and specific examples

[14–16 marks] for well-balanced analysis supported by an effective theoretical underpinning and specific, well-chosen examples

[17+ marks] for well-balanced and wide-ranging analysis, supported by a highly effective theoretical underpinning and specific, well-chosen examples.
