International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

MARKSCHEME

November 2013

PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES

Standard Level

Paper 2

8 pages

*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.*

The paper 2 markbands, below, must be used in conjunction with the paper-specific markscheme that follows.

Application of the markbands
Examiners judge the answers using a "best-fit" model, i.e. when assessing a candidate's work, the descriptors for each markband should be read until a descriptor is reached that most appropriately describes the level of the work being assessed. If a piece of work seems to fall between two descriptors, both descriptors should be read again and the one that more appropriately describes the candidate's work chosen. Where there are several marks available within a markband, the upper marks should be awarded if the candidate's work demonstrates most or all of the qualities described. The lower marks should be awarded if the candidate's work demonstrates few of the qualities described. A response that meets most of the requirements of a particular markband, but not necessarily all, can still be awarded marks in that markband.

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 *at least two* examples and using theory drawn from social psychology, analyse the link between conformity and violence.**

In order to address this question effectively, a definition of conformity is unavoidable (*eg* "yielding to peer pressure"). Experimental studies, such as those by Asch and Sherif and explanations of conformity such as "the need to belong" or Normative Social Influence, and "the need to be right" or Informational Social Influence, can be used for the theoretical component of the question. Examples could include historical examples such as Nazi Germany; more recent examples such as the conflict in Syria; or personal examples of how conformity and violence are linked.

If only examples or only theory are used, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague descriptions of conformity, without clear analysis of the link with violence, and with minimal or no use of social psychology or examples
[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with poor or one-sided analysis of the link with violence, with limited reference to either social psychology or specific examples
[11–13 marks] for satisfactory attempts at an analysis of the link with violence with some use of social psychology, and specific examples
[14–16 marks] for well-argued analysis of the link with violence, with good use and analysis of social psychology, and specific examples
[17+ marks] for a highly effective and convincing analysis of the link with violence, with wide-ranging and analytical use of social psychology, and specific examples.

2. **With reference to concepts of cultural and structural violence, and theories drawn from social psychology, examine the validity of the statement that "prejudice is a product of ignorance that hides behind barriers of tradition".**

In order to address this question effectively, a definition of prejudice is unavoidable (*eg* "an attitude towards the members of a group based solely on their membership of that group"). Candidates are asked to explore the causations and workings of prejudice. Candidates are likely to refer to theories such as Realistic Conflict Theory or the Authoritarian Personality to explain how a lack of knowledge ("ignorance") might lead to prejudice and result in structural violence. Candidates can use theories such as Social Identity Theory and the Authoritarian Personality to explain how traditions of prejudice can be considered a form of structural violence where inequality might be legitimized ("hides behind barriers of tradition").

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 prejudice, without clear response to the statement or use of theory
[8–10 marks] for a narrative/descriptive examination of the statement with some attempt at reference to concepts/theories
[11–13 marks] for satisfactory examination of the statement, supported by some reference to concepts/theories that may be only partially effective
[14–16 marks] for a well-argued examination of the statement, supported by effective reference to concepts/theories
[17+ marks] for a thoughtful, valid examination of the statement supported by wide-ranging and analytical reference to concepts/theories.

3. **Using examples to illustrate your answer, discuss whether social learning theory gives a sufficient explanation for human aggression.**

Candidates are asked to discuss the relative importance of social learning in explaining aggressive behaviour. They are expected to draw upon other aggression theories to ascertain if social learning alone can be sufficient to explain aggressive behaviour. They are likely to conclude that aggression can be explained by an interplay of theories, of which social learning is one.

If only social learning theory is discussed, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for vague generalizations
[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts of theories, with limited attempts at discussion of the question, and few or no examples, some of which may not be relevant
[11–13 marks] for a mainly satisfactory discussion, supported by some effective analysis of theories, and mainly relevant examples
[14–16 marks] for well-argued discussion supported by mainly effective analysis of theories and relevant examples
[17+ marks] for a thoughtful, valid discussion, supported by an insightful analysis of theories and relevant examples.

Topic 3: Conflict around the globe

4.   With reference to specific examples, analyse the military-industrial complex and how globalization has affected it.

For an effective answer, the specific terms from the question need to be defined.   The military-industrial complex may be defined as "the close relations between various parties involved in the defensive or offensive actions of countries, including weapons manufacturers, politicians and army officials".   Globalization may be defined as "the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness".   Candidates are likely to refer to the significant power wielded by weapons manufacturers, and how they might be able to influence politicians' or generals' decisions. Candidates might use globalization to refer to the blurring of national borders, increased regional (military) cooperation and how, according to hyperglobalists, multinational corporations have replaced states as the main international actor.

If the military-industrial complex is analysed on its own, without explicitly relating it to globalization, 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 military-industrial complex, or of how it has been affected by globalization, with few or no examples
[11–13 marks] for satisfactory, sometimes insightful, attempts at analysis of the military-industrial complex and some appropriate analysis of the effect of globalization on it, with one or two relevant examples
[14–16 marks] for clearly argued, usually insightful, analysis of the military-industrial complex and effective analysis of the effect of globalization on it, supported by relevant, specific examples
[17+ marks] for clear, in-depth, insightful analysis of the military-industrial complex, impressive analysis of the effect of globalization on it, supported by a broad variety of relevant, specific examples.

5.   **To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "Development should be viewed as a human rights issue, not as a question of simply increasing the gross national product."?**

In order to address the question effectively, a definition of development is unavoidable (*eg* "economic growth, the conditions under which it is achieved and the effects it has"). Similarly human rights and gross national product would have to be explained for effective analysis. Candidates are expected to assess the advantages and disadvantages of narrow interpretations of development ("increasing gross national product") compared with the advantages and disadvantages of broad interpretations of development, including discussion of it as, or as not, a human rights issue. They might also raise the debate of whether there is such a thing as universal human rights and how this would affect the measurement of development.

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, with no clear response to the statement, and minimal, or no, reference to different ways of measuring or defining development

[8–10 marks] for some partially successful argument for or against the statement, but demonstrating little knowledge or understanding of different ways of measuring or defining development

[11–13 marks] for satisfactory argument for or against the statement, demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of different ways of measuring or defining development

[14–16 marks] for a well-argued argument for or against the statement, demonstrating a clear knowledge and understanding of different ways of measuring or defining development

[17+ marks] for a well-argued, effective and convincing argument for or against the statement, demonstrating a clear and wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of different ways of measuring or defining development

6. **Evaluate the role of *two* of the outside parties in *one* regional armed conflict, and how successful they have been in influencing the behaviour of the core parties in the conflict.**

Candidates should identify a regional armed conflict of their choice. Successful answers will focus on the analysis of how successful two outside parties have been in influencing the core parties. Candidates might use the Third Party Intervention model to explain the level of involvement of the outside party. Alternatively they might use the PIN model, ABC triangle, or the conflict cycle to explain the interaction of the various parties. The use of peacekeeping, peacemaking or peacebuilding terminology would also be suitable.

If the chosen conflict lacks an armed component, mark out of [12 marks]. If no outside parties are discussed, mark out of [12 marks].

[0–7 marks] for a weak analysis of the regional armed conflict
[8–10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts of a regional armed conflict with some reference to the interaction of the various parties involved
[11–13 marks] for a mainly satisfactory analysis of a regional armed conflict and evaluation of the interaction of the various parties involved
[14–16 marks] for a well-argued, effective analysis of a regional armed conflict and evaluation of the interaction of the various parties involved
[17+ marks] for a clear, well-balanced, convincing and thorough analysis of a regional armed conflict and evaluation of the interaction of the various parties involved.