

# Markscheme

**May 2025**

**Psychology**

**Higher & Standard level**

**Paper 2**

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2025

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2025

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2025

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

**Paper 2 assessment criteria**

**Criterion A — Focus on the question**

**[2]**

To understand the requirements of the question students must identify the problem or issue being raised by the question. Students may simply identify the problem by restating the question or breaking down the question. Students who go beyond this by **explaining** the problem are showing that they understand the issues or problems.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1	Identifies the problem/issue raised in the question.
2	Explains the problem/issue raised in the question.

**Criterion B — Knowledge and understanding**

**[6]**

This criterion rewards students for demonstrating their knowledge and understanding of specific areas of psychology. It is important to credit **relevant** knowledge and understanding that is **targeted** at addressing the question and explained in sufficient detail.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2	The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Psychological terminology is used but with errors that hamper understanding.
3 – 4	The response demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail. Psychological terminology is used but with errors that do not hamper understanding.
5 – 6	The response demonstrates relevant, detailed knowledge and understanding. Psychological terminology is used appropriately.

**Criterion C — Use of research to support answer**

**[6]**

Psychology is evidence based so it is expected that students will use their knowledge of research to support their argument. There is no prescription as to which or how many pieces of research are appropriate for their response. As such it becomes important that the research selected is **relevant** and useful in **supporting** the response. One piece of research that makes the points relevant to the answer is better than several pieces that repeat the same point over and over.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2	Limited relevant psychological research is used in the response. Research selected serves to repeat points already made.
3 – 4	Relevant psychological research is used in support of the response and is partly explained. Research selected partially develops the argument.
5 – 6	Relevant psychological research is used in support of the response and is thoroughly explained. Research selected is effectively used to develop the argument.

**Criterion D — Critical thinking**

**[6]**

This criterion credits students who demonstrate an inquiring and reflective attitude to their understanding of psychology. There are a number of areas where students may demonstrate critical thinking about the knowledge and understanding used in their responses and the research used to support that knowledge and understanding. The areas of critical thinking are:

- research design and methodologies
- triangulation
- assumptions and biases
- contradictory evidence or alternative theories or explanations
- areas of uncertainty.

These areas are not hierarchical and not all areas will be relevant in a response. In addition, students could demonstrate a very limited critique of methodologies, for example, and a well-developed evaluation of areas of uncertainty in the same response. As a result a holistic judgement of their achievement in this criterion should be made when awarding marks.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2	There is limited critical thinking and the response is mainly descriptive. Evaluation or discussion, if present, is superficial.
3 – 4	The response contains critical thinking, but lacks development. Evaluation or discussion of most relevant areas is attempted but is not developed.
5 – 6	The response consistently demonstrates well-developed critical thinking. Evaluation or discussion of relevant areas is consistently well developed.

**Criterion E — Clarity and organization**

**[2]**

This criterion credits students for presenting their response in a clear and organized manner. A good response would require no re-reading to understand the points made or the train of thought underpinning the argument.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1	The answer demonstrates some organization and clarity, but this is not sustained throughout the response.
2	The answer demonstrates organization and clarity throughout the response.

## **Abnormal psychology**

1. Discuss the validity **and/or** reliability of diagnosis.

**[22]**

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review that addresses various aspects of validity and/or reliability of diagnosis.

Examples of research that could be used include, but are not limited to:

- Nicholls et al.’s (2000) studies of inter-rater reliability
- Silverman et al.’s (2001) study on test-retest of anxiety symptoms and diagnosis
- Rosenhan’s studies (eg 1973) of diagnostic validity in Schizophrenia
- Cwik et al.’s (2016) study on diagnostic accuracy and gender biases
- Lobbestael et al.’s (2011) study on the reliability of diagnosis
- Di Nardo et al.’s (1993) study on reliability in OCD and anxiety disorders using the DSM
- Cooper et al.’s (1972) study on cultural variation in diagnosis between the US and UK.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and/or ethical considerations
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- biases related to diagnosis
- interpretation and application of the findings
- implications of the findings
- comparative analysis of validity and reliability
- operationalization of terms
- strengths and limitations of the use of classification systems.

Candidates may discuss either validity or reliability in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may discuss both validity and reliability in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

2. Discuss the biological treatment of **one or more** disorders.

[22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of biological treatment(s) of one or more disorders.

Biological could include, but are not limited to:

- drug therapy
- electroconvulsive therapy (ECT)
- brain stimulation
- psychosurgery.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- TADS (2004-2007) multi-site longitudinal study on drug treatment of adolescents with depression
- Kirsch et al.’s (2014) and Holen et al.’s (2002) study on criticism of drug treatment for depression
- Spaans et al.’s (2015) study on remission using ECT vs. medication among elderly patients with depression
- MacNamara et al.’s (2016) study on the effectiveness of SSRIs for post-traumatic stress disorder
- Boggio et al.’s (2010) study on repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) treatment for the post-traumatic stress disorder
- Norris et al.’s (2011) study on the effectiveness of drug treatment for eating disorders
- Mayberg et al.’s (2005) study on deep brain stimulation.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- the effectiveness of the chosen treatment(s)
- the assumptions about etiology upon which the treatment is based advantages and disadvantages of the treatment
- alternative approaches to treatment e.g. CBT or interactionist approach
- holism vs reductionism
- methodological and ethical considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted
- practical applications of the research
- implications of the findings
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence.

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

Candidates may focus on one biological treatment in detail to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a range of biological treatments to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

**3. Discuss one or more explanations for one or more disorders.**

**[22]**

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of the chosen explanation(s) for one or more disorders.

Explanations for disorders include, but are not limited to:

- biological explanations
- cognitive explanations
- sociocultural explanations.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Gilbertson et al.’s (2002) study on the hippocampus and post-traumatic stress disorder in veterans
- Caspi et al.’s (2003) study on gene and environment interaction in depression
- Kendler et al.’s (1991) twin study on genetic vulnerability in bulimia nervosa
- Weissman et al.’s (2005) kinship study on depression
- Hitchcock et al.’s (2015) study on cognitive appraisal in post-traumatic stress disorder
- Tchanturia et al.’s (2011) study on cognitive flexibility as a specific type of cognitive style and anorexia nervosa
- Jaeger et al.’s (2002) cross-cultural study on the relationship between body dissatisfaction and the development of bulimia
- Brown and Harris’s (1978) study on sociocultural factors in vulnerability to depression
- Strober et al.’s (2000) study on genes and eating disorders.

Discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- alternative explanations
- combined explanations
- contrasting/comparing explanations
- practical applications and implications of the explanations
- cultural and gender considerations
- nature versus nurture debate
- methodological and ethical considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory findings
- how the findings of research have been interpreted
- holistic versus reductionist approaches

Candidates may discuss one explanation or one disorder to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may discuss a larger number of explanations or disorder(s) to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are acceptable.

Candidates may discuss alternative explanations or within-approach explanations. Both approaches are acceptable.

## Developmental psychology

4. Evaluate **one or more** studies investigating attachment.

**[22]**

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

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

Relevant research studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Rutter et al.'s (2004) study on attachment disorder
- Cockett and Tripp's (1994) study on long-term attachment deprivation effects
- Ainsworth et al.'s (1978); Ainsworth's (1969) cross-cultural studies of attachment
- Schaffer and Emerson's (1964) study on stages of attachment
- Pederson et al.'s (1990); Main's (1981) studies on the mother's behaviour and secure attachment
- Blehar et al.'s (1977) study investigating how early mother-infant play predicts attachment patterns
- Hamilton's (2000) longitudinal study examining if attachment security is stable throughout childhood and adolescence
- Hazan and Shaver's (1987) study on continuity in attachment patterns in romantic love.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- gender and/or cultural considerations
- the extent to which the findings can be generalized
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- theoretical contribution of the study
- implication of the findings
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty, inconclusive evidence or ambiguity
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence.

Responses referring to research on animals, such as Harlow's study of rhesus monkeys should be linked to attachment in humans. Responses that do not explicitly make any link to human behaviour should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion C: use of research to support the answer. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the markbands independently and could achieve up to full marks.

In questions that ask for evaluation of studies, in criterion A the extent to which the response is focused on the question is assessed. Responses that are generic, lack a focus on the specific question and seem as pre-prepared essays of relevance to the general topic (but not to evaluation of one or more studies) should be awarded **[0]**. If the response identifies which studies will be evaluated but there is also extra information that is not relevant or necessary for the specific question then **[1]** should be awarded. Responses that are clearly focused on evaluating one or more studies should gain **[2]**.

Marks awarded for criterion B should refer to definitions of terms and concepts relating to research studies. Overall this could include some knowledge of topic but more specifically knowledge and understanding related to research methods and ethics of chosen studies.

Marks for criterion B should be awarded as follows:

- 1–2 General knowledge of topic (attachment)
- 3–4 Knowledge of general research terms and concepts is provided but lacks detail. Some minor errors might be present
- 5–6 Relevant knowledge of specific research methods material is utilized and concepts are defined within the context of the specific study.

Marks awarded for criterion C assess the quality of the description of as study/studies and assess how well the student linked the findings of the study to the question - this doesn't have to be very sophisticated or long for these questions but still the aim or the conclusion should be linked to the topic of the specific question.

Criterion D assesses how well the student is explaining strengths and limitations of the study/studies.

If the candidate addresses only strengths or only limitations, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion D: critical thinking. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

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

**5. To what extent do biological factors influence cognitive **and/or** social development?  
[22]**

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term "to what extent" requires candidates to consider the contribution of biological factors affecting cognitive and/or social development.

Biological factors may include, but are not limited to:

- genetic and evolutionary influence
- maturation of the nervous system
- brain damage
- hormones
- chemical imbalance in the brain (i.e. neurotransmitters).

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Deary et al.'s (2006); Bouchard *et al.*'s (1990) studies on genetic inheritance in intelligence
- Waber's (2007); Giedd's (2004); Chugani et al.'s (2001) studies on the effects of maturation of the nervous system on cognitive development
- Cowell et al.'s (2006); Corky's (1997) studies on brain damage and memory deficits
- Kosfeld et al.'s (2005) study to investigate whether oxytocin affects trust in humans

Responses to this question may also use Piaget's and Vygotsky's theories. For these responses, marks should be awarded depending on how effectively responses link these to biological factors.

When responding to the command term "to what extent", considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- Degree of empirical support
- Methodological considerations
- Cultural and/or gender considerations
- Possible theoretical assumptions and/or biases
- Issues of validity and reliability as measures used to assess development
- Generalizability of findings
- Contradictory explanations or findings.
- Holistic versus reductionst approach
- Nature versus nurture debate
- Combined approaches.

Candidates may address a small number of biological factors influencing cognitive and/or social development to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may address a larger number of biological factors influencing cognitive and/or social development to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address other relevant factors (cognitive or sociocultural) in order to respond to the command term "to what extent".

**6. Discuss one or more factors influencing brain development.**

**[22]**

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term "discuss" requires candidates to offer a considered review of one or more factors influencing brain development.

Relevant factors may include, but are not limited to:

- neuroplasticity
- genetic factors e.g. genetic similarities, epigenetics
- environmental factors e.g. stress, neglect, trauma recovery
- cognitive factors eg problem-solving, cognitive stimulation, language acquisition, executive function development
- maturational theory of brain development.

Responses to this question may also use Piaget's and Vygotsky's theories. For these responses, marks should be awarded depending on how effectively responses link these to brain development.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Waber's (2007); Gogtay et al.'s (2004) longitudinal studies of brain development using MRI scans
- Chugani et al.'s (2001) study on developmental changes in brain serotonin synthesis capacity
- Johnson and Newport's (1989) study on maturational predispositions for learning a language
- Baird et al.'s (2002); Diamond's (1991) studies on the effect of maturation on the frontal lobe and the development of object permanence
- Bell and Fox's (1996) study on crawling experience related to changes in the cortical organization during infancy using EEG
- Danelli et al.'s (2012) case study on functional neuroplasticity
- Giedd et al.'s (2004) longitudinal study on brain development across developmental stages
- Rosenzweig et al.'s (1972) study on environmental effects on brain development
- Bremner's (2003) study on how early sexual abuse correlated with the atrophy of the hippocampus.

Discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- practical applications and implications of the findings
- the accuracy and clarity of theoretical concepts
- accuracy of assumptions and the role of biases
- interpretation/application of research/concepts
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence.
- comparison of different factors' effects

Responses referring to research on animals, such as Rosenzweig et al.'s (1972) study should be linked to human brain development. Responses that do not explicitly make any link to human brain development should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion C: use of research to support the answer. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

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

## Health psychology

7. To what extent do dispositional factors determine health?

[22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the influence that dispositional factors have on health.

Dispositional factors are internal factors, such as genetics and personality (eg optimism, resilience, cognitive styles) that can affect our health.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Setiawan et al.’s (2013) study on the role of personality traits on alcoholism
- Knight et al.’s (2002) impact of gender on alcoholism
- Kendler and Prescott’s (1998) study on the role of genetics on addiction
- Yan et al.’s (2014) study on the interaction of stress, personality, family functioning and internet addiction
- Sorensen et al.’s (1998) study on the role of genetics on obesity
- Ingledew and Ferguson’s (2007) study on the role of personality in predicting safer sex.

Considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- degree of empirical support
- methodological considerations
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- possible theoretical assumptions and/or biases
- measures used to assess dispositional factors and health outcomes
- free will and determinism
- generalizability of findings
- contradictory explanations or findings.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address other relevant factors (i.e. situational factors) in order to respond to the command term “to what extent”.

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

If a candidate only focuses on explanations of mental health issues with no explicit link to health problems the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion B. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach. However, if candidates address mental health issues and link these to physical health this approach is appropriate and can gain up to full marks.

8. Contrast **two** explanations of **one or more** health problems.

[22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “contrast” requires candidates to give an account of the **differences** between two explanations of one or more health problems, referring to both of them throughout.

The health problem(s) likely to be presented include: stress, addiction, obesity, chronic pain, and/or sexual health.

If a candidate only focuses on explanations of mental health issues with no explicit link to health problems the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion B. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

Relevant explanations to contrast may include, but are not limited to:

- sociocultural
- biological
- theory of planned behaviour
- biopsychosocial model
- stress and coping theory: chronic stress is linked to various health problems, including cardiovascular disease, obesity, and immune dysfunction
- social cognitive theory (SCT)
- health belief model
- cognitive behavioural model
- personality and dispositional factors.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- DiFranza et al.’s (2005) study on biological factors in adolescents’ smoking history and addiction
- Powel and Chaloupka’s (2003) study on the role of parental influences on the probability of youth smoking
- Unger et al.’s (2001) study on adolescent smoking considering the peer factor as well as individualistic and collectivistic cultures
- Volkow et al.’s (2002) study of obese individuals indicating one possible explanation of overweight (support of the theory of compulsive overeating)
- Prentice and Jebb’s (1995) study on increase in obesity and car ownership and television viewing
- Teevale et al.’s (2010) study on the role of sociocultural factors in obesity in Pacific adolescents and their parents.
- Volkow et al.’s (2019) study on chronic drug exposure and how it alters dopamine pathways, leading to compulsive drug-seeking behaviour and impaired self-regulation.

Contrasting discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- effectiveness of explanations
- degree of research evidence
- methodological and ethical considerations of supporting research
- practical applications
- assumptions and biases of explanations of health problems
- implications of findings
- the issue of reductionism versus holism.

If a candidate contrasts more than two explanations for one or more health problems credit should be given only to the first two explanations.

If a candidate addresses only one explanation for one or more health problems, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B: knowledge and understanding. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

If the candidate provides only an implicit contrast, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion D: critical thinking. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

Candidates may address one health problem to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of health problems to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

9. Discuss **one or more** research methods used to investigate the promotion of health. [22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one or more research methods used to investigate the promotion of health.

Relevant research methods could include, but are not limited to

- experiments
- correlational studies
- case studies
- interviews (e.g. semi-structured)
- surveys
- meta-analyses.

Relevant studies relating to health promotion may include, but are not limited to:

- Golechha’s (2016) meta-analysis on health promotion methods for smoking prevention and cessation
- Li et al.’s (2015) meta-analysis on health promotion interventions and policies addressing excessive alcohol use
- Langford et al.’s (2015) meta-analysis on effectiveness of the health promoting schools’ framework
- Lowe et al.’s (2004) case study on “food dudes” programme
- Sanderson and Yopyk’s (2007) experiment on promoting condom use
- Black et al.’s (2010) experiment on effectiveness of Challenge! health promotion model.

Critical discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- why the method(s) was/were selected and the appropriateness of the method(s) including strengths and weaknesses of the method(s)
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- comparing methods (for example, meta-analyses versus experiments)
- assumptions and biases in the research method
- the issues of validity, reliability and causality
- the issues of generalizability of findings
- the ease and cost of procedures
- the value of the empirical evidence generated by the research method
- short-term versus long-term effects of promotions of health
- ethical considerations related to how/why research method has been chosen and applied
- discussing how multiple methods complement each other (triangulation).

The question asks for a discussion of one or more research methods, marks awarded for criterion B should refer to definitions of terms and concepts relevant to the research methodology.

For questions asking for discussion of research methods, marks awarded for criterion B should refer to definitions of terms and concepts relevant for research methodology.

Marks for criterion B should be awarded as follows:

- 1–2 General knowledge of topic (promotion of health)
- 3–4 Knowledge of general research terms and concepts is provided but lacks detail. Some minor errors might be present
- 5–6 Relevant knowledge of specific research methods material is utilized and concepts are defined within the context of the specific study.

Marks awarded for criterion C assess the quality of the description of a study/studies and assess how well the candidate linked aspects of the study to the question.

Candidates may discuss one research method in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of research methods in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

For studies where there may be more than one research method, candidates should not be penalized for discussing one of the research methods other than the main research method.

## Psychology of human relationships

10. Discuss the formation of personal relationships.

[22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of the formation of personal relationships.

Candidates may refer to issues including, but not limited to:

- explanations of formation of personal relationships (learning, cognitive, evolutionary, economic, cultural)
- factors influencing the formation of personal relationships (communication)
- gender differences related to formation of personal relationships
- cultural differences related to formation of personal relationships.

Attraction and/or liking can also be addressed, as long they are tied to formation of relationships. Responses referring to studies on maintenance, changes, dissolution or end of a relationship are not acceptable and should not be credited.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Flora and Segrin's study on the role of communication and perception in relationship dynamics where findings tended to indicate that different factors predict relationship success depending on the stage of the relationship
- Wedekind's (1995) study on mate preference based on genetic makeup
- Fisher et al.'s (2005) study on neural mechanisms of mate choice
- Johnston et al.'s (2001) study investigating the importance of a woman's hormonal state on the attractiveness of men's faces
- Buss et al.'s (1989) cross-cultural study on factors in attraction
- Morry's (2005) study on the attraction–similarity hypothesis
- Gupta and Singh's (1982) study on arranged marriages in Indian couples.
- Markey and Markey (2007) – similarity in romantic partners
- Dion et al. (1972) – physical attractiveness stereotype
- Festinger et al. (1950) – proximity and relationship formation.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations related to the research into the formation of personal relationships
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- implications of the findings
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative explanations.

Responses that focus specifically on how relationships change and/or end and make no reference to formation of relationships are not eligible for credit. However, it is appropriate to discuss how factors that affect the formation of relationships may affect the maintenance and change of a relationship (e.g. according to fatal attraction theory the factors that bring us together are likely to cause the breakup of the relationship later on). For these responses the full range of marks can be awarded for all criteria.

11. Discuss **one or more** ethical considerations in studies investigating group dynamics. [22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one or more ethical considerations in studies investigating group dynamics.

The ethical consideration(s) discussed can be a guideline that was adhered to in the study (what guidelines were or could be followed) or a guideline that was breached (what guidelines were not followed).

Discussion of ethical considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- the role of informed consent when studying groups
- why deception is often used in studies of group dynamics
- the difficulties of ensuring confidentiality in social psychology research, especially in the study of group dynamics
- the potential for psychological and physical harm and associated restrictions on research design
- decisions as to why certain ethical guidelines were or were not followed
- changes over time in adherence to ethical standards/guidelines
- considerations in applying the findings of a study.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Sherif’s (1966) field experiment on competition in groups – informed parental consent
- Lyons-Padilla et al.’s (2015) survey investigating relationships between cultural identity, experiences of discrimination, and attitudes towards extremism – informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality
- Sternberg and Dobson’s (1987) study on resolution of interpersonal conflicts; Sternberg and Soriano’s (1984) study on styles of conflict resolution – anonymity and confidentiality
- McLaren’s (2003) study on the integrated threat theory – continued psychological harm when applying the results of a study.

For Criterion B (quality of knowledge of ethical issues) examiners need to be aware that some candidates provide minimal information about ethical issues and focus on other aspects of studies or address ethical issues only in a general manner. In awarding marks and establishing 'best fit' for knowledge and understanding examiners should take into account **level of detail** and **context**.

- If ethical considerations are only identified or described in generic terms, award marks in the lowest (1-2) band
- If ethical considerations are outlined within relevant studies, award marks in the mid (3-4) band
- If ethical considerations are described and clearly explained within relevant studies, award marks in the top (5-6) band.

If a candidate describes and discusses studies but does not focus on ethical considerations the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion D. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

Candidates may address one ethical consideration to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of ethical considerations to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are acceptable.

12. To what extent does the cognitive approach to understanding behaviour explain social responsibility (by-standerism, prosocial behaviour)? [22]

*Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.*

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the contribution of the cognitive approach in the understanding of social responsibility.

It is appropriate and useful for candidates to address the biological and/or sociocultural approach in the understanding of social responsibility in order to respond to the command term “to what extent” (e.g. arousal-cost reward theory, empathy-altruism model, just world hypothesis, diffusion of responsibility, pluralistic ignorance, kin selection theory, evolutionary theories, how social norms influence social responsibility, differences between individualistic and collectivistic societies, how social identity theory explains social responsibility).

Relevant theories/studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Aknin et al.’s (2013) study on prosocial spending and wellbeing
- Toi and Batson’s (1982) study on levels of empathy and cost and helping behaviours
- Cialdini et al.’s (1987) study on empathy, sadness, and increased helping behaviours
- Levine et al.’s (2001) cross-cultural differences in helping strangers
- Miyahara et al.’s (2018) study on impact of gender, culture and priming on empathetic concern
- Whiting and Whiting’s (1975) study on the role of a collectivist culture in prosocial behaviour
- Darley and Batson’s (1973) study on the role of situational and dispositional factors
- Miller et al.’s (1990) study on culture and social responsibility
- Latané and Darley (1968) on by-stander behaviour.

Considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- Degree of empirical support
  - Methodological and ethical considerations
  - Cultural and/or gender considerations
  - Possible theoretical assumptions and/or biases
  - Alternative explanations/factors
  - Generalizability of findings
  - Supporting and/or contradictory explanations or findings.
-