

Markscheme

November 2025

Psychology

Higher level and 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.

Marks	Level descriptor
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.

Marks	Level descriptor
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.

Marks	Level descriptor
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.

Marks	Level descriptor
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.

Marks	Level descriptor
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 normality versus abnormality.

[22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of normality and abnormality.

Knowledge and understanding of normality/abnormality may include but is not limited to:

- models: mental health; statistical; medical
- deviation from social and cultural norms
- the psychoanalytic explanation
- the cognitive explanation
- criteria for normality/abnormality e.g. Jahoda (1958); Rosenhan and Seligman (1984)

Relevant studies may include but are not limited to:

- Bolton (1999) – cultural issues in overdiagnosis
- Rosenhan (1973) – reliability and validity issues
- Lobbestael, Leurgans and Arntz (2011) – reliability of diagnosis
- Li-Repac’s (1980) study on the role of stereotyping in diagnosis
- Luhrmann et al. (2015) – cultural differences hearing voices and having conversations with those voices in schizophrenia.

Critical discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- difficulties in defining normality/abnormality
- validity and reliability in diagnosing normality/abnormality
- assumptions and biases in defining the concepts of normal and abnormal
- areas of uncertainty in diagnostic manuals
- methodological and ethical considerations of research
- the influence of social and cultural norms on the perception of normality/abnormality
- historical changes in our understanding of what constitutes normal and abnormal behaviour
- ethical implications (e.g. labelling)

Although studies illustrating difficulty in diagnosis (e.g. Rosenhan) may be relevant to the question, the response must be focused on the broader issue of normality versus abnormality to be awarded the full range of marks.

Responses are likely to focus on explaining concepts of normality versus abnormality and on related research. Marks awarded for criterion B should focus on how the responses reflect general knowledge of the topic including definitions of terms, explanations of theories and concepts. Marks awarded for criterion C assess the quality of the description of a study/studies and assess how well the student linked the findings of the study to the question.

2. Contrast **two** explanations for **one or more** disorders. **[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 disorders, referring to both explanations throughout.

Explanations contrasted may include, but are not limited to:

- cognitive
- biological
- sociocultural
- psychoanalytic
- biopsychosocial

Factors that might be considered when contrasting two explanations include, but are not limited to:

- genetic factors
- biochemical factors
- cognitive thinking style
- cognitive distortion and bias
- role of rumination
- cognitive vulnerability
- cultural factors
- environmental factors
- implications for treatment

Relevant studies may include but are not limited to:

- Nurnberg and Gershon’s (1982) review of seven twin studies on major depression
- Bours et al.’s (2001) correlation between amount of negative automatic thoughts and the severity of depression
- Haefffel and Hames (2013) cognitive vulnerability and major depressive disorder
- Brown and Harris’s (1978) study on social factors of depression
- Nicholson et al. (2014) interaction of noradrenaline and cortisol to predict negative intrusive memories in posttraumatic stress disorder
- El Leithy et al. (2006) counterfactual thinking and posttraumatic stress disorder stress reaction
- Kilpatrick et al. (2003) Violence and risk of posttraumatic, major depressive disorder
- Kendler et al.’s (1991) twin research on genetic vulnerability in bulimia nervosa
- Jaeger et al.’s (2002) cross-cultural study on the relationship between body dissatisfaction and development of bulimia

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 contrast explanations of one disorder in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may contrast explanations of more than one disorder in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

3. Discuss the role of culture in the 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 the role of culture in the treatment of one or more disorders.

Relevant studies may include but are not limited to:

- Sue and Zane’s (2009) study on the role of culture and cultural techniques in psychotherapy
- Marsala’s (2012) study on cultural conceptions of mental health and therapy
- Nicholl and Thompson’s (2004) study on psychological treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in adult refugees
- Hodge and Nadir (2008) study on culturally competent practice
- Hatala and Waldram’s (2016) case study on the role of sensorial processes in Q’eqchi’ Maya healing in depression and bereavement
- Griner and Smith’s (2006) study on the effectiveness of culturally sensitive treatment.

Discussion points related to culture and treatment may include but are not limited to:

- culture-bound disorders
- accessibility of treatment
- interpretation of the symptoms
- cultural norms
- gender differences within different cultures
- different cultural approaches to treatment
- etic versus emic approaches to treatment
- cultural acceptance of treatment

Candidates may address the role of culture in the treatment of one disorder to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may address the role of culture in the treatment of more than one disorder to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are acceptable.

For responses that do not focus on the role of culture and treatment and explore diagnosis, or explanations with no explicit addressing of treatment, marks awarded are likely to be affected in criteria A, B and C due to lack of focus/relevance.

Developmental psychology

4. Discuss the influence of poverty and/or socio-economic status on human development. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of the influence of poverty/socio-economic status on human development.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Bhoomika et al.’s (2008) study on the effect of malnutrition on cognitive performance in Indian children
- Wertheimer’s (2003) study on the correlation between academic achievement and living in poor families
- Hair et al.’s (2015) longitudinal study on Association of Child Poverty, Brain Development, and Academic Achievement
- Schoon’s (2002) longitudinal study investigating the long-term effect of poverty on academic achievement and attainment in adult life
- Evans and Kim’s (2007) study on the effects of long-term exposure to poverty in childhood on both physical and mental health
- Dadlani et al.’s (2018) study on influence of socio-economic status of young children influence their language performance

Critical discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- assumptions and biases in research
- areas of uncertainty
- cultural considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative explanations or factors
- practical applications
- implications of the findings

Candidates may address one or a small number of potential influences of poverty/socio-economic status to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may address a larger number of potential influences of poverty/socio-economic status to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

5. Evaluate **one or more** studies on the development of empathy and/or theory of mind. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

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

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Bischof-Köhler ‘s (1991) ‘The Development of Empathy in Infants’
- van der Mark et al.’s (2002) ‘Development of Empathy in Girls During the Second Year of Life: Associations with Parenting, Attachment, and Temperament’
- McDonald and Messinger’s (2011) ‘The Development of Empathy: How, when and why’
- Happé’s (1995) ‘The role of age and verbal ability in the theory of mind task performance of subjects with autism’
- Peterson et al.’s (2016) ‘Peer Social Skills and Theory of Mind in Children with Autism, Deafness, or Typical Development’
- Meltzoff’s (1995) ‘Representation of intentions in human children’
- Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith’s (1985) ‘Understanding false beliefs in human children’

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- areas of uncertainty
- gender and cultural considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- contrary and supporting findings
- alternative explanations or factors
- practical applications
- implications of the findings

Responses referring to animal research are acceptable as long as they are explicitly linked to human behaviour.

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 greater number of studies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

In questions that ask for evaluation of studies, in criterion A we assess to what extent is the response focused on the question. 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]** for this criterion. 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 be awarded **[2]**.

Marks awarded for criterion B should refer to definitions of terms and concepts. 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 (development of empathy and/or theory of mind)

- 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.

6. Discuss the role of brain development in learning. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term "discuss" requires candidates to offer a considered review of the role of brain development in learning.

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

- neuroplasticity e.g. neural networks; neural pruning
- maturational theory of 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 language
- Baird et al.'s (2002); Diamond's (1991) studies on maturation of frontal lobe and development of object permanence
- Bell and Fox's (1996) study on crawling experience related to changes in cortical organization during infancy using EEG
- Danelli et al.'s (2012) case study of neuroplasticity in an adolescent

Discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- implications of the findings
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative theories/explanations

Responses referring to animal research are acceptable as long as they are explicitly linked to human behaviour.

Marks for criterion A will be awarded for focus on theoretical explanations of brain development.

Marks for criterion B will reflect the quality of the knowledge and understanding of the chosen theories. Marks for criterion C reflect how studies are presented and used in the response. Criterion D should assess critical thinking related to theories and/or studies.

Health psychology

7. Discuss **one or more** risk and/or protective factors affecting health.

[22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of how one or more risk and/or protective factors affect health. Candidates may choose to discuss risk and/or protective factors determining specific health issues or health in general. Either approach is acceptable.

Risk/protective factors may include, but are not limited to:

- socioeconomic factors
- level of peer support
- sleep
- family factors
- health beliefs
- resiliency traits

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Doan et al.’s (2016) study on the risks on tiger parenting and its effect on stress
- Brondel et al.’s (2010) study on the protective role of sleep in obesity
- Booysen’s (2000) study on the role of ethnicity in workplace stress in South Africa
- Unger and Chen’s (1999) study on risk and protective factors related to adolescent smoking initiation
- Haines et al.’s (2012) study of risk and protective factors related to adolescent weight gain
- Yi et al.’s (2010) study of the role of risk and protective factors in risky sexual behaviours in Cambodian high school students.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- theoretical issues
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- cultural and gender considerations

Candidates may discuss a small number of risk/protective factors in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of risk/protective factors in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

8. Evaluate **one or more** studies related to explanations of **one or more** health problems. **[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 related to explanations of health problem(s). Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Relevant studies include, but are not limited to:

- Steptoe and Marmot’s (2003) survey on the interaction of psychological, social and physiological aspects of stress
- Bauman et al.’s (1990) correlational study on likelihood of smoking in adolescence where parents also smoke
- Sorensen’s (1998) longitudinal study on genetic variability and the role of environment on obesity
- Binswanger et al.’s (2012) semi-structured interview study of risk and protective factors in drug users after prison release
- Luthar et al.’s (1998) study using diagnostic interviews on the risk and protective factors among addicted mothers’ children
- Unger and Chen’s (1999) survey on the role of social networks and media in predicting age of smoking: risk and protective factors

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

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- implications of the findings
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- why the method(s) was/were selected and the appropriateness of the method(s) including strengths and weaknesses of the method(s)
- possible theoretical assumptions and/or biases in relation to the chosen method

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 greater number of studies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

In questions that ask for evaluation of studies, in criterion A we assess to what extent is the response focused on the question. 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]** for this criterion. 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 be awarded **[2]**.

Marks awarded for criterion B should refer to definitions of terms and concepts. 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 (explanations of health problems)
- 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.

Studies of mental health issues may be presented and can be credited if the case is explicitly made for mental health being a health problem.

9. Discuss the effectiveness of **one or more** health promotion programmes. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to make a considered review of the effectiveness of one or more health promotion programmes. The effectiveness relates to the success rate of any health promotion programme.

Examples of health promotion programmes may include, but are not limited to:

- food labelling programmes
- stress reduction programmes such as mindfulness based stress reduction (MBSR) or yoga
- health education campaigns such as the TRUTH anti-tobacco campaign (US) or the National Tobacco Campaign (Australia)
- NHS’s ‘Healthy Child Programme’; keeping children healthy and safe (UK)
- NHS Diabetes Prevention Programme (UK)
- taxes and/or subsidies upon products such as sugar, tobacco or alcohol

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Peckmann and Reibling’s (2006) study of the effectiveness of fear campaigns
- Yee et al.’s (2006) study of effectiveness of strategies to change behaviours related to obesity
- Sly et al.’s (2002) survey on community based anti-smoking promotion among teens
- Holm’s (2002) survey on the efficiency of health campaigns
- Schum and Gould’s (2007) study of why health campaigns are effective
- Prochaska and Di Clemente’s (1983) ‘Longitudinal research on the effectiveness of the Integrative Model of change for smoking behaviour’
- Marlatt and Gordon’s (1985) ‘Relapse prevention: maintenance strategies in the treatment of addictive behaviours’
- Huhman et al.’s (2007) evaluation of a national physical activity intervention for children: VERB campaign

Critical discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- implications of the findings
- generalization of the findings
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- comparing and contrasting the effectiveness of different health promotion programmes

Candidates may discuss one health promotion programme in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of health promotion programmes in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

If a candidate discusses health promotion programmes in general with no reference to their effectiveness 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.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Evaluate **one or more** studies investigating the formation of personal relationships. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

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

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Flora and Segrin’s (2003) study on the perception of the relationship in married and dating couples
- Walster et al.’s (1966) study on the matching hypothesis and attractiveness
- Jones et al.’s (2007) study on social proof and attractiveness
- Flora and Segrin’s (2000) study on relationship development in dating couples
- Wedekind’s (1995) study on mate preference based on genetic makeup
- Buss et al.’s (1990) study on cross-cultural factors in attraction (the international mate selection project)
- Gupta and Singh’s (1982) study on arranged marriages in Indian couples
- Keim and Klärner’s (2012) study on personal relationships’ impact on future family formation
- Sanders’s (1997) study on the formation of personal relationships between social beings.

Studies that focus specifically on how relationships change and/or end and make no reference to formation of relationships are not eligible for credit in criterion C.

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

- methodological and ethical considerations
- gender considerations
- contrary findings
- practical applications of the empirical findings
- how the findings of research have been interpreted
- implications of the findings
- validity and reliability.

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 greater number of studies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

In questions that ask for evaluation of studies, in criterion A we assess to what extent is the response focused on the question. 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 the 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 (formation of relationships)
- 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 utilised 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 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 which in this case is the formation of relationships.

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

11. Discuss prejudice and/or discrimination in relation to 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 prejudice and/or discrimination in relation to group dynamics.

Candidates may focus on any aspect of prejudice and/or discrimination including the origins, development, effects of and/or the effectiveness of efforts to reduce prejudice and/or discrimination.

Relevant studies include, but are not limited to:

- Croucher’s (2013) study on Islamophobia in France, Germany and the UK
- Nosek et al. (2007) on implicit cognition and schema processing in relation to prejudice
- Harris and Fiske (2005) on the possible biological factors involved in prejudice and discrimination against the outgroup
- Darley and Gross’s (1983) study on the role of sociocultural factors in prejudice/discrimination
- Fein and Spencer’s (1997) study on prejudice as self-image maintenance
- Sherif’s (1961) Robbers Cave study investigating “realistic conflict theory”
- Tajfel’s (1970) experiments on intergroup discrimination based on the “minimal group paradigm”
- Reynolds and Kliek (2016) on new developments in prejudice reduction from its neural basis and impact on well-being

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted
- practical applications of the research
- implications of the findings
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative explanations/factors

If generic (that is, non-group dynamics) responses on prejudice/discrimination are presented, marks awarded are likely to be affected in criteria A, B and C due to lack of focus/relevance.

12. Discuss **one or more** ethical considerations in research related to social responsibility. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of ethical considerations in investigating social responsibility.

Ethical considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- protection of participants
- issues of consent/assent
- debriefing
- right to withdraw from a study
- use of deception
- confidentiality
- anonymity.

Ethical considerations may be positive (what guidelines were followed) or negative (what guidelines were not followed).

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Drury et al (2009) study on the role of social identity theory in helping
- DeWall et al.'s (2008) study investigating the roles of ego depletion and glucose on prosocial behaviour
- Levine's (2005) study on prosocial behaviour in football fans
- Whiting and Whiting's (1975) study comparing prosocial behaviour in six cultures
- Miller et al.'s (1990) study on cultural norms and moral values related to social responsibility
- Burnstein et al.'s (1994) study on hypothetical helping behaviour towards different degrees of relatives
- Piliavin et al.'s (1969) subway study on by-standerism versus helping behaviour.

Critical discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- the considerations of conducting research in a different culture
- why deception is used
- the difficulties of ensuring confidentiality
- the role of informed consent
- decisions as to why certain ethical guidelines were/were not followed
- changes over time in adherence to ethical standards/guidelines.

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.

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