

Markscheme

May 2022

Psychology

Higher level

Paper 2

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2022

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 2022

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, 2022

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 to 2	The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Psychological terminology is used but with errors that hamper understanding.
3 to 4	The response demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail. Psychological terminology is used but with errors that do not hamper understanding.
5 to 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 to 2	Limited relevant psychological research is used in the response. Research selected serves to repeat points already made.
3 to 4	Relevant psychological research is used in support of the response and is partly explained. Research selected partially develops the argument.
5 to 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 to 2	There is limited critical thinking and the response is mainly descriptive. Evaluation or discussion, if present, is superficial.
3 to 4	The response contains critical thinking, but lacks development. Evaluation or discussion of most relevant areas is attempted but is not developed.
5 to 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. Evaluate **one or more** studies investigating the validity and/or reliability of diagnosis.

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 the validity and/or reliability of diagnosis by weighing up the strengths and limitations of the selected study/studies. The focus of the evaluation should be upon the study/studies, not on the validity and/or reliability of diagnosis. Studies related to diagnosis of any disorders (eg OCD, anorexia, depression) are acceptable and can achieve maximum marks as long as the focus is on reliability and/or diagnosis of those disorders. Responses may use studies referring to gender and cultural bias of diagnosis and can be awarded marks for these as long as the bias explicitly relates to issues of validity and/or reliability of diagnosis. 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:

- Nicholls *et al.*'s (2000) studies of inter-rater reliability
- Wakefield *et al.*'s (2007) study on the validity of diagnosis
- Silverman *et al.*'s (2001) study on test-retest of anxiety symptoms and diagnosis
- Rosenhan's studies of diagnostic validity
- Kleinman's (1982) study of differences in interpretation of somatic symptoms in Chinese culture and the United States
- Lipton and Simon's (1985) study on reliability of diagnosis of randomly selected 131 patients in a hospital in New York
- Lobbestael, Leurgans and Arntz's (2011) study of reliability of diagnosis using the DSM IV
- Bolton's (2002) cross-cultural validity of the western key concept of PTSD
- Li-Repac's (1980) study on the effect of cultural stereotyping on diagnosis.

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

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory findings
- the applications of the empirical findings
- how the findings of the research have been interpreted
- implications of the findings.

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.

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 topic but more specifically knowledge and understanding related to research methods and ethics of chosen studies

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.

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

2. Evaluate **one or more** studies investigating prevalence rates of **one or more** psychological disorders.

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 investigating prevalence rates of one or more psychological disorders by weighing up the strengths and limitations of the selected study or studies. The focus of the evaluation should be upon the study/studies, not on the prevalence rates of psychological disorders. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

The disorder(s) chosen is/are likely to come from the list in the guide:

- anxiety disorders
- depressive disorders
- obsessive compulsive disorders
- trauma and stress related disorders
- eating disorders.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Brown and Harris’s (1977) study of gender vulnerability to depression
- Makino *et al.*’s (2004) study regarding the prevalence of eating disorders in Western and non-Western countries
- Weisman *et al.*’s (1995) study regarding the cross-cultural variation in data on depression rates
- Garrison *et al.* (1995) investigating the incidence of PTSD in adolescents after Hurricane Andrew
- Dutton’s (2009) study of cultural variation in the prevalence of major depression
- Nolen-Hoeksema’s (2001) study of gender rates in depression
- Piccinelli and Wilkinson’s (2000) study of gender differences in depression.

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

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory findings
- the applications of the empirical findings
- how findings have been interpreted
- implications of the findings.

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.

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 topic but more specifically knowledge and understanding related to research methods and ethics of chosen studies.

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.

3. Discuss **one** biological treatment **and one** psychological treatment for **one or more** psychological disorders.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of one biological and one psychological treatment for one or more psychological disorders.

The disorder(s) chosen is/are likely to come from the list in the guide:

- anxiety disorders
- depressive disorders
- obsessive compulsive disorders
- trauma and stress related disorders
- eating disorders.

Biological treatment could include, but is not limited to:

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

Psychological treatment could include, but is not limited to:

- Interpersonal Therapy (IPT)
- Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT)
- Exposure and Systematic desensitization
- Virtual Reality Therapy (VRT)
- Mindfulness-based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT)
- Group therapy.

Responses may refer to an interactionist approach or a biopsychosocial approach to treatment. These responses might refer to the interactionist approach as one treatment or argue that two treatments are used for helping patients with a disorder. Both approaches are equally acceptable and can be credited up to full marks.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Mason and Hargreaves’s (2011) qualitative investigation into the effectiveness of MBCT
- Butler *et al.*’s (2006) review of meta-analysis related to CBT efficacy
- Hodges and Oei’s (2007) discussion of the applicability of CBT to Chinese culture
- MacNamara *et al.*’s (2016) studying the effectiveness of SSRIs for PTSD
- Parsons and Rizzo’s (2008) meta-analysis of studies into the effectiveness of virtual reality therapy for PTSD.
- McLay *et al.*’s (2011) assessment of the effectiveness of VRT for post-traumatic stress disorder.

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 with regard to the chosen disorder
- culture, gender, ethical, and/or practical considerations related to the use of treatment of the chosen disorder
- advantages and disadvantages of the treatment.

If a candidate discusses more than one biological treatment or more than one psychological treatment, credit should be given only to the first treatment.

Developmental psychology

4. Discuss **one or more** theories of brain development.

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 theories of brain development.

Relevant theories may include, but are not limited to:

- theory of neuroplasticity
- maturational theory of brain development.

Responses to this question may also use Piaget's and Vygotsky's theory. 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 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) study of a 14-year-old adolescent who had left hemispherectomy at age 2.5 and later made substantial neuro-linguistic recovery
- Takatsuru *et al.* on how the brain compensates for damage caused by trauma.

Discussion points may include, but are not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations related to the research into brain development
- 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.

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.

5. Evaluate **one or more** studies investigating influences on cognitive **and/or** social development.

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 influences on cognitive and/or social development by weighing up the strengths and limitations of the selected study/studies. The focus of the evaluation should be upon the study/studies, not the influences of cognitive and/or social development. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Candidates may evaluate one or more studies investigating specific aspects of cognitive and/or social development (for example memory, intelligence, gender development, peer relationship) or evaluate one or more studies investigating cognitive and/or social development in general. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

The term “influence” may include, but is not limited to:

- genetic influence
- maturation of the nervous system
- trauma/deprivation
- resilience
- peers
- poverty
- nutrition
- educational programmes/support from parents/educators.

Responses to this question may also use Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theory. In these responses marks should be awarded depending on how effectively responses target and explain **influences** on cognitive and/or social development.

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

- Waber's (2007); Giedd's (2004); Chugani *et al.*'s (2001) studies on the effects of maturation of the nervous system on cognitive development
- Deary *et al.*'s (2006); Bouchard *et al.*'s (1990) studies on genetic inheritance in intelligence
- Cowell *et al.*'s (2006); Corky's (1997) studies on brain damage and memory deficits
- Fagot's (1978); Condry and Condry's (1976) studies on the role of society in gender development
- Carly and Eagly's (1999); Eagly and Johnson's (1990); Maccoby and Jacklin's (1980) meta-analysis considering the influence of gender on group relations
- studies relating to Vygotsky addressing peer mentoring or the relevance of zone of proximal development.

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory findings
- application of the empirical findings
- how the findings of the research have been interpreted
- implications of the findings.

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.

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 topic but more specifically knowledge and understanding related to research methods and ethics of chosen studies

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 **one or more** theories of attachment.

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 theories of attachment.

Relevant theories may include, but are not limited to:

- Bowlby's evolutionary theory of attachment
- Ainsworth's theory of attachment styles
- Schaffer's theory of attachment stages
- Learning theory of attachment
- Kagan's temperament theory of attachment.

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
- Schaffer and Emerson's (1964) study on stages of attachment
- Hodges and Tizard's (1989) study on the effect of early institutionalisation
- 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 related to the research into attachment
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- implication of the findings
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative theories/explanations.

Responses referring to research of 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.

Health psychology

7. Discuss the effectiveness of **one or more** health promotion programmes.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of the effectiveness of one or more health promotion programmes.

Health promotion programmes may include, but are not limited to:

- TRUTH campaign, anti-smoking campaign (Sly *et al.*, 2002; Schum and Gold, 2007)
- National Tobacco Campaign, Australia (Woodward, 2003)
- NHS Diabetes Prevention Programme, England
- food labelling programmes
- taxes and/or subsidies upon products such as sugar, tobacco or alcohol
- stress reduction programmes such as MBSR or yoga as exercise
- public health campaigns designed to change beliefs and attitudes.

Relevant factors related to the effectiveness of health promotion may include, but are not limited to:

- effectiveness of the reduction of risk factors of target population
- use of mass media to change health behaviours
- health promotion strategies used
- primary and secondary health promotion
- characteristics of the target population
- determinants of health.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- cultural considerations
- ethical considerations in programme implementation
- conditions under which the programme may be employed
- empirical evidence of programme success or failure
- methodological concerns in measuring outcomes of the programme.

8. Evaluate **one or more** studies related to prevalence rates of health problems.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal by weighing up strengths and limitations of one or more studies related to the prevalence rates of health problems. The focus of the evaluation should be upon the study/studies, not on prevalence rates of health problems. Although both strengths and limitations should be addressed, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Health problems are likely to come from the list in the guide:

- stress
- addiction
- obesity
- chronic pain
- sexual health.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Rhani, Bonu, Jha, Nyguen and Jamjoum’s (2003) study in tobacco use prevalence rates in India
- Thoits’s (1995) study of gender prevalence in giving and receiving social support
- Parker *et al.*’s (2005) study of prevalence rates from 1992 and 2002 showing increasing health problems among Swedish elderly population
- Makino *et al.*’s (2004) study of prevalence rates in eating disorders in Western and non-Western countries
- Weinberger *et al.*’s (2019) study on increasing prevalence rates of smoking in US adults with mental health and substance use problems
- Zheng *et al.*’s (2018) study of prevalence rates of smoking and knowledge of health hazards among internal migrants in China
- Agha *et al.*’s (2017) study related to rising prevalence rates of obesity and related effects on public health.

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

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory findings
- the applications of the empirical findings
- how the findings of research have been interpreted
- implications of the findings.

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.

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 topic but more specifically knowledge and understanding related to research methods and ethics of chosen studies

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.

9. Evaluate the biopsychosocial model of health and well-being.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires candidates to make an appraisal by weighing up strengths and limitations of the biopsychosocial model of health and well-being. Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations should be addressed, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Relevant research may include, but is not limited to:

- Engel’s (1977) biopsychosocial model of health
- Buckner, Heimberg, Ecker, and Vinci’s (2012) study in the use of the biopsychosocial model to treat addiction
- Wallace’s (1990) biopsychosocial disease model of alcoholism
- Nguyen *et al.*’s (2016) review of biopsychosocial treatment for obesity
- Jack’s (2013) biopsychosocial factors affecting female metabolism in type 1 diabetes
- Cohen *et al.*’s (2003) treatment of nicotine dependence: biopsychosocial perspective.

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to:

- the importance of considering a holistic approach to health
- advantages and disadvantages of the model
- methodological considerations related to the research into the biopsychosocial model of health and well-being
- cultural factors and gender considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory empirical evidence
- alternative explanations
- accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- practical applications.

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.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Discuss **one or more** explanations for why relationships change or end.

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of explanations for why relationships change or end.

Explanations of why relationships change or end may include, but are not limited to:

- social exchange theory
- equity theory
- attribution theory
- evolutionary explanations such as mate retention
- patterns of communication
- attachment styles
- fatal attraction theory
- other theories which show progression into a relationship or development/change within a relationship.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Flora and Seagrin’s (2003) study on the role of perception of the relationship
- Feilmlee’s (1995, 1998) study investigating fatal attraction theory
- Levenson, Carstensen and Gottman’s (1994) and Gottman and Levenson’s (1992) study on communication patterns, physiological arousal, and marital satisfaction
- Buss and Shackelford’s (1997) study on mate retention behaviour in men and women.
- Fincham *et al.*’s (2000) and Graham and Conoley (2006) study on the relationship between attributions and marital satisfaction.

Discussion may include, but is not limited to:

- examining underlying assumptions and biases of relationships
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- methodological and/or ethical considerations related to research into the explanations for why relationships change or end
- cultural/gender considerations
- alternative explanations
- areas of uncertainty.

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

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 research investigating group dynamics.

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

Ethical considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- deception
- protection from physical or mental harm
- briefing and debriefing
- right to withdraw from a study
- informed consent
- anonymity/confidentiality.

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 and Sternberg and Soriano’s (1984) study on styles of conflict resolution – anonymity and confidentiality.

Discussion related to ethical considerations may include, but is 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 research into group dynamics
- the potential for psychological and physical harm and associated restrictions on research design
- decisions as to why certain ethical guidelines were/were not followed
- changes over time in adherence to ethical standards/guidelines

12. Evaluate one or more studies investigating prosocial behaviour.

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 related to prosocial behaviour. The focus of the evaluation should be on the study/studies, not on prosocial behaviour.

Although both strengths and limitations should be addressed, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Piliavin *et al.*'s (1969), field experiment on factors involved in helping behaviour
- Whiting and Whiting's (1979) comparison of prosocial behaviour in six cultures as a result of child-rearing practices
- Batson *et al.*'s (1981) experiment on participants' motivation to help if they could escape based on the empathy-altruism theory
- Latane and Darley's (1968) study on bystanderism
- Oliner and Oliner's (1998) study on dispositional factors and personal norms in prosocial behaviour in relation to rescuing Jews during the Second World War
- Miller *et al.*'s (1990) study on the influence of cultural norms and moral values on perceptions of social responsibility
- Levine *et al.*'s (2001) study investigating cross-cultural differences in helping behaviour
- Bartlett and DeSteno's (2006) study on gratitude mediation of prosocial behaviour
- Gentile *et al.*'s (2009) study on the effects of prosocial video games on prosocial behaviours.

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

- methodological and ethical considerations
- cultural and gender considerations
- supporting and/or contradictory findings
- practical applications of empirical findings (*eg* anti-bullying programmes)
- how the findings of the research have been interpreted
- implications of the findings.

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.

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 topic but more specifically knowledge and understanding related to research methods and ethics of chosen studies.

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.
