

Markscheme

May 2026

Psychology

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2026

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 2026

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, 2026

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. Evaluate **one or more** studies investigating the validity **and/or** reliability of diagnosis. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires students 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 (e.g. OCD, anorexia, depression) are acceptable and can achieve maximum marks as long as the focus is on reliability and/or validity of 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 may include but are not limited to:

- Nicholls *et al.*'s (2000) study on 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 (1973) study 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.

In criterion A we assess the extent to which the response is 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. If the student 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.

2. Contrast the biological approach and the sociocultural approach to understanding the etiology of abnormal psychology. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “contrast” requires students to give an account of the differences between the biological approach and the sociocultural approach to understanding the etiology of abnormal psychology, referring to both of them throughout.

Relevant studies may include but are not limited to:

- Kendler et al.’s (1991) study on genetic factors and bulimia nervosa
- Strober’s (2000) study on genetic factors and bulimia nervosa
- Sanders and Bazalgette’s (1993) study on media and body image
- Sharen and Sundar’s (2015) study on eating disorders in women
- Caspi’s (2003) study on genetic factors and stressful life events on depression
- Delgado and Moreno’s (2000) study on neurotransmitters and depression
- Marsala’s (1979) study on cultural conceptions of mental health
- Kleinman’s (1982) study on culture and depression
- Brown and Harris’s (1978) study on social origins of depression in women.

Critical discussion may include but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations related to the research into the biological approach and sociocultural approach to understanding etiology
- the issue of reductionism versus holism
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty (including research methods used and data uncertainties)
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence.

If the student 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.

If the student provides only a discussion of one approach to understanding the etiology of abnormal psychology, the response should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]** for criterion B. All remaining criteria should be awarded marks according to the best fit approach.

3. Discuss the effectiveness of **one or more** treatments for **one or more** disorders. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

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

Relevant treatments may include but are not limited to:

- biological: drug, ECT, brain stimulation
- cognitive-behavioural therapy
- behavioural
- psychoanalytic
- eclectic.

Relevant studies may include but are not limited to:

- Cooper *et al.*'s (2003) study on short and long-term effects of psychological treatment on post-partum depression
- Neale *et al.*'s (2011) meta-analysis of studies of the outcome of using antidepressants versus placebos
- Elkin *et al.*'s (1989) outcome study of treatment for depression
- MacDermut *et al.*'s (2001) meta-analysis of the effectiveness of group therapy for depression
- Pampallona *et al.*'s (2004) study on the efficacy of drug treatment alone versus drug treatment and psychotherapy in depression
- Vocks *et al.*'s (2010) meta-analysis of the effectiveness of psychological and pharmacological treatments for binge-eating disorder
- Davidson *et al.*'s (2001) study on drug therapy for PTSD.

Discussion may include but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations related to investigation of treatments for disorders
- gender and cultural considerations
- practical applications and implications of the findings
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- assumptions and biases
- comparison/contrast of therapies
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- side-effects
- cost-effectiveness.

Students may discuss the effectiveness of one treatment for disorder(s) in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may discuss the effectiveness of a larger number of treatments for disorder(s) in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Developmental psychology

4. Discuss the role of peers **and/or** play in cognitive development **and/or** social development. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires students to offer a considered review of the role of peers and/or play in cognitive and/or social development.

Relevant topics may include but are not limited to:

- the influence of different categories of play on cognitive and/or social development
- the therapeutic value of play
- Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theories related to play and cognitive development
- the link between cognitive development and peer relationships
- the link between peer relationships and social comparison
- cultural differences in peer relationships.

Studies may include but are not limited to:

- Hughes’s (1999) study on learning social skills through role play
- Russ’s (2004) study of a child’s capacity for cognitive flexibility and creativity developed by role play
- Todd et al. (2016); Fagot’s (1985) studies on gender-specific toys
- Bradbard *et al.*’s (1986) study on the influence of sex stereotypes on children’s exploration and memory
- Albert *et al.*’s (2013) study on peer influences in adolescent decision-making
- Newcomb and Bentler’s (1988) study showing how positive relationships are important in reducing adolescents’ drug use
- Kupersmidt and Coie’s (1990) studies on peer rejection as predictor of externalizing problems in adolescence.

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
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative explanations addressing cognitive and/or social development.

Students may discuss one aspect of the role of peers and/or play in cognitive and/or social development in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of aspects of the role of peers and/or play in cognitive and/or social development in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

5. Evaluate **one or more studies relevant to the development of gender identity. [22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires students to make an appraisal of one or more studies related to the development of gender identity by weighing up the strengths and limitations of the 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 related to gender identity may include but are not limited to:

- Martin and Halverson’s (1983) study showing the role of gender schemas on gender roles
- Witt (1997); Fagot’s (1978) studies showing the influence of parents on gender roles
- Neculaesei (2015); Mead’s (1935) studies showing that gender roles depend upon the society
- Money and Ehrhardt’s (1972) study claiming that children are gender neutral at birth.
- Slaby and Frey’s (1975) study on gender constancy
- Martin’s (1989) study on the influence of gender labelling on information processing
- Bussey and Bandura’s (1999) study on how the media can create gender stereotypes.

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 and implications of the findings
- how the findings of research have been interpreted
- validity and reliability.

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 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 (development of gender identity)
- 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 student 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.

6. Discuss **one or more** ethical considerations in research investigating how humans develop as learners. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires students to offer a considered review of ethical considerations in research investigating how humans develop as learners.

Ethical considerations may be positive (what guidelines were followed) or negative (what guidelines were not followed) or a combination of both.

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:

- Waber (2007); Giedd (2004); Chugani et al.'s (2001) studies on the effects of maturation of the nervous system on cognitive development
- Cowell et al. (2006); Corky's (1997) studies on brain damage and memory deficits
- Deary et al. (2006); Bouchard et al.'s (1990) studies on genetic inheritance in intelligence
- Piaget and Inhelder (1956); McGarrigle and Donaldson (1974); Samuel and Bryant's (1984) studies on stages of cognitive development
- Siegler (1978); Case's (1992) studies on the information-processing approach to cognitive development.

Critical discussion may include but is not limited to:

- the difficulties of ensuring anonymity and confidentiality in psychology research
- the role of informed consent in research with children
- why deception was or was not used
- decisions as to why certain ethical guidelines were/were not followed
- changes over time in adherence to ethical standards/guidelines.

While the response may include some description of studies, the main focus of the response should be on the ethical considerations.

For Criterion B (quality of knowledge of ethical issues) examiners need to be aware that some students 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**.

Ethical considerations are only identified or described in generic terms should be awarded marks in the lowest (1-2) band.

Ethical considerations are described within relevant studies should be awarded marks in the mid (3-4) band.

Ethical considerations are described within relevant studies **and** clearly linked to the topic being focused on should be awarded marks in the top (5-6) band.

Students may discuss one or a small number of ethical considerations related to one or a small number of research studies in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may discuss a larger number of ethical considerations related to a larger number of research studies in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Health psychology

7. To what extent do dispositional factors **and/or** health beliefs determine health? [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “to what extent” requires students to consider the influence that dispositional factors and/or health beliefs have on health.

Dispositional factors and/or health beliefs may include but are not limited to:

- perceived susceptibility
- perceived severity
- perceived benefits
- perceived barriers
- personality traits
- health motivation
- perceived behavioural control
- attitudes
- optimism bias.

In order to respond to the command term “to what extent” it is appropriate and useful for students to address other factors (e.g. situational factors) that may determine health.

Relevant research may include but is not limited to:

- Reed’s (1999) study relating to pessimism and HIV-related symptoms
- Kearney *et al.*’s (2006) study of stress and the immune system
- Weinberger *et al.*’s (1981) study on health beliefs and smoking behaviour
- Polivy’s (2001) false hope theory regarding dietary goals and optimism
- Gatchel’s (2017) study on fear avoidance belief and chronic pain
- Chapin’s (2010) study on the role of optimism bias in adolescent risky sexual practices
- Festinger’s (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance in relation to health-related behaviour.

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

- degree of empirical support
- methodological considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- implications and practical applications of the findings
- the accuracy and clarity of the concepts
- assumptions and biases
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- alternative explanations or factors
- issues of validity and reliability.

Students could choose to discuss the extent to which dispositional factors and/or health beliefs affect one, or more than one health-related phenomena. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Students may address a small number of dispositional factors and/or health beliefs in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may address a larger number of dispositional factors and/or health beliefs in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

8. Discuss **one or more** research methods used to understand health problems. **[22]**

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

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

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 may include but are not limited to:

- Speisman et al.'s (1964) study on cognitive appraisal and stress (experiment)
- Cohen's (2016) study on stress and illness (interviews)
- Koch et al.'s (2008) study on stress and obesity (questionnaires / correlational study)
- Crum et al.'s (2011) study on nutrient value (experiment)
- Joseph's (2015) study on consumption of fast food (questionnaires / interviews)
- Jokela et al.'s (2013) meta-analysis of personality traits and obesity
- Reed et al.'s (1999) study on pessimism in AIDS symptoms (longitudinal study)
- Deshpande, Basil and Basil's (2009) study on the HBM and healthy eating habits among college students (survey).

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/or weaknesses of the method(s)
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- areas of uncertainty
- assumptions and biases in the research method
- the issues of validity and reliability
- the issues of generalizability of findings
- the ease and cost of procedures
- the use of alternative/additional methods (triangulation)
- ability to infer causality
- discussing how multiple methods complement each other (triangulation)
- ethical considerations related to how/why research methods have been chosen and applied.

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. Overall, this includes some knowledge of the specific topic (health problems) and general knowledge and understanding related to research methods (for example definitions of relevant terms in research methodology).

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

Students 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.

9. Evaluate one or more studies related to promoting health. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires students to make an appraisal of one or more studies related to promoting health 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 studies relating to promoting health may include but are not limited to:

- Golechha’s (2016) study on health promotion methods for smoking prevention and cessation
- Li et al.’s (2015) study on health promotion interventions and policies addressing excessive alcohol use
- Langford et al.’s (2015) study on effectiveness of the health promoting schools’ framework
- Lowe et al.’s (2004) study on “food dudes” programme
- Peckman and Reibling’s (2006) study of the effectiveness of fear campaigns
- Sanderson and Yopyk’s (2007) study on promoting condom use
- Black et al.’s (2010) study on effectiveness of challenge health promotion model.

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

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

If the student 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]** 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 (health promotion)
- 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 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.

If the study/studies do not focus on promoting health, but on health in general, award up to a maximum of **[2]** for criterion C.

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

Students may evaluate one study related to promoting health 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.

Psychology of human relationships

10. Evaluate **one or more** explanations of why relationships change **and/or** end. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “evaluate” requires students to make an appraisal by weighing up the strengths and limitations of one or more explanations for why relationship change and/or end. The main focus of the evaluation should be on the explanations for why relationships change and/or end, rather than on the studies presented.

Although a discussion of both strengths and limitations is required, it does not have to be evenly balanced to gain high marks.

Explanations of why relationships change and/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
- Gottman’s four horsemen of the apocalypse.

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) studies investigating fatal attraction theory
- Levenson, Carstensen and Gottman (1994); Gottman and Levenson’s (1992) study on communication patterns, physiological arousal, and marital satisfaction
- Buss and Shackelford’s (1997) study on mate retention behaviour
- Fincham *et al.* (2000); Graham and Conoley’s (2006) study on the relationship between attributions and marital satisfaction
- Rollie and Duck’s (2006) study on relationship breakdown.

Evaluation of the selected explanations 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 and/or gender considerations
- alternative explanations
- assumptions and biases
- practical applications (e.g. relationship counselling).

Responses solely focusing on formation of relationships should be awarded up to a maximum of [2] for criterion B: knowledge and understanding.

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 on all criteria.

Marks awarded for criterion C assess the quality of the description of 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 evaluating one or more explanations of why relationships change and/or end.

If the student 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.

Students may evaluate one explanation to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may consider more explanations to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

11. Discuss one or more studies related to prejudice and/or discrimination. [22]

Refer to the Paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires students to offer a considered review of one or more or more studies related to prejudice and/or discrimination.

Relevant studies may include, but are not limited to:

- Nosek, Banaji and Greenwald’s (2007) study on implicit cognition and schema processing in relation to prejudice
- Harris and Fiske’s (2005) study on the possible biological factors involved in prejudice and discrimination against the outgroup
- Darley and Gross’s (1983) study on the possible role of social cognition in estimations of another person’s success
- 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 Klim’s (2016) study 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
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- how the findings of the research have been interpreted and applied
- implications of the findings
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence
- validity and reliability of the findings.

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 (prejudice and/or discrimination)
- 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. Students may discuss one study to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may consider more studies to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

12. Discuss one or more factors influencing by-standerism. [22]

Refer to the paper 2 assessment criteria when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires students to offer a considered review of one or more factors influencing by-standerism.

Factors influencing by-standerism may include but are not limited to:

- diffusion of responsibility
- pluralistic ignorance
- normative social influence (conformity)
- cultural considerations
- costs/rewards of helping behaviour
- dispositional characteristics
- social identity theory – individuals are more likely to help in-group members
- strategies based on social cognitive theory and Sabido method are likely to decrease by-standerism.

Relevant studies may include but are not limited to:

- Latane and Darley’s (1970; 1968) studies of unresponsive by-stander
- Darley and Batson’s (1973) study on the role of situational and dispositional factors
- Piliavin et al.’s (1969) subway study of helping behaviour
- Oliner and Oliner’s (1988) study of dispositional factors in by-standerism
- Levine’s (2005) study on dispositional characteristics in football fans
- Drury et al.’s (2009) virtual reality study on by-standerism.

Critical discussion may include but is not limited to:

- methodological and ethical considerations of research related to one or more factors influencing by-standerism
- cultural and/or gender considerations
- how the findings of research have been interpreted and applied
- implications and practical applications of the findings
- assumptions and biases
- areas of uncertainty
- alternative explanations
- supporting and/or contradictory evidence.

Students may discuss one factor influencing by-standerism to demonstrate depth of knowledge or may consider more factors to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.
