

Section A: Mental health

Q1: Describe one definition of abnormality and support your answer with an example. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: One definition of abnormality identified, described in detail and supported with a relevant example.	Candidates can be expected to describe any one of the four definitions of abnormality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ deviation from social norms ▪ failure to function adequately ▪ statistical infrequency ▪ deviation from ideal mental health.
2 marks: One definition of abnormality identified and briefly described OR one definition of abnormality identified and supported with a relevant example.	
1 mark: One definition of abnormality identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q2: Explain one weakness of drug treatment for one specific disorder (depression, phobias or schizophrenia) in relation to ethical considerations. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: Relevant ethical weakness identified and explained in detail in the context of treatment for one of the named disorders.	<u>Possible answers could include:</u> Protection from harm – side effects Withdrawal – participants have limited ability to withdraw once drug treatment has started. Informed consent – some patients with severe mental ill health may not have the capacity to consent to drug treatment.
2 marks: Relevant ethical weakness identified, and briefly explained in the context of treatment for one of the named disorders.	
1 mark: Relevant ethical weakness identified, but NEITHER explained in the context of treatment for one of the named disorders NOR with the weakness developed/elaborated.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q3a: Charlie is behaving in a way that people regard as strange. Whatever events happen in Charlie's life, they do not seem to affect Charlie's mood at all. Charlie remains constantly happy and excited. Explain how one of the historical views of mental illness might explain Charlie's behaviour. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: One historical view identified and explained in detail in the context of Charlie's behaviour.	Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding through accurate reference to one of the historical views of mental illness (humoural, supernatural, or hospital movement). Candidates are required to <i>apply</i> the historical view of mental illness to explain Charlie's behaviour. For example, reference could be made to imbalance in the four humours, to Charlie being possessed by evil spirits, etc.
2 marks: One historical view identified, and briefly explained in the context of Charlie's behaviour.	
1 mark: One historical view identified, but NEITHER explained in the context of Charlie's behaviour NOR with the historical view developed/elaborated.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q3b: Charlie is behaving in a way that people regard as strange. Whatever events happen in Charlie's life, they do not seem to affect Charlie's mood at all. Charlie remains constantly happy and excited. Explain one way the medical model might explain Charlie's behaviour. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: One explanation from the medical model identified and explained in detail in the context of Charlie's behaviour.	Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding through accurate reference to one of the medical model explanations of mental illness (i.e. biochemical; genetic; or brain abnormality). Candidates are required to <i>apply</i> their chosen medical model explanation to make sense of Charlie's behaviour. For example, reference could be made to biochemical imbalance within his brain or to genetic inheritance.
2 marks: One explanation from the medical model identified, and briefly explained in the context of Charlie's behaviour.	
1 mark: One explanation from the medical model identified, but NEITHER explained in the context of Charlie's behaviour NOR with the historical view developed/elaborated.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q4: Describe two ways in which the key study by Watson and Raynor (1920) could have been improved. (6 marks) [3+3]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each suggestion:	Improvements could relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Validity ▪ Reliability ▪ Ethics ▪ Generalisability ▪ Etc.
3 marks: An appropriate suggested improvement is identified and explained in detail in relation to the Watson and Raynor study.	
2 marks: An appropriate suggested improvement is identified and briefly explained in relation to the Watson and Raynor study.	
1 mark: An appropriate suggested improvement is identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Customer Testing

Q5: Discuss the psychology as a science debate in relation to the topic of alternatives to the medical model. (12 marks)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. ▪ Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>In discussing the psychology as a science debate in relation to the topic of alternatives to the medical model, candidates can be expected to explore ways in which the topic may show evidence of being scientific and also of not being scientific.</p> <p>Relevant points could centre on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The possibility of establishing causal links (e.g., classical conditioning) ▪ Psychodynamic explanations that are hard to falsify; reliance on self-report (e.g., for cognitions) ▪ The extent to which there is empirical evidence to support the explanations ▪ The nature of the research that might lend support to them (e.g. case studies, as opposed to controlled experiments).
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. ▪ Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. ▪ The information presented may be partially accurate. ▪ There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. ▪ The information presented may contain inaccuracies. ▪ There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ Only one side of the argument will be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No creditworthy response. 	0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No creditworthy response. 	

Section B: Criminal psychology

Q6: Layla is the governor of a prison. She is concerned that too many of the inmates released from her prison go on to reoffend. Explain how restorative justice could be used in Layla’s prison to reduce reoffending by inmates released from her prison. **(6 marks) [4+2]**

Marking Criteria	Guidance
5-6 marks: Suggested strategy is clearly explained in detail showing good knowledge and understanding. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question.	Answers can be expected to show understanding of what restorative justice involves, who would be involved in it, how it would be conducted, etc. This should be applied to the scenario in the question (i.e. to how restorative justice could operate within a custodial context).
3-4 marks: Suggested strategy is explained with some detail, showing reasonable knowledge and understanding. The answer is mainly related to the context of the question.	
1-2 marks: Suggested strategy is explained with little detail showing limited knowledge and understanding. The answer may not be related to the context of the question.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q7: Explain one similarity and one difference between the use of imprisonment and non-custodial punishment as responses to criminal behaviour. **(6 marks) [3+3]**

Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each point:	<u>Relevant points of comparison could focus on:</u>
1 mark: Relevant similarity or difference identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The range of crimes they can be used with ▪ Success at reducing reoffending ▪ Financial cost of the response ▪ Public perception of them ▪ Impact on the offender’s family ▪ They both impact you liberty
1 mark: Relevant supporting detail/example in relation to imprisonment.	
1 mark: Relevant supporting detail/example in relation to non-custodial punishment.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q8: Explain two ways in which the key research by Raine et al (1997) can be related to the freewill-determinism debate. (6 marks) [3+3]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each point:	<u>Relevant points of comparison could include:</u>
1 mark: Understanding of the freewill-determinism debate shown.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests determinism through the idea of levels of activity in different regions of the brain (e.g. the amygdala) causing changes in behaviour. ▪ Suggests determinism through the highly controlled way the study was designed and how this helped to isolate differences in brain activity among the NGRI group. ▪ Suggests determinism through the comparison to a semi-matched control group. ▪ Challenges determinism because Raine himself stresses that the findings cannot be taken to show that violence is caused by biology alone. ▪ Challenges determinism because regions of the brain don't operate in isolation from other regions of the brain or from wider social or environmental considerations.
1 mark: Relevant detail from the Raine et al. study given.	
1 mark: Link between the Raine et al. study and the freewill-determinism debate clearly explained.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Customer Review

Q9: Discuss the validity of research into in the courtroom. (12 marks)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. The information presented is accurate. There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>In discussing the validity of research into in the courtroom, candidates can be expected to explore ways in which such research may lack validity as well as ways in which it may be valid.</p> <p><u>Relevant points could centre on:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological validity. Population validity. Control of extraneous variables. Use of self-report to collect data. Experimental designs (and order effects, demand characteristics, etc.) The impact of ethical considerations.
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. The information presented is accurate. There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. The information presented may be partially accurate. There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. The information presented may contain inaccuracies. There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. Only one side of the argument will be discussed. Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No creditworthy response. 	0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No creditworthy response. 	

Section C: Child psychology

Q10a: Alex has been studying child psychology and needs to conduct a piece of research for her final project. They have decided to investigate the topic of attachment. Using your knowledge of research into attachment, explain how Alex could investigate the development of attachment in babies. (8 marks)		
Level	Marking Criteria	Guidance
Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The designed investigation demonstrates excellent knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. ▪ The investigation is clearly explained in detail in the context of the given scenario throughout. ▪ The study should be explicitly conducted within ethical guidelines. 	<p>Candidates are expected to design a piece of empirical research.</p> <p>Reference can be expected to be made to the research method, sampling method, etc.</p> <p>Depending on the research method chosen (e.g., experiment, correlation, self-report, or observation), details that are appropriate to that method can be expected to be outlined, such as IV, DV, controls, type(s) of observation, etc.</p> <p>Whichever method is chosen, it should be relevant to the topic of development of attachment and outlined in this context.</p>
Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The designed investigation demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. ▪ The investigation is explained with reasonable detail in the context of the given scenario throughout. ▪ The study should be explicitly conducted within ethical guidelines. 	
Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The designed investigation demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. ▪ The investigation is explained with limited detail and may not be in the context of the given scenario throughout. ▪ The study should be conducted within ethical guidelines (which may be implicit). 	
Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The designed investigation demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. ▪ The investigation is explained with minimal detail and may not be in the context of the given scenario throughout. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	

Q10b: Discuss sampling bias in research into the development of attachment. (12 marks)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. The information presented is accurate. There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>In discussing sampling bias in research into development of attachment, candidates can be expected to explore ways in which sampling bias may be a problem as well as ways in which it may not be a problem.</p> <p>Relevant points could centre on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different aspects of samples, such as their socio-economic status, age, gender, nationality, ethnicity, species, etc., Whether sampling methods have led to biased samples. Consideration could also be given to the impact of such research methods as longitudinal studies and whether participant attrition has resulted in biased samples
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. The information presented is accurate. There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. The information presented may be partially accurate. There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. The information presented may contain inaccuracies. There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. Only one side of the argument will be discussed. Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No creditworthy response. 	0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No creditworthy response. 	

Section C: Environmental psychology

Q11a: Jamal works for the local council and wants to encourage more people in the town to recycle. In order to do this, he needs to understand why recycling rates are low, so Jamal has given an environmental psychologist the task of conducting research into this. Using your knowledge of research into recycling behaviours, explain how a psychologist could investigate factors which influence the tendency of local residents to recycle. **(8 marks)**

Level	Marking Criteria	Guidance
Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The designed investigation demonstrates excellent knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. The investigation is clearly explained in detail in the context of the given scenario throughout. The study should be explicitly conducted within ethical guidelines. 	<p>Candidates are expected to design a piece of empirical research.</p> <p>Reference can be expected to be made to the research method, sampling method, etc.</p> <p>Depending on the research method chosen (e.g., experiment, correlation, self-report, or observation), details that are appropriate to that method can be expected to be outlined, such as IV, DV, controls, type(s) of observation, etc.</p> <p>Whichever method is chosen, it should be relevant to the topic of recycling and outlined in this context.</p>
Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The designed investigation demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. The investigation is explained with reasonable detail in the context of the given scenario throughout. The study should be explicitly conducted within ethical guidelines. 	
Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The designed investigation demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. The investigation is explained with limited detail and may not be in the context of the given scenario throughout. The study should be conducted within ethical guidelines (which may be implicit). 	
Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The designed investigation demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of research methods and the topic under investigation. The investigation is explained with minimal detail and may not be in the context of the given scenario throughout. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	

Q11b: Discuss the individual-situational explanations debate in relation to the topic of recycling and other conservation behaviours. (12 marks)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. ▪ Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>In discussing the individual-situational explanations debate in relation to the topic of recycling and other conservation behaviours, candidates can be expected to explore evidence of both situational and individual explanations.</p> <p>Support for situational explanations could come from the impact of prompts, feedback, bottle deposit schemes, apparent social norms, etc., while individual explanations could centre on knowledge deficits, attitudes, values, feelings of self-efficacy, etc.</p> <p>Answers can be broadened out from recycling to other conservation behaviours. Any relevant piece of research can be used to support the points being made.</p>
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. ▪ Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. ▪ The information presented may be partially accurate. ▪ There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. ▪ The information presented may contain inaccuracies. ▪ There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ Only one side of the argument will be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No creditworthy response. 	0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No creditworthy response. 	

Section C: Sport and exercise psychology

Q12a: Beth is the coach for her daughter's rugby team. It is halfway through the season and they have lost every match they've played. Some of the girls in the team are beginning to lose interest in the sport. Explain two strategies for motivating athletes that a psychologist might suggest to Beth. (8 marks) [4+4]		
Level	Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each suggestion:		
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that could be used to motivate athletes. ▪ There is excellent application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy – several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. ▪ The strategy is explicitly related to the context of the question. 	<p>Candidates are expected to explain two strategies for motivating athletes that a psychologist might suggest to Debbie.</p> <p>The suggested strategies should be grounded in psychological research.</p> <p>The strategies should be suggestions that a psychologist might actually make (so, for example, they should be within the ethical guidelines).</p> <p>Answers can be expected to centre on the use of imagery (especially MG-M imagery). Answers could also centre on ways of enhancing self-efficacy, self-confidence, competitiveness, or intrinsic motivation.</p> <p>It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p>
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that could be used to motivate athletes. ▪ There is good application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy - some details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. ▪ The strategy is explicitly related to the context of the question. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that could be used to motivate athletes. ▪ There is limited application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy. ▪ The strategy may not be explicitly related to the context of the question. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that could be used to motivate athletes. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	

Q12b: Discuss the reliability of research into motivation in sport. (12 marks)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. ▪ Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>In discussing the reliability of research into motivation in sport, candidates can be expected to explore ways in which such research may lack reliability as well as ways in which it may be reliable.</p> <p>Relevant points could centre on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The use of standardised questionnaires. ▪ The use of multiple items to measure the same variable. ▪ The use of large samples. ▪ Testing and retesting/whether findings are supported in follow-up studies, etc.
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. ▪ Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. ▪ The information presented may be partially accurate. ▪ There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. ▪ The information presented may contain inaccuracies. ▪ There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ Only one side of the argument will be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No creditworthy response. 	0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No creditworthy response. 	