Child Psychology Q's & Answers

1.

(a) Outline the key research by Gibson and Walk (1960) and use it to show the extent to which depth can be perceived by infants. **(10)**

Mark Scheme

(a)	*	**Outline the key research by Gibson and Walk (1960) and use it to show the extent to which depth can be perceived by infants.** **AO1 (5 marks)** Candidates must refer to the key study by Gibson and Walk. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively. A good (L4) response will typically include details of at least 3 of following features: - Why the study was done (e.g. background, aim or hypotheses) - Who was the study done on (e.g. details of sample) - How the study was done (e.g. research method used, method or procedure including materials) - What was found (e.g. the results or conclusions) A reasonable (L3) response will typically include 2-3 of the above features. A limited (L2) response will typically include 1-2 of the above features. A basic (L1) response will typically include 1 of the above features. **AO2 (5 marks)** Candidates should *apply* their knowledge and understanding of the study by Gibson and Walk to show what it tells us about the extent to which depth can be perceived by infants. Answers can be expected to refer to: • How preference for the shallow side of the visual cliff suggests an ability to perceive depth. • How all of the 27 human infants who moved were prepared to crawl over the shallow side but only 3 of them would crawl over the deep side. • How many of the infants crawled away from the mother when she called them to the cliff side, however they would also back up onto the deep side before setting off towards their mother across shallow side suggesting that some aspects of visual perception appear to precede the development of physical movement. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without using it to show the extent to which depth can be perceived by infants will only gain marks in the lower bands.	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1 **Annotations** Level to be annotated on the left hand side. √ Ticks for any feature (AO1). APP for what it tells us about how depth can be perceived by infants. **Key features of the study:** **AIM:** To investigate depth perception in infants and young animals and to support suggestion that both humans' and other species' depth perception is innate. **RM**: 36 infants aged from 6 to 14 months. Second part of the study involved behaviour of chicks, turtles, rats, lambs, kids, pigs, kittens and dogs. **SAMPLE**: Lab experiment with repeated measures design (IV – the cliff side or the shallow side; DV – whether or not child would crawl to his mother). Quasi element for animal species. **PROCEDURE:** The visual cliff consisted of a board laid across a large sheet of heavy glass which is supported approx. a foot above the floor. On one side of the board a sheet of patterned material is placed flush against the under-surface of the glass. On the other side a sheet of the same material is laid upon the floor; this side of the board thus becomes the visual cliff. Each child was placed on the centre board, and his mother called him from the cliff side and the shallow side successively. Similarly, chicks, and other animals were placed on the visual cliff apparatus and the subsequent behaviour was observed.

APPENDIX 1
Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (a) QUESTIONS
AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)
AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)

Level	Marks	Generic mark scheme (Part a)	Guidance
4	9 – 10	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the answer may contain detailed knowledge of the study (e.g., a number of accurate fine details) and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it (e.g. making a number of different, relevant application points, rather than just one application point). Alternatively, answers may 'go beyond' by bringing in additional supporting research (i.e., use more than just the key study to address the question) where the wording of the question permits this.
3	6 – 8	Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). The answer is essentially accurate. There is adequate description of the key study, and it is applied in the way that the question requires. Broadly speaking, the candidate is correct in what they are saying. However, their answer lacks the extension (detailed knowledge of the study and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it) that typifies answers in the top band.
2	3 – 5	Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, description of the study may lack the detail (or accuracy) that can be expected of a standard response; the key study may be described but not actually applied in the way that the question requires; the examiner may not be convinced of the candidate's understanding.
1	1 – 2	Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but essentially are wrong/flawed in what is being said.
0		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

(b) Discuss the reliability of research into perceptual development. **(15)**

Mark Scheme

(b)	*	**Discuss the reliability of research into perceptual development.** **AO1 (2 marks)** Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the reliability. **AO3 (13 marks)** Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate research into perceptual development in relation to the reliability. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research investigating perceptual development in children and how this can be studied in babies and animals. Any relevant research is creditworthy. Answers may refer to: • Reliability in terms of objective standardised procedures, or the subjective nature of observations of particularly non-human participants. • Replication as a means to assess reliability. • Sample size (which must be considered in light of the ability to deal with anomalous data, rather than just a point which could easily be related to validity.) • The reliability of extrapolating from non-human behaviour. Points about reliability need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated. Other appropriate responses should be credited.	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2 **Annotations** Level to be annotated on the left hand side. **NB.** Blakemore and Cooper's study is creditworthy. Answers need to be focused on the research.

APPENDIX 2
Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (b) QUESTIONS
AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (2 marks)
AO3: Analyse, interpret and evaluate scientific information, ideas and evidence (13 marks)

Level	Marks	Generic mark scheme (part b)	Guidance
4	12–15	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates many points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the candidate may present intellectually surprising arguments, their arguments may centre on well-informed comparisons of evidence, or they may explore (quantitatively) more arguments than a 'standard' response will.
3	8–11	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a reasonable number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Reasonable use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent, and understanding is reasonable. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 9-10 marks). Answers in this band are evaluative rather than descriptive, and points made are backed up with relevant supporting evidence. If one evaluative point is explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 8 marks. If two evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 9-10 marks. If three evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 10-11 marks.
2	4–7	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a limited number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation which are limited in range. Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. Demonstrates some understanding. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, they may be essentially descriptive (rather than evaluative); the examiner may not be convinced that the answer is discussing the relevant concept (e.g., in a question about validity, the candidate's answer may seem to be more about reliability); the response may raise appropriate evaluative points but these may lack relevant supporting evidence.
1	1–3	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a few basic points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues and arguments show little understanding. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., in a question about discussion of ethical considerations, ethical guidelines are named but they are not then related to the topic in the question).
0		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

(c) Nina is the manager of a pre-school playgroup for children aged 2–5 years. She is concerned that young children have too much 'screen time' (i.e. playing on electronic devices) so wants to use play to aid their development.

Outline at least one play strategy a psychologist might suggest to Nina to use with the children at her playgroup to help develop their perception. **(10)**

Mark Scheme

(c)	*	**Outline at least one play strategy a psychologist might suggest to Nina to use with the children at her playgroup to help develop their perception.** **AO2 (10 marks)** Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one play strategy to develop perception in young children. Suggestions may refer to: • Application of sensory integration therapy, developing visual form constancy (e.g. through use of shape sorters or structured block play) or auditory perceptual constancy (e.g. through listening to music), etc. • Social learning theory, classical conditioning or operant conditioning (positive and/or negative reinforcement) could be applied. Answers could focus in depth on one suggestion or refer to a range of suggestions. It is important that suggestions are **related to the context of the question** and are suggestions that a psychologist might potentially make (so should therefore be within ethical and legal guidelines). Other appropriate responses should be credited.	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3 **Annotations** Level to be annotated on the left hand side.

APPENDIX 3
GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION B PART (c) QUESTIONS

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (10 marks)

Level	Marks	Generic Mark Scheme (part c)	Guidance
4	9–10	Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. This might be because the advice comprises a range of different suggestions (e.g., three or more explained in context and with appropriate psychological rationale for them, e.g. names psychological research, concepts or theories or explicit appropriate psychological terminology). Alternatively, if taking a 'depth' approach, the answer would contain one application and rationale explained in detail, beyond that seen in standard, accurate responses.
3	6–8	Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). Advice put forward by the candidate will be related to the scenario in the question and there will be explicit and appropriate psychological rationale for the advice (e.g., named psychological research, concepts or theories or appropriate psychological terminology). It is clear what is being suggested (i.e., it is specific) and why it is being suggested. Candidates can take either a 'breadth' or 'depth' approach (e.g., the advice may comprise two or possibly even three suggestions, but it could equally well centre on one suggestion explained in detail).
2	3–5	Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may relate to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be in this band for a number of reasons. For example, the advice offered may not be related to the scenario in the question (i.e., it may be generic) or it may lack appropriate psychological rationale. It is unclear what is being suggested (i.e., what the precise advice is) or why it is being suggested.
1	1–2	Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: Responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., advice is offered but it is generic and has no psychological rationale behind it).
0		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

2.

(a) Outline the key research by Barkley-Levenson and Galván (2014) and explain what it tells us about brain development. (**10**)

Mark Scheme

(a)	*	**Outline the key research by Barkley-Levenson and Galvan (2014) and explain what it tells us about brain development.** **AO1 (5 marks)** Candidates must refer to the key study by Barkley-Levenson and Galvan (2014). Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively. A good/Level 4 response will typically include details of at least 3 of following features: - Why the study was done (e.g. background or aim or hypotheses) - Who was the study done on (e.g. details of sample) - How the study was done (e.g. identification of the research method used; methodological details/ procedure) - What was found (e.g. the results or conclusions) A reasonable/Level 3 response will typically include 2-3 of the above features. A limited/Level 2 response will typically include 1-2 of the above features. A basic/Level 1 response will typically include 1 of the above features. **AO2 (5 marks)** Candidates should apply their knowledge and understanding of the study by Barkley-Levenson and Galvan to explain what it tells us about brain development. Answers can be expected to refer to: • How the researchers were able to see increased or decreased levels of activity in different brain regions when taking part in the gambling task • Note that the ventral striatum was where they saw relatively increased levels of activity in the left ventral striatum of the adolescents as expected value increased. • Explain how this may reflect neural support for necessary risk-taking behaviour among adolescents who are moving from dependence on caregivers to independence. For answers to be placed in the top (9-10) band, they can be expected to go beyond this, such as by explaining the significance of the ventral striatum in particular (e.g. in relation to its role in emotional responses, especially the experiencing of pleasure) or by referring accurately to findings in relation to another region of the brain beyond the ventral striatum. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without explaining what it tells us about brain development will only gain marks in the lower bands.	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1
Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (a) QUESTIONS
AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)
AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)

Level	Marks	Generic mark scheme (Part a)	Guidance
4	9 – 10	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the answer may contain detailed knowledge of the study (e.g., a number of accurate fine details) and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it (e.g. making a number of different, relevant application points, rather than just one application point). Alternatively, answers may 'go beyond' by bringing in additional supporting research (i.e., use more than just the key study to address the question) where the wording of the question permits this.
3	6 – 8	Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). The answer is essentially accurate. There is adequate description of the key study, and it is applied in the way that the question requires. Broadly speaking, the candidate is correct in what they are saying. However, their answer lacks the extension (detailed knowledge of the study and/or detailed understanding of how to apply it) that typifies answers in the top band.
2	3 – 5	Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, description of the study may lack the detail (or accuracy) that can be expected of a standard response; the key study may be described but not actually applied in the way that the question requires; the examiner may not be convinced of the candidate's understanding.
1	1 – 2	Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but essentially are wrong/flawed in what is being said.
0		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

(b) Discuss whether research into pre-adult brain development is scientific. **(15)**

Mark Scheme

(b)	*	**Discuss whether research into pre-adult brain development is scientific.** **AO1 (2 marks)** Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of psychology as a science. **AO3 (13 marks)** Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate research into pre-adult brain development in relation to psychology as a science. As well as referring to the key research, candidates can refer to research investigating brain development and the impact of this on risk-taking behaviour. Any relevant research is creditworthy. Candidates may refer to such features of science as: • Replicability • Objectivity • Falsifiability • The use of controlled experiments • Manipulation of variables • Collection of quantitative data • Cause and effect • Standardised • Hypothesis testing They may also argue that a study being biological is scientific (on the grounds that Biology is a science) Candidates may make claims about whether research within the topic area can be regarded as scientific. Points about psychology as a science need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated. Other appropriate responses should be credited.	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 2
Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (b) QUESTIONS
AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (2 marks)
AO3: Analyse, interpret and evaluate scientific information, ideas and evidence (13 marks)

Level	Marks	Generic mark scheme (part b)	Guidance
4	12–15	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates many points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. For example, the candidate may present intellectually surprising arguments, their arguments may centre on well-informed comparisons of evidence, or they may explore (quantitatively) more arguments than a 'standard' response will.
3	8–11	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a reasonable number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Reasonable use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent, and understanding is reasonable. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 9-10 marks). Answers in this band are evaluative rather than descriptive, and points made are backed up with relevant supporting evidence. If one evaluative point is explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 8 marks. If two evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 9-10 marks. If three evaluative points are explored (with relevant supporting evidence) then it is likely to be awarded 10-11 marks.
2	4–7	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a limited number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation which are limited in range. Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. Demonstrates some understanding. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be limited for a number of reasons. For example, they may be essentially descriptive (rather than evaluative); the examiner may not be convinced that the answer is discussing the relevant concept (e.g., in a question about validity, the candidate's answer may seem to be more about reliability); the response may raise appropriate evaluative points but these may lack relevant supporting evidence.
1	1–3	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding. Response demonstrates a few basic points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues and arguments show little understanding. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., in a question about discussion of ethical considerations, ethical guidelines are named but they are not then related to the topic in the question).
0		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.

(c) Emma is Head of Sixth Form in a secondary school. She is worried about risk-taking behaviour among sixth form students at the school.

Outline at least one suggestion a psychologist, using their knowledge of brain development, might make to Emma about how to reduce risk-taking behaviours among students in the sixth form at her school. **(10)**

Mark Scheme

(c)	*	**Outline at least one suggestion a psychologist, using their knowledge of brain development, might make to Emma about how to reduce risk-taking behaviours among students in the sixth form at her school.** **AO2 (10 marks)** Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of at least one strategy using knowledge of brain development to reduce risk-taking behaviours. Suggestions may refer to: • Application of operant conditioning (e.g., reinforcing non-risk-taking behaviour; punishing risk-taking behaviour) • Social learning theory (e.g., getting parents to model non-risk-taking behaviour in front of their children) • Dietary interventions (e.g., selling foods in the school canteen that are high in omega-3) • Application of the principles behind Graduated Driving Licence schemes so that students gain more freedoms in stages (e.g. parents could be advised to apply these in relation to their child learning to drive) • Making situational changes (e.g., lobbying for zebra crossings near the school) Answers could focus in depth on one suggestion or refer to a range of suggestions. It is important that suggestions are **related to the context of the question** and are suggestions that a psychologist might potentially make (so should therefore be within ethical and legal guidelines). Other appropriate responses should be credited.	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 3
GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION B PART (c) QUESTIONS

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (10 marks)

Level	Marks	Generic Mark Scheme (part c)	Guidance
4	9–10	Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.	Answers in this band go beyond what might be expected of a standard, accurate response. This might be because the advice comprises a range of different suggestions (e.g., three or more explained in context and with appropriate psychological rationale for them, e.g. names psychological research, concepts or theories or explicit appropriate psychological terminology). Alternatively, if taking a 'depth' approach, the answer would contain one application and rationale explained in detail, beyond that seen in standard, accurate responses.
3	6–8	Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	A standard, accurate response will sit in the middle of this band (i.e., be awarded 7 marks). Advice put forward by the candidate will be related to the scenario in the question and there will be explicit and appropriate psychological rationale for the advice (e.g., named psychological research, concepts or theories or appropriate psychological terminology). It is clear what is being suggested (i.e., it is specific) and why it is being suggested. Candidates can take either a 'breadth' or 'depth' approach (e.g., the advice may comprise two or possibly even three suggestions, but it could equally well centre on one suggestion explained in detail).
2	3–5	Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may relate to the general topic area rather than the specific question. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Answers can be in this band for a number of reasons. For example, the advice offered may not be related to the scenario in the question (i.e., it may be generic) or it may lack appropriate psychological rationale. It is unclear what is being suggested (i.e., what the precise advice is) or why it is being suggested.
1	1–2	Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: Responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	Answers in this band contain some creditworthy material but it is not used effectively (e.g., advice is offered but it is generic and has no psychological rationale behind it).
0		No creditworthy response.	Answers in this band contain no creditworthy material.