



GCE

Psychology

H167/02: Psychological themes through core studies

AS Level

Mark Scheme for June 2025

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2025

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING RM Assessor

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor Online Training: OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are available in RM Assessor
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the scoris 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the scoris messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. There is a NR (**No Response**) option. Award NR (No Response):
 - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
 - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
 - OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The scoris **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.** If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the scoris messaging system, or e-mail.

9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.
10. For answers marked by levels of response: Not applicable in F501
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
 - To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct
	Development/explanation/elaboration of point
	Incorrect
	Unclear
	Something contradictory
	Missing information
	Context
	Application to the source/article
	Good use of research
	Evaluation
	Not answering question
	Benefit of doubt given
	Irrelevant
	Seen (to show content on a page has been noted, but not credited)
	Highlighter tool

Section A – Core Studies

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	(i)	From Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression: Identify <u>two</u> features of the sample used. <u>Likely answers:</u> • 72 (1) children (1). • Children (1) aged 37 to 69 months (1). • Children (1) with mean age of 52 months (1). • Children (1) from Stanford University Nursery School (1). • Boys and girls (1) from Stanford University Nursery School (1). • 72 (1) boys and girls (1). • American (1) children (1). • Other appropriate features should be credited.	2	2 marks – For two accurate features of the sample, e.g., children (1) aged 37-69 months (1) 1 mark – For one accurate feature of the sample, e.g., children (1). 0 marks – No creditworthy information. N.B. If more than two features are identified, credit the first two features only if they are the same first line. If the second is not creditworthy then mark the first feature on line starting 2.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	(ii)	From Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression: Suggest <u>one</u> way the sample used in this study may be considered biased. <u>Likely answers:</u> - All participants were drawn from the same location (1) so findings cannot be generalised to other areas of the USA of the world (1). - All participants were (young) children (1) so findings are not representative of adults (1). - All participants were aged between 37-69 months (1) therefore findings cannot be generalised to children/people/individuals of other ages (1). - Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.	2	2 marks – For a clear explanation of one way the sample may be considered biased. There should be both: - an identification of how the sample was biased. - implications of the identified bias. 1 mark – For a vague, partial or uncontextualised, answer, e.g. all participants came from the same nursery school (identification of an appropriate bias with no implication suggested), the sample was not representative so findings cannot be generalised (uncontextualised). 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(b)		Identify the experimental method <u>and</u> design used in Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaller study. Experimental method: Field (experiment) (1). Design: Repeated measures (design) (1).	2 [1+1]	2 marks – For the correct identification of both: - the method, i.e. field (experiment) - the design, i.e. repeated measures. 1 mark – For the correct identification of either the method or the design. 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)		Explain why Casey et al.'s (2011) study into neural correlates of delay of gratification is considered a quasi experiment. <u>Most likely answers:</u> - This study is considered a quasi experiment because the independent variable did not have to be manipulated (1) as the participants were either a high or low delayer (1). - Whether the participant was a low delayer or a high delayer (1) was naturally occurring and could not be manipulated by the researchers (1). - Other appropriate explanations should be credited.	2	2 marks – For a clear answer that refers to: - the fact that the IV does not have to be manipulated/is naturally occurring. - contextualised to Casey et al.'s study. 1 mark – For a vague or partial answer, e.g. one that only refers to the fact that the IV does not have to be manipulated (uncontextualised). 0 marks - No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(b)		Suggest why the method used in Casey et al.'s (2011) study can be considered reliable. <u>Likely answers:</u> - The study was a laboratory experiment which involves high levels of control, making the procedure replicable (1). Casey et al. used an fMRI scanner, an extremely reliable and standardised piece of technical equipment (1). It is therefore highly likely that findings will be objective. (1). - The study was a laboratory experiment which involves allowing for high levels of consistency (1). The 'hot' and 'cool' impulse control task was completed in the same way (1). It is therefore highly likely that if the experiment were repeated using the same task similar results would be gained (1). - Other appropriate answers should be credited.	3	3 marks – For a clear and accurate response that: - shows an understanding of reliability. - supports this with appropriate evidence from Casey et al.'s study. - considers the implications of using a reliable method (to check consistency of results). 2 marks - For showing an understanding of reliability supported by appropriate evidence from Casey et al.'s study, i.e. no implications of using a reliable method are considered. 1 mark – For a vague or partial answer, e.g. a mere explanation of reliability not linked to Casey et al.'s study, i.e. no contextualisation; appropriate evidence from Casey et al.'s study without an obvious understanding of the term reliability. 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(a)		Outline <u>one</u> of the control tasks used in Baron-Cohen et al.'s (1997) study into autism in adults. <u>Likely answers:</u> - Gender Recognition Task (1) which involved identifying the gender of the eyes used in the Eyes Task (1). One task involved using standardised photographs of eyes but rather than asking participants to identify the emotions being expressed (1) they had to identify the gender of the person instead (1). - Basic Emotion Recognition Task (1) which involved judging photographs of whole faces displaying basic emotions (1). - Participants were presented with six full faces (1) and had to decide which emotion was being expressed from a choice of six (1).	2	2 marks – One of the control tasks has been identified and briefly outlined or has been well outlined. 1 mark – One control task has merely been identified or briefly outlined 0 marks – No or incorrect response, e.g. the Eyes Task, the Strange Stories Task.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(b)		Explain how Freud's (1909) study of Little Hans relates to the key theme of 'understanding disorders'. <u>Likely answers:</u> - Understanding disorders is about recognising some individuals will display behaviours that are not considered abnormal or atypical (1). The psychodynamic perspective suggests these behaviours can be understood in terms of unconscious conflicts (1). For example, Freud concluded Hans's phobia of horses was the result of unconscious conflict known as the Oedipus complex (1). Psychologists attempt to understand disorders so that people with mental health problems can be helped (1). Freud believed that mental health problems could be explained in terms of conflicts relating to psychosexual development (1). So Freud suggested that Hans needed to resolve the conflict between his unconscious sexual feelings for his mother and his fear of his father castrating him to get rid of his phobia (1). - Other appropriate explanations should be credited.	3	3 marks – A clear answer which: - shows understanding of the key theme of 'understanding disorders'. - shows understanding of how the psychodynamic perspective explains disorders. - shows understanding of how the Little Hans study relates to the psychodynamic explanation. 2 marks – For an answer which address at least two of the above points. 1 mark – For a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points e.g. for a partial answer that is not contextualised to Freud's study. 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(a)		Outline how the term ‘ethnocentrism’ could relate to Milgram’s (1963) study into obedience. <u>Likely answers:</u> - Ethnocentrism refers to the use of an individual’s <u>own cultural group as a basis for judgements</u> (1) about other cultures. Milgram’s sample was drawn from the New Haven area of America, so it is ethnocentric to assume that the levels of obedience shown by American participants would reflect the levels of obedience seen among people in other cultures. (1) Ethnocentrism is a tendency to only view behaviours from the perspective of your own culture or country (1). When Milgram found that American citizens were likely to obey orders to harm and potentially kill another human being, he assumed that this could be applied to other nationalities without having tested this (1). - Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.	2	2 marks – For a clear response that: - shows an understanding of ethnocentrism. - shows how Milgram’s study may be ethnocentric. 1 mark – For: EITHER - a mere description of the term ‘ethnocentrism’, i.e. no contextualisation OR - a mere example of how Milgram’s study may be considered ethnocentric without showing any real understanding of the term. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer. N.B. The idea that ethnocentrism is when one culture perceives themselves as being superior to other cultures can be credited. This may be linked to Milgram by suggesting that he was challenging ethnocentrism by trying to demonstrate that the idea of highly obedient Germanic personality was a myth.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(b)	Describe <u>one</u> similarity between Milgram's (1963) study into obedience and Bocchiaro et al.'s (2012) study into disobedience and whistle-blowing. <u>Likely answers:</u> - The studies were both conducted in a laboratory setting. (1) Milgram's study was conducted in a laboratory at Yale University (America) (1) and Bocchiaro et al.'s study was conducted in a laboratory at the VU University, Amsterdam/Holland/The Netherlands. (1) - Both studies recruited participants using the self-selected sampling method (1). Milgram's obtained his participants through a newspaper advertisement (1) and Bocchiaro et al. obtained their sample through flyers posted in the university canteen (1). - Both studies used a standardised procedure (1). In Milgram's study, participants were always the teacher and saw the learner strapped into a chair, had to conduct the same word test and use the same electric shock machine (1). In Bocchiaro et al.'s study, participants were always presented with the same cover story on sensory deprivation and asked to compose the statement to convince other students to take part (1). - Both studies were conducted in prestigious places of learning (1). Milgram conducted his study at Yale University (1) and Bocchiaro et al. conducted their study at the VU University (1). - Other appropriate similarities should be credited.	3	3 marks – For a description that: - clearly identifies a similarity between the two studies. - supports this similarity with evidence from Milgram's study. - supports this similarity with evidence from Bocchiaro et al.'s study. 2 marks – For a description that: - clearly identifies a similarity between the two studies. - supports this similarity with evidence from only one of the named studies. 1 mark – For a vague, partial or uncontextualised, answer, e.g. both studies were conducted in a laboratory setting/controlled environment. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
5			Describe the procedure used in Grant et al.'s study into context dependent memory. <u>Answers likely to refer to:</u> • Instructions, describing the experiment as a class project and stating that participation was voluntary, were read aloud. • Participants were asked to read the given article once, as if they were reading it for a class assignment. They were allowed to highlight and underline as they read. • Participants were informed that their comprehension would be tested with both a short-answer test and a multiple-choice test. • All participants wore headphones while they read. Those in the silent condition were told they would not hear anything over the headphones whilst those in the noisy condition were told they would hear moderately loud background noise, but that they should ignore it. • Reading times were recorded by the experimenters. • A break of approximately two minutes between the end of the study phase and the beginning of the test phase was incorporated to minimise recall from short-term memory. • The short-answer test was given, followed by the multiple-choice test. • Participants were tested in either silent or noisy conditions and were informed of the condition before testing. • Regardless of testing condition, all participants wore headphones. • At the end of the testing phase participants were debriefed concerning the purpose of the experiment. • The entire procedure lasted about 30 minutes.	4	4 marks – For a very good response that refers to: At least four relevant details. A full mark answer must include the idea that participants are learning in one context and then some are tested in the same context while others are tested in a different context. 3 marks – For a good response that refers to at least three relevant details. 2 marks – For a basic response that refers to at least two relevant details. 1 mark – For an extremely weak response that refers to at least one relevant detail. 0 marks – No creditworthy information. N.B. Award marks according to the quality of the response. For example, if the candidate has provided four relevant details but the response does not read well/is poorly constructed, only award 3 marks.

Section B – Areas, perspectives and debates

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(a)	Describe <u>one</u> strength of using the cognitive area to explain behaviour. Support your answer with evidence from any of the core studies placed in the cognitive area. <u>Likely strengths:</u> • Often employs a scientific method. • Studies can have practical applications. • Allows the collection of quantitative data which can be used to compare different groups or individuals. • Can be reductionist allowing researchers to concentrate on one variable to study its effect on behaviour. • Allows studies to be well controlled leading to high internal validity. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited.	3	3 marks – For a clear description that: • identifies a strength. • explains the strength. • supports the strength with appropriate evidence from any of the cognitive area core studies. 2 marks – For a reasonable description that identifies a strength and supports this with appropriate evidence from any one of the cognitive area core studies or identifies and explains a strength but does not support it with appropriate evidence. 1 mark – For a vague or partial answer, e.g. the mere identification of an appropriate strength with no supporting evidence, i.e. uncontextualised to any of the cognitive area core studies. 0 marks – No creditworthy information. N.B. Studies are likely to be: Loftus and Palmer (1974) or Grant et al. (1998). Studies could be Moray (1959) or Simons and Chabris (1999)

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(b)	Describe <u>one</u> weakness of using the cognitive area to explain behaviour. Support your answer with evidence from any of the core studies placed in the cognitive area. <u>Likely weaknesses:</u> • Studies can lack ecological validity/mundane realism. • Focuses on mental processes and ignores other influences on behaviour such as emotions and perceptions. • Too reductionist as simplifies the complexities of mental processes. • Use of laboratory experiments increases the chances that participants may respond to demand characteristics so it may not produce valid findings. • Offers mechanistic explanations for behaviour because human thinking is represented by the behaviour of a machine. This may not represent what happens in real life situations. • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.	3	3 marks – For a clear description that: • identifies a weakness. • explains the weakness. • supports the weakness with appropriate evidence from any of the cognitive area core studies. 2 marks – For a reasonable description that identifies a weakness and supports this with appropriate evidence from any of the cognitive area core studies or identifies and explains a weakness but does not support it with appropriate evidence 1 mark – For a vague or partial answer, e.g. the mere identification of an appropriate weakness with no supporting evidence, i.e. uncontextualised to any of the cognitive area core studies. 0 marks – No creditworthy information. N.B. Studies are likely to be: Loftus and Palmer (1974) or Grant et al. (1998). Studies could be Moray (1959) or Simons and Chabris (1999)

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(c)	Explain how Loftus and Palmer's (1974) study on eyewitness testimony links to the cognitive area of psychology. Support your answer with evidence from Loftus and Palmer's (1974) <u>second</u> experiment into eyewitness testimony. <u>Likely answers:</u> - The cognitive area states the mind is like a computer (input, process, output), therefore output in the form of behaviour is influenced by the way information is processed (1). Loftus & Palmer wanted to show that eyewitness testimonies (the output) is influenced by the process of reconstructing memories (1). They found that participants reconstructed a memory of broken glass when one did not exist in the film clip they had viewed (1). - The cognitive area makes inferences about internal mental processes (1). Loftus & Palmer made inferences about how memory was working when studying the reliability of eyewitness testimonies (1). They concluded that memory is a reconstructive process on the basis that some of their participants recalled seeing broken glass that had not existed in the film of an automobile accident (1). - The cognitive area uses experimental methods to attempt to measure mental processes (1). Loftus & Palmer used a laboratory experiment to measure the extent the participant's memories could be influenced by leading questions (1). They found that 16/50 participants recalled seeing broken glass after an accident (when there had been none) if they had been exposed to a leading question. This was compared to 6/50 in the control group (1).	3	3 marks – The response demonstrates a clear and accurate explanation of why Loftus and Palmer's study links to the cognitive area by: - outlining a principle of the cognitive area. - explaining how Loftus and Palmer's study broadly relates to this principle - supporting with evidence from Loftus and Palmer's second experiment. 2 marks – An answer which address at least two of the above points. 1 mark – A partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points or is an uncontextualised answer. 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(d)	Describe <u>one</u> way the cognitive area is similar to the behaviourist perspective. Support your answer with evidence from core studies or other appropriate evidence. <u>Likely answers:</u> - Both areas offer the opportunity to conduct research using experiments. - Both areas allow research to be conducted in controlled environments. - Both areas allow researchers to establish cause and effect between variables. - Both areas offer the opportunity to collect objective, quantitative data. - Both areas can be reductionist. - Both areas can raise ethical concerns. - Research in both areas can lack ecological validity. - Other similarities should be credited. <u>Appropriate evidence:</u> - Cognitive studies referred to are likely to be: Loftus and Palmer (1974), Grant et al. (1998). - Behaviourist studies referred to are likely to be Bandura et al. (1961), Chaney et al. (2004). - Other studies may be cited but these should be justified as being clearly linked to the cognitive area and the behaviourist perspective.	4	4 marks – For a good and well-developed answer that: - identifies an appropriate similarity. - explains the similarity. - supports the similarity with appropriate evidence from a cognitive area core study. - supports the similarity with evidence from a core study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective. 3 marks – For a good answer that: - identifies an appropriate similarity. - supports the similarity with appropriate evidence from a cognitive area core study. - supports the similarity with evidence from a core study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective. or - identifies an appropriate similarity. - explains the similarity. - supports the similarity with appropriate evidence from a cognitive area core study or from a core study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective. 2 marks – For a reasonable answer that: - identifies an appropriate similarity. - supports the similarity with appropriate evidence from either a cognitive area core study or a core study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective.

					1 mark – For a basic answer that merely identifies an appropriate similarity which is not supported by any evidence, i.e. is uncontextualised. 0 marks – No creditworthy information.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(e)	Evaluate the situational position in the individual/situational debate in psychology. Support your answer with evidence from core studies that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective. <u>Answers should show an understanding of the individual/situational debate:</u> - Individual explanations for behaviour sees the personal characteristics/traits/personality/disposition of an individual to be the main cause of their behaviour, and behaviour is therefore constant regardless of the situation. - Situational explanations for behaviour sees the surrounding environment, including other people in that environment as being the main cause of their behaviour, therefore behaviour can be dependent on the situations they find themselves in. <u>Likely strengths of the situational side of the debate include:</u> - As behaviour is seen to be the results of environmental influences, e.g. upbringing, poverty, others in the surrounding environment; it can be suggested that behaviour is predictable so cause and effect can be established, e.g. Bandura et al. (the models in the surrounding environment who were seen by the children bashing the bobo doll were the cause of the children's subsequent aggression).	12	10-12 marks – Good: for a thorough and balanced discussion that is relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range (at least 3) points are considered and are well developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues very well. Relevant evidence is used to good effect to support the points being made. There is consistent use of psychological terminology, and well-developed line of reasoning which is logically structured. Information presented is appropriate and substantiated. 7-9 marks – Reasonable: for a reasonably balanced discussion that is mainly relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented with reasonably clear understanding of the points raised. A range of points are considered and some are developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues well. Relevant evidence is used mostly to good effect to support the points being made. There is good use of psychological terminology in a response with reasonable structure. Information presented is largely appropriate. 4-6 marks - Limited: for a limited discussion that is has some relevancy to the demands of the question.

		- Research that takes a situational approach for explaining behaviour is <u>usually very scientific</u> and often uses controlled experimental methods to establish cause and effect. This increases the validity of any research, e.g. Bandura et al. conducted a laboratory experiment in a highly controlled environment. Three different rooms were used and each time they were organised in an identical way for each participant/ the models in each condition followed the same procedure for each child. - As behaviour is seen to be the results of environmental influences, e.g. the way a child is brought up, role models, rewards or punishments; <u>behaviour can be changed by improving or altering an individual's environment</u>, reinforcing or rewarding desirable behaviour/punishing undesirable behaviour. A situational explanation for behaviour therefore has practical applications, e.g. Chaney et al. (the rewards gained through the use of the Funhaler – improved health – can be adapted and applied to other medical conditions). - Other appropriate strengths should be credited. <u>Likely weaknesses of the situational side of the debate include:</u> - Considering behaviour to be due to environmental influences is <u>reductionist</u> as other factors may influence behaviour, e.g. Bandura et al. (natural levels of aggression) - Studying behaviour from a situational point of view tends to <u>rely on observations</u> which can lead to observer bias, observer influence, etc. leading to invalid/unreliable findings, e.g. Chaney et al. (the parents being biased in relation to observing and recording the use of the Funhaler). - Research that takes the situational side of the debate can be influenced by <u>demand characteristics</u> and therefore individuals may not display genuine behaviour, e.g. Bandura et al. (children may have realised they were expected to bash the bobo doll and therefore behaved accordingly). - Other appropriate weakness should be credited.	Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the points raised. There is evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. Relevant evidence is used as part of the discussion. There is some use of psychological terminology in a response with limited structure. Information presented is sometimes appropriate. 1-3 marks – Basic: for a basic discussion that is rarely relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with weak understanding of the points raised. Relevant evidence is weak or not apparent at all. There is limited or no use of psychological terminology and structure is poor. Information presented in rarely appropriate. 0 Marks – No creditworthy information. N.B. - Arguments for/against should be identified, explained and supported by appropriate evidence from a developmental area study. - If only one study used in the discussion cap at 9 marks. - If all points are made through the context of a study/studies (with no generic points), i.e. study-specific, then the answer should be capped at 6 marks.
--	--	--	--

Section C – Practical Applications

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(a)	Identify <u>one</u> ethical concern in the above article and outline how researchers addressed this concern. <u>Ethical concerns addressed in the article:</u> • Informed consent: supporting evidence: 'Written informed consent was obtained by sending a form to each participant to complete (and return via email).' • Right to withdraw: supporting evidence: 'Introductory instructions told participants they could stop playing at any point'. • Confidentiality: supporting evidence: Introductory instructions told them their 'personal details would not be disclosed'. • Debrief: supporting evidence: 'All participants received an email telling them the outcome of the study once the results had been analysed.'	2	2 marks – A clear identification of an ethical concern supported by appropriate evidence from the article as to how researchers addressed this concern. 1 mark – The mere identification of an appropriate ethical concern with no/inappropriate supporting evidence. 0 marks – No creditworthy information, e.g. merely providing evidence from the article without linking it to an ethical concern.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(b)	Explain <u>two</u> reasons why the results of the study described in the article might may lack validity. <u>Answers are likely to refer to:</u> - It was an online experiment which <u>lacks ecological validity</u> and so may not reflect how participants would respond to peer pressure in real life. - Being able to see peers' choices on a computer screen is <u>not the same</u> as witnessing other people's decisions <u>in real life</u> so participants may have just 'gone with the flow' and therefore not responded as they would in a real situation. - The findings may <u>lack population validity</u> as only 20 individuals took part/all were healthy/all were right-handed so findings may not be representative of people who are unhealthy/left-handed making findings hard to generalise. - Participants may have <u>responded to demand characteristics</u> by thinking that choices made by peers indicated the aim of the experiment and so they copied their peers' choices to support the experiment's aim, rather than responding how they really wanted. - Other appropriate answers should be credited.	4 [2+2]	For each reason: - an accurate reason is identified as to why the study in the article may lack validity (1) - the reason is supported with a clear explanation. (1) 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(c)	Outline why the results of the study described in the article support the determinism side of the freewill/determinism debate. Support your answer with evidence from the article. <u>Likely answers:</u> • Determinism is the idea that behaviour is determined by forces beyond the individual's control (1). In this article, there is evidence of biological determinism (1). The fMRI data analysis suggested a neural basis for social influence with individuals conforming to their peers by trusting their opinions and copying their behaviours (1). • Determinism is the idea that behaviour is determined by external forces beyond the individual's control (1). This article looks at how individuals cannot resist peer pressure which is an example of an external force (1). It shows the majority of students decided to send money to a stranger when the believed 80% of their peers had done (1). • Determinism disputes the idea of free will (1). The article suggests that participants have no choice over whether they respond to social influence or not (1). This is because it shows that peer pressure triggers something in the brain which leads to people automatically copying their peers' behaviours (1). Other appropriate answers should be credited.	3	3 marks – For showing an understanding of the following: • the concept of determinism. • how the concept relates to the article in broad terms • appropriate evidence from the article. 2 marks – For showing a vague understanding of the concept of determinism supported by appropriate content from the article. 1 mark – For showing an understanding of the concept of determinism not supported by appropriate content from the article/uncontextualised. 0 marks – No creditworthy information, i.e. merely quoting content from the article as this shows no understanding of the concept of determinism.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(d)	Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest and explain <u>two</u> ways young people could be encouraged to avoid the effect of negative peer pressure. <u>Answers are likely to refer to:</u> - Such psychological theories as classical conditioning, operant conditioning, social/observational learning theory (what) to avoid peer pressure (why). - Cognitive behaviour therapy (what) to avoid peer pressure (why). - Education in schools/on television/in social clubs, etc. (what) to improve understanding the effects of peer pressure and thus encourage youngsters to avoid its negative aspects (why). - Campaigns (what) to raise awareness of issues relating to the effects of peer pressure and thus encourage youngsters to avoid its negative aspects (why). - Role play situations (what) to increase awareness of what it is like to experience negative aspects of peer pressure so that it can be avoided (why).	8	7-8 marks - A high standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative aspects of peer pressure (what). There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (why). The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (how). Two suggestions are covered. 5-6 marks - A good standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative aspects of peer pressure (what). There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (why). The suggestions are mostly accurate and some vague details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (how). Two suggestions are covered. 3-4 marks – A reasonable knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative aspects of peer pressure (what). There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (why). This may be implicit rather than explicit. The suggestions are somewhat vague and lack in detail relation to how they might be implemented (how). 1-2 marks – Only basic knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative aspects of peer pressure (what). There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions, possibly with little or no information relating to either the (why) or the (how). The suggestions will have limited accuracy. 0 marks – No creditworthy response.

		- Suggestions relating to how these ideas could be implemented to avoid the negative aspects of peer pressure (how). - Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.		N.B. To reach the top two bands the candidate must refer to the <i>what</i>, <i>how</i> and <i>why</i> aspects of any suggestions. If only <u>one</u> suggestion is made then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.
Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(e)	Evaluate the suggestions you have made in 7(d) using your knowledge of psychology. <u>Potential issues for evaluation:</u> - Assumptions relating to nature/nurture. - Assumptions relating to freewill/determinism. - Assumptions relating to reductionism/holism. - Assumptions relating individual/situational explanations. - Usefulness (including practicality, funding issues, effectiveness, appropriateness). - Ethical considerations. - Social sensitivity. - Psychology as a science. - Ethnocentrism. - Ecological validity/validity.	8	7-8 marks for demonstrating good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised in relation to issues and debates. A range of appropriate evaluation points (at least three) are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). Both suggestions are evaluated. 5-6 marks for demonstrating reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments are coherently presented in the main with reasonable understanding of the points raised in relation to issues and debates. A range (at least two) of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). Both suggestions are evaluated. 3-4 marks for demonstrating limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments may lack clear structure/organisation and show limited understanding of the points raised in relation to issues and debates. The candidate may evaluate only one suggestion. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). 1-2 marks for demonstrating basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lack clear structure/organisation and show a very basic understanding of the points raised in relation to issues and debates. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). 0 marks – No creditworthy response. N.B. If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.

			• Reliability. • Other appropriate issues should be considered and credited accordingly.		N.B. Even if the candidate raises the required number of points for a particular mark band, this does not automatically place the response in that band. The overall quality of the response and the other requirements for each band must be considered.
--	--	--	---	--	---

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2025 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.