

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Explain why Kohlberg's (1968) research into moral development is considered a longitudinal study.</p> <p><u>The answer should refer to:</u></p> <p>Description of a longitudinal study: A longitudinal study is one in which one participant, or a group of participants, is studied over a period of time.</p> <p>Reference to Kohlberg: Studied the <i>same</i> 75 American boys, aged 10 - 16 years old, for 12 years. Followed at three-year intervals until they were 22-28 years old</p>	3	<p>3 marks -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear and accurate description of a longitudinal study. • Clear reference to Kohlberg (studied for 12 years) • At least one other feature supporting longitudinal nature of Kohlberg <p>2 marks - Any two of the above</p> <p>1 mark - A vague or partial answer e.g. a mere description of a longitudinal study with no supporting evidence, e.g. Kohlberg studied the same participants for a long period of time.</p> <p>0 mark - No creditworthy information, e.g. mere descriptions of the sample.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Candidates who performed well on this question demonstrated an understanding of longitudinal research and clearly identified features of Kohlberg's study which made it longitudinal. Most candidates showed an understanding of longitudinal research but many candidates needed to either include more detail or check the accuracy of the links made to the core study to demonstrate knowledge (e.g. every 3 years, over 12 years etc.).</p>
	Total	3	
2	<p>Outline the background to Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study.</p> <p><u>Likely answers will refer to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor adherence to prescribed frequency/technique remains a major problem for paediatric asthmatics on inhaled medication. • Compliance for offering medication regularly to asthmatic children is low. • Behaviour therapy and behaviour modification - based on operant conditioning have been approaches used by clinical psychologists and health practitioners to improve adherence. • Positive reinforcement techniques - whether incentive toys on the Funhaler 	4	<p>4 marks - A detailed and accurate outline which describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor compliance to asthma medication • Operant conditioning/Behaviour therapy • Elaboration of conditioning/behaviour modification • Link to study <p>3 marks - A good outline which includes three of the points above</p> <p>2 marks - A reasonable outline which includes two of the points above</p> <p>1 mark - A partial or vague answer which vaguely describes background research/theory</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>would lead to improved adherence in young asthmatics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate studies of conditioning - e.g. Skinner. <p>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</p> <p><u>Links to Chaney</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate how operant conditioning affects adherence of children to asthma medication. • To show that a novel asthma spacer device, the “funhaler” (which incorporates incentive toys) can provide positive reinforcement leading to improved adherence in young asthmatics. 		<p>0 mark - No creditworthy information. e.g. only stating the aim of Chaney</p> <p>Examiner’s Comments</p> <p>This question required candidates to ‘tell the story’ of Chaney et al.’s study. The majority of candidates wrote about the aim of Chaney et al. without describing the motivation behind the research aim. Those who were more successful with this question provided detailed and accurate descriptions of background theory/research (e.g. positive reinforcement, low levels of adherence to asthma medicine).</p> <p> OCR support</p> <p>Most candidates did not give the correct response to this question and had limited knowledge on the background information to the core study. When a response on the background was given, it was often vague and without development showing a lack of understanding of the underlying concepts of the study.</p> <p>For support with this, see our guide to core studies teacher guides on Teach Cambridge which offer appropriate content for the core study backgrounds.</p>
	Total	4	
3	A	1	<p>Through local child or general practitioner clinics</p> <p>Examiner’s Comments</p> <p>Most answered correctly.</p>
	Total	1	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
4			B	1	Every 5 seconds for 20 minutes <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most answered incorrectly. Of those who did answer incorrectly, the majority chose option A.
			Total	1	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Bandura <i>et al.</i> (1961) conducted a study into the transmission of aggression. Outline <u>one</u> way that the procedure increased the reliability of this study.</p> <p><u>Likely answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the aggressive condition the same tinker toy was initially assembled by the model. • In the aggressive condition the model physically and verbally aggressed the bobo doll using a standardised procedure. • In the non-aggressive condition, the model always totally ignored the bobo doll. • The same (5ft.) bobo doll was used throughout phase one. • In phase two, each child was allowed to play with attractive toys but for each child these were taken away after two minutes. • In phase three, the same (3ft.) bobo doll was used throughout. • The same toys were used for each child in phase three, e.g. mallet, dart gun, tea set. • Each of the three rooms used in the experiment were set up identically for each child. • Every child was observed for the same amount of time (20 minutes) in phase three. • In phase three a time point sample was used with every child where every 5 seconds a note was made of the behaviour shown in one of the behavioural categories. • Other appropriate answer. 	2	<p>2 marks - A clear response which identifies a relevant way the study addressed the issue of reliability, supported by evidence from Bandura <i>et al.</i>'s study.</p> <p>1 mark - A vague response that merely identifies a relevant way Bandura <i>et al.</i>'s study addressed the issue of reliability.</p> <p>0 mark - no creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If the answer just demonstrates an understanding of the term reliability but not in the context of Bandura <i>et al.</i>'s study, then award 1 mark maximum.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Many candidates struggled to provide a clear understanding of reliability and an accurate description of how the procedure used in Bandura <i>et al.</i>'s study increased reliability. Candidates needed to develop their understanding of the term 'reliability' by outlining 'standardised' for example. Many made incorrect reference to how the children were pre-rated for aggression before the study began, which increases validity not reliability.</p>
	Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Describe Bandura's study into the transmission of aggression and briefly explain how this may relate to the effects of social media.</p> <p>Possible key features for description of study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background to study • Aims and hypotheses • Design • Sample • Procedure • Materials • Key findings • Conclusions drawn <p>How the study relates to the effects of social media:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People on social media may act as negative role models. • Mental health behaviours may be observed and imitated from social media. 	7 (AO1-5) (AO2-2)	<p>5 marks for a detailed and accurate description which identifies a range of key features of the study (procedure and findings are essential).</p> <p>3-4 marks for an accurate description which identifies some of the key features of the study (procedure or findings).</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague description of the study which identifies some of the key features.</p> <p>0 mark - no creditworthy response.</p> <p>For application to the effects of social media; 2 marks a relevant link which is clearly explained.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief but clear link or for one which is not well explained.</p> <p>0 mark - no creditworthy response.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Candidates who knew the core study responded well to this question. Responses given varied in accuracy rather than detail as some candidates were inaccurate when referring to toys which were not present, or the use of video recordings of models. Application to the source was achieved well by the majority of candidates, some developing on this by utilising key terms from the social learning theory. The candidates who did not gain application marks, often referred to general comments 'we can be influenced by other people' or alternate theories 'behaviours in social media will be watched and the child will want what the person they are watching has'. The best responses made direct references back to the findings and conclusions of the study.</p>
	Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
7		<p>Identify <u>two</u> features of the sample used in Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study.</p> <p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Australian / 32 / children / males and females / age range 1.5-6 years / mean age 3.2 years / average duration of asthma 2.2 years / asthma sufferers / used inhalers (and spacers). 	1+1	<p>1 mark – Any one feature. 0 mark – No or incorrect answer.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>The majority of candidates responded to this question well. The minority of candidates are making reference to the sampling method rather than features of the sample.</p>
		Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>Explain how Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study can support the nurture side of the nature/nurture debate.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chaney <i>et al.</i> showed that behaviour can be strongly influenced by external factors in the environment. They showed that children can learn behaviour through the process of positive reinforcement because when participants used the Funhaler correctly, the positive reward of seeing/hearing the toy work, had a positive effect on their asthmatic conditions making them more willing to adhere to their medical regime, thus improving their health status. • Chaney <i>et al.</i> found that when children used the Funhaler correctly, their asthma improved. This external influence meant that the children learned through the process of operant conditioning (learning as a result of the consequences of behaviour) that using an inhaler correctly can lead to improved health status. This shows that behaviour can be strongly influenced by learning processes and the environment. • Other appropriate answer. 	3	<p>3 marks – A clear and accurate explanation of how Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study can support the nurture side of the debate. The response must include:</p> <p>(a) Reference to the nurture side of the debate.</p> <p>(b) How Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study links to the nurture side of the debate.</p> <p>(c) Supporting evidence from Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study.</p> <p>2 marks – A reasonable explanation which may lack clarity in relation to how Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study links to the nurture side of the debate/may have weak or vague supporting evidence, e.g. Chaney <i>et al.</i> showed that children can learn behaviour through the process of positive reinforcement because when participants used the Funhaler correctly, their asthma improved.</p> <p>1 mark – A vague answer <i>or</i> one that is <u>uncontextualised</u> to Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study, e.g. Chaney <i>et al.</i> showed that children's asthma improved as they learned to use the Funhaler correctly (vague); Chaney <i>et al.</i> showed that children can learn behaviour from the external environment through the process of operant conditioning/ positive reinforcement (no Contextualisation).</p> <p>0 mark – No or incorrect answer.</p> <p>Examiner's Comments</p> <p>The majority of candidates responded to the question well. Candidates did well, stating a principle of the nurture debate (learning, environment, influence of external factors) and clearly linking this to Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study (Funhaler, spinner, whistle). This question also required evidence from Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study to contextualise their response (e.g. improved medical adherence/improved their health/asthma). Candidates were able to apply the principles of nurture better on this question than Question 6 (b).</p>
	Total	3	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Bandura et al. (1961) in their study on transmission of aggression used an independent measures design.</p> <p>Explain a strength of this design as used in this study.</p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strength of this design as used in this study is that there is no chance of boredom/fatigue/practice (order effects) by the children witnessing more than one condition (1), i.e. an aggressive male model, an aggressive female model, a non-aggressive male model, and a non-aggressive female model (1). • A strength of this design as used in this study is that because different children are used in each condition, they only witness one of a male/female aggressive model, male/female non-aggressive model or no model (1) and so they are unlikely to guess the aim and change their behaviour (demand characteristics) in the final stage (1). • Other appropriate answer. 	2	<p>2 marks – A clear contextualised strength of an independent measures design is identified.</p> <p>1 mark – A strength of an independent measures design is merely identified, i.e. no contextualisation, e.g. a strength of an independent measures design is that participants only take part in one condition so there is no chance of boredom influencing behaviour in the testing/final stage;</p> <p>OR understanding of an independent measures design is vague though the candidate has attempted to contextualise their response, e.g. the children only took part in either the aggressive or non-aggressive conditions.</p> <p>0 mark – No or incorrect answer.</p> <p>Examiner's Comments</p> <p>The minority of candidates performed well on this question by explaining a strength of an independent measures design (less chance of order effects/demand characteristics) and contextualising the strength. Other candidates needed to go beyond merely explaining a strength and apply this to Bandura et al.'s study. Candidates who referred to phrases like 'aggression' or 'role model', demonstrated good contextual links to their strength.</p>
	Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
10		<p>Outline <u>one</u> way in which Chaney et al.'s study into Funhalers could be criticised for its lack of validity</p> <p>Possible criticisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of population validity – cultural and age bias. • Lack of construct validity – a narrow measure of reinforcement was taken through adherence to Funhaler. • Lack of internal validity – experiment took place in the field so many uncontrolled variables. • Demand characteristics/social desirability – parents may have reported the success of the Funhaler because that is what was expected. 	2	<p>2 marks for identifying a relevant issue of validity in context of the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant issue of validity with no contextualisation.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Some candidates performed well on this question by identifying a relevant issue of validity. Others needed to go beyond merely identifying an issue of validity and apply this to Chaney et al.'s study. Candidates who referred to phrases like – Medical adherence, compliance, medicating – demonstrated good contextual links to their validity issue.</p>
		Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
11	a	<p>Explain how Chaney <i>et al</i>'s study into Funhalers relates to the theme of 'external influences on behaviour'.</p> <p><u>Example of a 3 mark answer</u> Chaney et al found that children could be influenced through the process of reinforcement (1). They changed their behaviour by using the inhaler more (1) when it was presented as a Funhaler with bells and whistles. The children using and no using the Funhaler clearly had different external influences (1).</p> <p>NB Reinforcement may be referred through use of the term reward(ing) or positive outcomes/consequences.</p>	3	<p>3 marks for a clear answer which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognises the influence comes from reinforcement • shows it is external to the children as it relies on incentive toys • shows the behaviour was adherence with an inhaler. <p>2 marks for an answer which addresses at least two of the above points.</p> <p>1 mark for a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>This question elicited many good responses which showed sound technical knowledge of the study. Some candidates were not always specific enough about the behaviour being impacted on.</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
b	<p>Outline one strength and one weakness of the method used in Lee et al's study into lying and truth telling.</p> <p>The candidate is most likely to identify an experiment as the method, and may specifically identify a laboratory or quasi-experiment.</p> <p>Possible strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high level of internal validity/control • ability to reliably establish cause and effect • objectivity • practical/ethical (quasi) <p>Possible weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of ecological validity/artificial (lab) • lack of construct validity <p>NB Do credit responses where candidates identify self-report or interviews as the method.</p> <p><u>Example of a 4 mark answer</u> A strength Lee et al's lab experiment is that it was highly controlled (1) so that extraneous variables such as the order in which stories were presented did not affect the DV (1). However, a weakness is the lack of construct validity (1) as for the purpose of measurement, children's morality was measured by a simple rating scale (1).</p>	4 (2 + 2)	<p>2 marks for a clearly identified and relevant strength which is appropriately applied to the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant strength either explicitly, or implicitly through application to the study.</p> <p>Plus</p> <p>2 marks for a clearly identified and relevant weakness which is appropriately applied to the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant weakness either explicitl, or implicitly through application to the study.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Those candidates who were able to understand the demands of this question often earned at least 1 mark for the strength and then 1 mark for the weakness. Only some of these candidates were able to apply the strength and weakness to the study in a meaningful way.</p> <p>A large proportion of candidates took the question to be about methodology in general and focused on features such as the sampling method or sample, experimental design or type of data, for example. Such responses were not creditworthy as the mark scheme focused on two possible methods – the quasi experiment (or experiment generally) or interviews (self-report) appropriate to Lee's study.</p> <p> Misconception</p> <p>Many candidates did not seem sure about the concept of a method to the extent that some left the question unanswered. The method refers to the main means for collecting data with observations, self-report and experiments being common methods used in psychology.</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
c	<p>Explain one issue with validity that arose in Bandura et al's study into aggressive role models.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal validity related to high levels of control in the study. • External validity related to generalisability of findings beyond the study. • Ecological validity related to the artificiality of the set up. • Population validity relating to the representativeness of the study. • Construct validity related to how broadly the DV was measured. <p><u>Example of 1 mark answer</u></p> <p>Bandura's study lacked construct validity. (1)</p> <p><u>Example of 2 mark answer</u></p> <p>The study was low in ecological validity (1) because aggression was tested in unnatural conditions in a laboratory (1).</p> <p><u>Example of 3 mark answer</u></p> <p>The study had an issue with population validity (1) as it only used a narrow age range of children (1) which means it is difficult to generalise the findings and suggest that all children learn aggression in this way (1).</p>	3	<p>3 marks for a clear response which identifies a relevant issue with validity, outlines how/why it arose in the study(context)and demonstrates an understanding of the type of validity in the process.</p> <p>2 marks for a clear response with two of the above features or for a vague response with all three of the above features.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant issue of validity or for some understanding of the concept of validity.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>There were many good responses to this question with ecological validity and population validity being the most popular issues raised. The best responses were able to relate explicitly to the chosen issue to the study with some level of detail.</p> <p> Assessment for learning</p> <p>There are many core studies that use the experimental method and candidates tend to know this has implications for ecological validity and then can go on to explain features of the study that do not relate to real life.</p> <p>However, it is good practice to get students to reflect on how these features impact on the validity of the findings for that particular study e.g. in real life it is unlikely that the exact same object children have witnessed aggression towards appears in a different environment almost immediately afterwards.</p>
	Total	10	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Outline the procedure used in Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study briefly explain how this relates to the use of aversion of aversion therapy for homosexuality.</p> <p>Possible key features for description of the study's procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • standard spacer device versus Funhaler device • amount of adherence was measured • sample was children 1.5-6 years • use of Funhaler was assessed through use of interviews with parents • matched questionnaires were used to measure difference in adherence to each inhaler • Funhaler designed to be self-reinforcing <p>How findings relate to the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • behaviour change • role of conditioning / learning • impact of environment on behaviour 	3+2	<p>For description of the study;</p> <p>3 marks for an accurate description which identifies the key features of the procedure.</p> <p>2 marks for a satisfactory description which identifies most of the key features of the procedure.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief or vague description which identifies features of the procedure.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>For application to the use of aversion of therapy;</p> <p>2 marks a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly, explained.</p> <p>1 mark for a clear link or for one which is not well explained</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
	Total	5	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
13	a	i	<p>Chaney et al. (2004) used a repeated measures design in their Funhaler study.</p> <p>Explain how this design was used.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <p>Repeated measures was used as participants took part in both conditions of the experiment (1) first of all being assessed on the outcomes of using a standard inhaler and then being assessed on the outcomes of using the Funhaler (1).</p>	2	<p>2 marks for demonstrating knowledge of a repeated measures design and for applying this to the procedure used in the study.</p> <p>NB The knowledge may be implicit in the application of the study.</p> <p>1 mark for demonstrating knowledge of a repeated measures design.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
		ii	<p>Outline one strength of using a repeated measures design in this study.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <p>One strength is that there are no participant variables acting as extraneous variables (1) so adherence to a particular inhaler cannot be attributed to the personality of the child or the support of the family (1)</p>	2	<p>2 marks for demonstrating knowledge of a strength of the design and for applying this to the study.</p> <p>1 mark for demonstrating knowledge of a strength of the design either explicitly, or implicitly through application to the study.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
	b		<p>Briefly discuss the extent to which Kohlberg's (1968) study into moral development may be considered ethnocentric.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focus on American – through sampling and longitudinal research. • However, five other cultures studied to support universality of theory. • Still Western bias in overall sample. • Stories may be more relevant to some cultures than others. • Story was changed for Taiwanese participants showing some awareness of cultural differences. • Implication that some cultures develop slower than others, implying a deficiency in cultural experience or possibly intellect. 	4	<p>3-4 marks for a clear, detailed and well informed discussion of the extent of ethnocentrism in the context of the study.</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague discussion of the extent of ethnocentrism in the study. There may be some muddling of ideas or applications as part of the discussion.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>NB The question requires a <i>brief</i> discussion and marks should be awarded according to this.</p> <p>A full mark response does not necessarily have to consider both sides of the argument – a good answer could argue that the study is or is not ethnocentric alone.</p> <p>The discussion can focus on one aspect of the study (e.g. sample) and still earn full marks.</p>
			Total	8	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
14	a	i	<p>Give two features of the sample used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into aggression.</p> <p>Features:</p> <p>Number: 72 children</p> <p>Gender: 36 boys, 36 girls</p> <p>Age: 37-69 months (or 3-5 years) or mean 52 months</p> <p>Target population: from Stanford University Nursery School</p>	2	<p>1 mark for each feature identified with correct reference from the study.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Candidates can only gain credit once for one type of feature.</p>
		ii	<p>Outline one way in which this sample was biased.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <p>Cultural bias – all American</p> <p>Age bias – represented younger children only</p> <p>Socio-economic/class bias – in nursery at university</p> <p><u>Example of 2 mark answer</u></p> <p>It is not representative of all age groups (1) as it only focused on younger children who may be more open to the influence of role models (1).</p>	2	<p>2 marks for identifying a relevant type of bias and outlining this in the context of the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant type of bias either explicitly, or implicitly through application to the study.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Candidates do not have to specifically name the type of bias to gain the first mark but it must be made clear through their answer that they understand why the sample is unrepresentative</p> <p>If candidates simply provide an outline of features of the sample without commenting on why this makes the sample biased then zero marks..</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
b	<p>Kohlberg's study of moral development raises a number of issues of validity.</p> <p>Describe how two of these issues arise in the study.</p> <p>Possible issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low ecological validity – scenarios were hypothetical rather than real • Social desirability bias – participants may want to appear more moral than they are • High population validity – large sample • Low population validity – original sample showed both cultural and gender bias • High construct validity – the use of qualitative responses to the scenarios • Low construct validity – responses were then categorised to fit different stages of Kohlberg's theory • Low internal validity – not a very controlled piece of research; many extraneous variables e.g. different scenarios, different styles of questioning • Low temporal validity – concepts of morality change over time making findings out-of-date. <p>NB Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	2+2	<p>For each issue:</p> <p>2 marks for a relevant feature of the study that has been related to an appropriate type of validity or where the impact on validity is made clear</p> <p>1 mark a muddled response which is critical or supportive of the study in relation to its validity</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Candidates do not have to specifically name a type of validity to gain the full 2 marks but it must be made clear in their answers which type of validity they are referring to (i.e. they can name or describe).</p> <p>Demand characteristics and social desirability can be credited here as issues with validity.</p>
	Total	8	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
15 a	<p>To what extent does Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s Funhaler study change our understanding of the key theme of external influences on children's behaviour? Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies.</p> <p><u>Example of a 1-mark answer</u></p> <p>Chaney's study showed that children can learn through positive reinforcement whereas Bandura showed that children can learn observing behaviours demonstrated by significant others (1). (No context)</p> <p><u>Example of a 2-mark answer</u></p> <p>Chaney's study showed that children who used a funhaler learnt through positive reinforcement/operant conditioning (1) whereas Bandura had previously shown that children can learn behaviour through observing role models (1).</p> <p><u>Example of a 3-mark answer</u></p> <p>There are other external influences on children's behaviour beyond observing the behaviour of role models/significant others as found in the earlier study by Bandura <i>et al.</i> (1). Grant's study showed that children can learn through the process of operant conditioning/positive reinforcement (1) as when the participants used the funhaler there was a positive effect on their asthmatic conditions making them more willing to adhere to their medical regime, thus improving their health status (1).</p> <p>Other appropriate answer.</p>	3	<p>3 marks for a <u>clear and accurate</u> response which demonstrates knowledge and understanding of how Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study changes/adds to our understanding of the key theme. To get the full 3 marks there needs to be a clear comparison to show how understanding has changed/developed.</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague response which shows <u>some</u> knowledge and understanding of Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study and makes <u>some</u> attempt to show how this study changed understanding of the key theme. Only 1 mark can be awarded if the answer /a merely description of Chaney <i>et al.</i>'s study is not contextualised.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
b	<p>Describe one similarity between Chaney et al.'s study and Bandura et al.'s study into the external influences on the development of children's behaviour.</p> <p><u>Possible similarities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental method • Children as participants • Both used boys and girls • Use of quantitative data • Based on behaviourist principles • Both used fun/interesting toys as incentives. <p><u>Examples of 4-mark answer:</u></p> <p>Both studies employed the experimental method (1) by manipulating an IV (1). In the Chaney et al. study the IV was whether a child was using a standard inhaler or a funhaler (1) while in the Bandura et al. study one of the IVs was whether a model behaved aggressively or not (1).</p> <p>Both studies use children as participants (1). This means one can study the development of behaviour as individuals grow and mature (1). Bandura et al. used children aged 37-69 months (1) and Chaney et al. used children aged 1.5 – 6 years of age (1).</p> <p>Other appropriate answer.</p>	4	<p>4 marks – for a clear response which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies a similarity • further outlines that similarity • illustrates the similarity with reference to Chaney et al.'s study • illustrates the similarity with reference to Bandura et al.'s study. <p>3 marks for a vague response with the <u>all</u> of the above points or for a clear response with three of the points.</p> <p>2 marks for a vague response with <u>three</u> of the above points or for a clear response with two of the points.</p> <p>1 mark for a vague response with <u>two</u> of the above points or for a clear response with the difference identified/implied.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
	Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
16	<p>Explain one way in which Bandura et al.'s study into aggression can be considered unethical.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short term distress from observing aggressive acts • long term effects of modelling aggressive behaviour • children's inability to give informed consent • children observed unknowingly – deception • confidentiality breached due the footage being made available <p><u>Example of 1 mark answer</u></p> <p>The experiment caused distress (1).</p> <p><u>Example of 2 mark answer</u></p> <p>Bandura et al published photographs of the children used in the study (1) which can be seen as a breach of confidentiality nowadays (1).</p> <p><u>Example of 3 mark answer</u></p> <p>The participants were not adequately protected (1) as they were purposefully exposed to aggressive role models (1) which could have encouraged anti-social in the long term which could harm them as individuals or others (1).</p>	3	<p>3 marks for a clear response which identifies a relevant ethical issue that is well explained in the context of the study.</p> <p>2 marks for a response which identifies a relevant ethical issue that is considered in the context of the study, or for a response which identifies a relevant ethical issue that is well explained but is not applied to the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant ethical issue either explicitly or implicitly.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Examiner's Comments</p> <p>Nearly all candidates scored marks on this question by identifying a relevant ethical issue that they could then apply to Bandura et al.'s study. There was variability in how well this was explained in the context of the study which distinguished between 2 and 3 mark responses.</p> <p> AfL</p> <p>This question sometimes resulted in candidates offering more than one ethical issue. It is important that candidates understand that when asked for one thing only this is all that can be credited and that this will also be their first response only.</p>
	Total	3	
17	A	1	<p>Examiner's Comments</p> <p>Most answered this correctly</p>
	Total	1	

Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
18		B	1	<u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most answered this correctly
		Total	1	
19		<p>Outline one way in which Chaney et al. followed ethical considerations in their Funhaler study.</p> <p>Possible ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed consent from parents. • Confidentiality – participant details not shared when study published. • Right to withdraw from study (parents). • The Funhaler made available to control group at the end. • Reduces the likelihood of stress/psychological harm as children participated in their own homes. <p><u>Examples of a 1-mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They respected confidentiality. • The Funhaler was made available to all children. <p><u>Examples of a 2-mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children were only used once informed consent (1) had been received from their parents (1). • Participants' health and well-being was considered (1) by ensuring the Funhaler was made available to all children once its success had been established (1). 	2	<p>1 mark for demonstrating knowledge of a relevant ethical consideration.</p> <p>1 mark for outlining this consideration in the context of Chaney et al.'s study.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Most candidates performed well on this question with few candidates not scoring the full 2 marks, e.g. 'Chaney followed ethical considerations by gaining informed consent from the children's parents.'</p>
		Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
20		<p>Outline how the results of Bandura et al's study on the transmission of aggression support social learning theory</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLT is supported by Banduras results because children who observed an aggressive role model did imitate (1) aggressive behaviour, such as hitting the Bobo doll (1). Therefore imitation of aggressive behaviour was shown. • Other appropriate response 	2	<p>2 marks – An accurate outline given as to how Bandura's results support social learning theory. Must have context from the study: aggressive role models / hitting the Bobo doll / shouting 'pow'. 1 mark SLT link, 1 mark context with Bandura</p> <p>1 mark – Partial of vague answer <i>e.g. children in the aggressive condition imitated behaviour</i></p> <p>0 marks – no credit worthy information</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Generally well answered, when errors were made by candidates, it was due to a lack of context given relating to the core study.</p>
		Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
21	<p>Outline how Lee et al.'s study links to the developmental area in psychology</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lee et al.'s study is considered developmental because children at different ages were studied (1) which shows how attitudes towards truth telling and lying telling develop (1) • Children aged 7, 9 and 11 years (1) were tested on their truth telling and lying behaviour (1) • Other appropriate response 	2	<p>2 marks – Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding in context of the study <i>Candidates need to link the features of Lee et al's study to how they studied or made conclusions about development across ages in ratings of truth and lie telling</i></p> <p>1 mark – Response demonstrates partial application of psychological knowledge and understanding OR response demonstrates good application of knowledge but is not contextualised e.g. <i>Lee et al's study showed development in behaviour in different ages</i></p> <p>0 marks – no credit worthy information</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Many candidates who did not score highly in this question were unable to identify the developmental feature of Lee's study (Cross-Sectional) design and made comments relating to a longitudinal design (inaccurate for Lee's study of development). Many candidates were able to highlight the area of investigation and provide context for the study (on truth and lie telling), but without correctly identifying the design, were unable to access marks. Another common error was focusing on differences between cultures which gave a social rather than developmental feature of the study.</p>
	Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
22	<p>Bandura et al.'s study on the transmission of aggression is based on the principles of social learning theory. Outline social learning theory.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Social Learning Theory says that people learn by observing the behaviours (1) of other people around them who serve as role models (1). Once behaviour has been observed it is likely to then be imitated (1). • Attention, Retention, Reproduction, Motivation • Other appropriate response <p><i>Key terminology: Observation of behaviour, imitation, role models.</i></p>	3	<p>3 marks – Response demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of social learning theory.</p> <p>2 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of social learning theory but lacks some clarity / specific use of relevant terminology</p> <p>1 mark – Response demonstrates limited / basic knowledge and understanding of social learning theory. Response lacks depth and may be very brief</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Most candidates were able to gain full marks by identifying the key features of Social Learning Theory: observation of behaviour of role models and imitation of that behaviour.</p>
	Total	3	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
23 a	<p>Describe what the findings from Chaney et al.'s Funhaler study shows us about the development of behaviour.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If external influences lead to pleasant / satisfying consequences, the behaviour is likely to be repeated. This study shows us that children can develop health-enhancing behaviours over time through the positive reinforcement produced as a result of using a Funhaler. Asthmatic participants found they were able to breathe more easily if they used the Funhaler (as prescribed) and so, over time, were willing to use it and developed behaviours that would, over time, improve their overall health status. (Positive) health behaviours can develop over time. Even after only 2 weeks, the use of a Funhaler as opposed to a basic spacer device led to increased medical compliance in young (Australian) asthmatics. Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. 	[3]	<p>3 marks - A clear description of what the study shows us about the development of behaviour linked to Chaney et al.'s study as suggested in the Answer Guidance bullet point 1. i.e. For 3 marks the candidate must include reference to one of: positive reinforcement / external influence(s)/operant conditioning.</p> <p>2 marks – A reasonable description of what the study shows us about the development of behaviour linked to Chaney et al.'s study as suggested in the Answer Guidance bullet point 2.</p> <p>1 mark – Vague or partial answer e.g. the use of a Funhaler as opposed to a basic spacer device led to increased medical compliance in young (Australian) asthmatics i.e. <u>the mere identification of a finding / result from the study / no link to development</u>; (good) behaviours can develop over time as a result of external influences on the individual. If the external influence leads to pleasant at satisfying consequences, the behaviour is likely to be repeated and become part of an individual's everyday conduct / the use of positive reinforcement can lead to the development of a behaviour; i.e. <u>no contextualisation</u>.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If there is no obvious or implied link to development the response is capped at 1 mark.</i> <p>Examiner's Comments There were some excellent answers to this question with many candidates providing clear descriptions of how Chaney et al.'s study showed how behaviour can be developed. Appropriate references were made to how operant conditioning / external influences / positive reinforcement lead to the development of behaviours with good supporting evidence from the study itself. Some candidates however gave reasonable descriptions of how behaviours can develop but failed to support their descriptions with any evidence from the actual study i.e. they did not contextualise their answer.</p>

Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b i	<p>From Bandura et al.'s study into the transmission of aggression: Outline how participants were pre-rated for aggression in the nursery. Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were rated on (four) <u>5-point rating scales</u> by the <u>experimenter / researcher and / or (nursery school) teacher</u> (who knew them well). • Other appropriate outlines of the procedure should be credited. 	[2]	<p>2 marks – A clear outline of how participants were pre-rated for aggression including reference to (4) / <u>5-point rating scales</u> and who did the rating – <u>teacher and / or experimenter</u> i.e. one of the two people.</p> <p>1 mark – Vague or partial answer e.g. participants were pre-rated for aggression in social interactions by the experimenter and / or a nursery school teacher, participants were pre-rated for aggression using a 5-point rating scale, participants were observed by the experimenter and a nursery school teacher.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information e.g. using a rating scale.</p> <p>Examiner's Comments This was generally answered well though some candidates failed to refer to either the 5-point rating scale or who did the rating. Weak candidates showed confusion by referring to participants being rated for aggression whilst in the aggression-arousal room where they played with the nice toys.</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>ii</p> <p>Explain why the researchers pre-rated participants for aggression before placing them into groups for the experiment.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were pre-rated for aggression before being placed into groups for the experiment so they could be <u>matched</u> on aggression, arranged into triplets and <u>assigned</u> randomly to one of the two experimental groups or the control group. • Participants were pre-rated for aggression before being placed into groups for the experiment so they could be <u>matched</u> on aggression <u>so that those with similar levels of aggression could be distributed evenly across the two experimental groups and the control group.</u> • Participants were pre-rated for aggression as a form of control. This allowed the researchers to <u>match</u> the children on aggression so they could <u>be evenly distributed evenly across the two experimental groups and the control group.</u> • Other appropriate explanations should be credited. 	[2]	<p>2 marks – A clear, detailed explanation such as the one given in the Answer Guidance. Reference should be made to: <u>matching participants and so they could be assigned to groups to prevent any one group being unbalanced in respect of aggression levels.</u></p> <p>1 mark – Vague or partial answer e.g. so they could be matched on aggression, so one group did not contain more aggressive children than any other group, so that individual characteristics such as how aggressive they are didn't affect the results, it was used as a control for aggression, to reduce the chance of confounding / extraneous variables affecting the results.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Credit can be given for answers that infer the purpose of pre-rating the children for aggression was a form of control.</i> <p>Examiner's Comments</p> <p>Many candidates scored 1 mark here through references to ratings allowing researchers to match participants on aggression / as a form of control / so not all the aggressive children were in the same group. Good candidates gave a full answer stating that participants were pre-rated for aggression before being placed into groups for the experiment so they could be <u>matched</u> on aggression <u>so that those with similar levels of aggression could be distributed evenly across the two experimental groups and the control group.</u></p>
	Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
24	<p>From Chaney et al.'s Funhaler study: Outline one reason the Funhaler device made spacers more appealing to children</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Funhaler incorporates a number of features to distract the attention of children from the drug delivery event itself • The design anticipates the potential for boredom of children with particular incentive toys that activate when the device is used to maintain their attention • The incentive toys activate when the device was used correctly so the children were incentivised to use the device correctly to make the Funhaler interactive / fun • Other appropriate response 	2	<p>2 marks – An accurate and detailed reason of one reason why the Funhaler made spacer more appealing to children</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague reason outlined <i>e.g. because it was more interactive</i></p> <p>0 marks – no credit worthy information</p> <p>Examiner's Comments Overall, most candidates showed good knowledge and understanding of the Chaney et al study with most achieving full marks. Some common issues came where candidates failed to highlight what the reinforcer was or they did highlight what the reinforcer was but did not explain why it made the Funhaler more appealing. Some candidates described features which were not accurate e.g. a ball and some candidates reworded the question to answer it e.g. "the Funhaler was more attractive / fun to children so they used it more".</p>
	Total	2	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
25	<p>From Bandura et al's study into the transmission of aggression: Describe how the observation method was used. [4]</p> <p>Possible features of observation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of structured observation through behavioural categories – imitative aggression, partially imitative aggression, non-imitative physical and verbal aggression, non-aggressive behaviour • categories tallied providing quantitative data • use of covert observation through one way mirror • use of time sampling – responses recorded every 5 seconds for 20 minutes • two observers used • non-participant observation as children observed from a different viewpoint • controlled observation as room set up with a number of different toys <p>4 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. The observers rated the child's behaviour in terms of pre-determined response categories (event sampling) whilst sitting in an adjoining observation room and watching the child through a one-way mirror (recordings also taken to observe at a later time). Responses were recorded every 5 seconds for 20 minutes (time sampling) in the following categories and provided an aggression score as tallies were added up at the end of the observation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Imitative aggression (physical, verbal and non-aggressive speech). ii. Partially imitative aggression. iii. Non-imitative physical and verbal aggression. iv. Non-aggressive behaviour. <p>3 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Two observers observed behaviour every 5 seconds for 20 minutes in the following categories: Imitative aggression (physical, verbal 	4	<p>4 marks – An increasingly accurate and detailed response clearly showing how observation was used to observe transmission of aggression.</p> <p>3 marks – An accurate response detailing how observation was used showing reasonable knowledge and understanding but may be lacking some detail.</p> <p>2 marks – A limited response detailing how observation was used showing some knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>1 mark – Basic response with no detail showing very limited knowledge and understanding of how observation was used.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>N.B. Not all details are required for full marks.</i></p> <p><i>To access full marks at least one behavioural category must be referred to.</i></p> <p><i>Responses which describe features in a generic way without a clear reference to the details of Bandura's study to be capped at two marks.</i></p> <p><i>Do also credit descriptions of how the observation method was used for the first part of the study where children were observed in the playground.</i></p> <p>Examiner's Comments</p> <p>Most candidates understood the question well enough to access some of the available marks. Some candidates made the mistake of focusing on observation as a social learning process rather than a research process which meant their responses were not worthy of credit. The best responses used technical language to identify the features of the observational method used in Bandura et al.'s study (e.g. covert observation) and then outlined how they specifically occurred (use of one way mirror). Not many candidates seemed aware of the behavioural categories used in the observation which was considered an essential piece of information for full marks.</p>

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>and non-aggressive speech), partially imitative aggression. non-imitative physical and verbal aggression and non-aggressive behaviour.</p> <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Observers watched the children through a one-way mirror every 5 seconds for 20 minutes. • e.g. Bandura used an observation which was covert, structured, non-participant observation and produced quantitative data. <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. observers watched the children through a one-way mirror • e.g. a covert, controlled observation was used 		
	Total	4	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
26	<p><i>Explain why Bandura et al.'s study on the transmission of aggression can be placed in the developmental area.</i></p> <p>Possible links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the idea that people change and develop, and that this is an on-going process over the life span • the idea that behaviour develops through learning • the idea that early experiences in childhood have an effect on later development • the idea that people develop through pre-determined stages • the investigation of development in children <p><u>Examples of a 3 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developmental area is concerned with the study of psychological and behavioural changes and developments throughout a person's lifespan (1). Bandura et al.'s study focuses on the social process of how children can learn and develop aggressive behaviours (1). The study showed that children who observed a model behaving aggressively were more likely to imitate the aggressive behaviours than those who saw a non-aggressive model or no model at, thus suggesting that certain behaviours can develop as people grow and mature (1). • The developmental area often focuses on children as this is when significant development takes place (1). This links to Bandura's study as it sees children as being particularly susceptible to social learning (1). Bandura showed that many children will develop aggressive behaviour simply by imitating the actions of an adult whom they have recently witnessed being violent (1). • Other appropriate explanations should be credited. 	[3]	<p>1 mark for demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the developmental area <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for making the link between the area and Bandura's study <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for relevant reference to a finding or conclusion from Bandura's study</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the developmental area as well as relevant knowledge of Bandura et al.'s study meaning two marks was a common score. However, only some candidates could make a clear enough link between the two for the third mark.</p>
	Total	3	