

GCE

Psychology

H567/02: Psychological themes through core studies

A 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 RM Assessor 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, email or via the RM Assessor messaging system.
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 the annotation 'SEEN' to confirm that the work has been seen and mark any responses using the annotations in section 11.

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 RM Assessor **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.**
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:
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/ Creditworthy point
	Development/explanation/elaboration of point
	Incorrect- if content is completely wrong (use sparingly)
	Unclear
	Something contradictory therefore lacks clarity
	Missing information needed for full credit
	Context- appropriate reference to the source
	Application to the source/article
	Good creditworthy use of research
	Evaluation (Analysis/Interpretation)
	Not answering question
	Benefit of doubt given and credited
	Irrelevant to this question
	To show content on a page has been noted, but not credited OR empty page
	Highlighter tool for required features

Section A – Core Studies

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	Outline <u>one</u> difference between the samples used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression and Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study. Differences include: number, ages, age range, ethnicity, gender. <u>Likely answers:</u> - One difference between the two studies is the number of participants used. Bandura = 72 children (accept range 70-74) Chaney = 32 children. (accept range (30-34) - One difference between the two studies is the ethnicity of the participants. Bandura = from the USA/ Stanford University nursery Chaney = participants were from Australia. - One difference between the two studies is the age range of the participants. Bandura = aged 3 years 1 month to 5 years 9 months/with a mean age 4 years 4 months. Chaney = aged between 1.5 and 6 years/with a mean age of 3.2 years. - One difference between the two studies is the number of boys and girls used as participants. Bandura = had an equal number of boys and girls/36 boys and 36 girls Chaney = 22 boys and 10 girls. NB: No credit for sample method	3	3 marks – For including the following: - Identification of an appropriate difference between the samples used. - Supporting evidence from Bandura et al. - Supporting evidence from Chaney et al. 2 marks – For identifying an appropriate difference with supporting evidence from <u>either</u> Bandura et al. <u>or</u> Chaney et al. OR No clear identification of a difference but clear evidence given from Bandura et al and Chaney et al with implied comparison. 1 mark – For merely identifying an appropriate difference, e.g. the age of the children. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(b)	Outline <u>one</u> difference between the experimental designs used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression and Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study. <u>Example answers:</u> - Bandura et al. used an independent measures design whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design. (1) The children in Bandura et al.'s study only participated in one condition, i.e. they either saw an aggressive or non-aggressive model/they either saw a male or a female model (1). In Chaney et al.'s study all the children's medical compliance was assessed in both conditions of using a standard inhaler and the Funhaler. (1) - Bandura et al. used a matched pairs design whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design. (1) The children in Bandura et al.'s study were matched on their pre-rated levels of aggression (1). In Chaney et al.'s study all the children's medical compliance was assessed in both conditions of using a standard inhaler and the Funhaler. (1) NB: No credit for experiment type (Field/Lab)	3	3 marks – For including the following: - Identification of an appropriate difference between the experimental designs used. - Supporting evidence from Bandura et al. - Supporting evidence from Chaney et al. 2 marks – For identifying an appropriate difference with supporting evidence from <u>either</u> Bandura et al. <u>or</u> Chaney et al. 1 mark – For merely identifying an appropriate difference, e.g. Bandura et al. used an independent measures design whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design, i.e. no contextualisation. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer. NB. Bandura's study can be classed as independent measures or matched pairs (but the supporting evidence must be in relation to the IV in support of the named design.)

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance										
2	(a)	With reference to Kohlberg's (1968) study into the stages of moral development: Give two reasons why children at the preconventional level will say Heinz should not have stolen the drug for his wife. Two reasons, one for obedience/punishment and one for self-interest. <u>Most likely answers will refer to:</u> <table><tr><th>Obedience and Punishment</th><th>Self Interest</th></tr><tr><td>To obey the rules.</td><td>To avoid self-condemnation</td></tr><tr><td>To avoid punishment by authority</td><td>To obtain rewards</td></tr><tr><td>To not break the law</td><td>To avoid dislike by others</td></tr><tr><td>To avoid punishment</td><td>To be respected by others.</td></tr></table>	Obedience and Punishment	Self Interest	To obey the rules.	To avoid self-condemnation	To avoid punishment by authority	To obtain rewards	To not break the law	To avoid dislike by others	To avoid punishment	To be respected by others.	2 [1+1]	1 mark – For each correctly identified reason. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer. NB: Do not credit general reference to morality e.g. 'Because it is immoral' as does not show reasoning for the stage.
Obedience and Punishment	Self Interest													
To obey the rules.	To avoid self-condemnation													
To avoid punishment by authority	To obtain rewards													
To not break the law	To avoid dislike by others													
To avoid punishment	To be respected by others.													

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(b)	Outline <u>one</u> conclusion that that can be drawn from the findings of Kohlberg's study. <u>Most likely answers:</u> • The stages in an individual's moral development are sequential/invariable. • Each stage of moral development comes one at a time and always in the same order. • An individual may stop at any given stage and age in an invariant sequence of moral development. • Preconventional thought is based on self-interest • Conventional thought is based on rules and approval from others • Post-conventional thought is based on respect for democratically agreed rules/personal conscience. • Kohlberg's six-stage theory of moral development is not significantly affected by widely ranging social, cultural or religious conditions. • Children can differ in the rate at which they progress through the stages. • Stages of moral development are universal • Other appropriate conclusions should be credited.	2	2 marks – A clear and accurate conclusion, such as one of the examples given. 1 mark – A vague or partial answer, e.g. each stage of moral development comes one at a time, i.e. no reference to 'in the same order'; "There are stages children go through in moral development' i.e. no reference to 'sequential/invariable' 'Moral development is universal' i.e. no reference to 'stages'

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
3			Outline the background to Moray's (1959) study into auditory attention. <u>Answers are likely to refer to:</u> • Selective attention - the world is composed of many more sensations than can be handled by the perceptual and cognitive capabilities of the human observer. To cope with the flood of available information, humans must selectively attend to only some information and somehow 'tune out' the rest. (Broadbent, 1958). • The 'Cocktail Party Effect' – where people were very skilled at tuning in to one voice/conversation whilst turning off/tuning out from other conversations, but if another conversation mentioned their name, the individual's attention would be drawn to it. • Research using 'shadowing' tasks (e.g. Cherry) found participants who shadowed a message presented to one ear were ignorant of the content of a message simultaneously presented to the other ear. • Other researchers then moved on from Cherry's work on how people can attend to one message by investigating why so little seemed to be remembered about the other conversations (Hampton & Morris, 1996). • Other appropriate outlines should be credited. <u>Links to Moray</u> • Moray wanted to build on Cherry's research to test if participants hearing their own name would break through the barriers put up in the process of focusing attention during a shadowing task.	4	4 marks – A detailed and accurate outline which describes: • Selective attention/ inattentional barriers/ dichotic listening tests (general) • Past research/theory into selective attention identified (specific) • Elaboration of research into selective attention people i.e. tuning into to one voice/conversation' • Link to Moray i.e. aim to repeat with students/ further elaboration of past research 3 marks - A good outline which includes three of the points above 2 marks – A reasonable outline which includes two of the points above 1 mark – A partial or vague answer which vaguely describes background research/theory 0 marks – No creditworthy information. e.g. only stating the aim of Moray

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(a)	Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory was a laboratory experiment. Describe <u>one</u> strength of using a laboratory experiment in this study. <u>Example answers:</u> - One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that they can readily ensure that every participant is treated in the same way by using standardised procedures (1). For example, every participant completed the same short-answer and multiple-choice test (1). - One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that the environment can be controlled so no situational variables, such as distractions, noise, the presence of other people can affect results (1). For example, all participants wore headphones. - One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that they are easy to replicate (making findings reliable) (1). In Grant all participants followed the same procedure: reading an article, had a break of about 2 minutes, completed a short-answer test and then a multiple-choice test. - One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that they enable the use of complex equipment/materials (1). For example, every participant used a cassette player and headphones (1). - Other appropriate strengths should be credited.	2	2 marks – For a clear and accurate description which includes: - Identification of an appropriate strength of a laboratory experiment. - Appropriate supporting evidence from Grant et al.'s study. 1 mark – For the mere identification of an appropriate strength of a laboratory experiment, i.e. no contextualisation. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(b)	Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory was a laboratory experiment. Outline <u>two</u> features of the procedure used in this study. <u>Answers should identify and contextualise two features</u> • Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: silent-silent, silent-noisy, noisy-noisy or noisy-silent • Participants read an article under silent or noisy conditions • Read aloud standardised instructions that described the tasks as part of a class project/. • Participants read an article once and were told they would have to complete tasks based on the article. • Participants were given instructions: silent were told nothing would be heard/ noisy were told they would be played loud background music. • Participants had a break of 2 mins between the study and test • Participants were tested in either matching (silent-silent) or mismatching (silent-noisy) conditions (Independent measures design). • Participants completed a short answer/recall test and the multiple-choice/recognition test. • Participants were debriefed and were told the research was on the influence of context on memory recall. • All participants were given headphones to wear/ All read the same psychoimmunology article (basic standardised features) • Other appropriate features of the procedure should be credited.	4 [2+2]	<u>For each feature:</u> 1 mark – A feature of the procedure identified. Plus 1 mark – This feature is further contextualised. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer. NB. No marks are credited for details of sample/sample method, operationalisation of variables (planning stage) and aims/hypotheses. Must be features of the procedure/ process. NB <u>One</u> basic standardised feature can be credited

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
5			Explain how the findings from Bocchiaro et al.'s (2012) study into disobedience and whistle-blowing relate to the key theme of 'responses to people in authority'. <u>Answers are likely to refer to:</u> - Bocchiaro et al's study showed that people don't necessarily respond to authority how they believe they will (as shown by the different responses given by the comparison group/demonstrated by the sample). For example: 3.6% of the comparison group said they would obey, but 76.5% of the 'real' participants obeyed. 64.5% of the comparison group said they would whistle-blow, but only 9.4% of the 'real' participants blew the whistle. 31.9% of the comparison group said they would disobey, but 14.1% of the 'real' participants disobeyed. - There isn't a specific personality type that makes it more likely for people to respond to authority in a particular way. For example: - There were no significant differences between those who obeyed, disobeyed or whistle-blew in terms of responses on the HEXACO-PIR/the six personality characteristics. - There was no particular pattern of social orientation between those who obeyed, disobeyed or whistle-blew in terms of their responses to the Decomposed Games. - Other appropriate explanations and evidence should be credited.	3	3 marks for a clear answer which: - Recognises behaviour relating to authority figures i.e. whistle-blowing (what) or who the authority figure was (who) - Reference to Bocchiaro's study in terms of task. - An accurate finding of one measure showing how they responded to authority. 2 marks for a reasonable answer which refers to two of the above 1 mark a vague/partial answer which refers to one of the above 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
6			Briefly discuss the extent to which the findings of Maguire et al.'s (2000) study on taxi drivers can be considered valid. <u>Example discussion points:</u> • High internal validity as participants matched on gender, handedness, good psychological and physical health, and age of the taxi drivers • High validity with the use of blind researcher to carry out pixel counting and VBM scores to remove bias • High validity with comparison of the taxi-drivers to a control group giving construct validity. • Low ecological validity as MRI scanner is not something participants would have to do on a daily basis. • High validity as the variable being measured (hippocampal volume) is not something participants could falsify, • Highly valid because they are supported by evidence from comparative studies with animals and brain damaged patients consistent with the findings from the taxi drivers. • High validity as the volume differences in the hippocampus were established by two independent measures - VBM and pixel counting. • Other appropriate discussions should be credited.	5	5 marks – For a very clear discussion that has considered the extent to which findings can be considered valid. discussion refers to either three reasons why the findings can/cannot be considered valid or two reasons which considers the extent of both how the study can and cannot be considered valid. 3-4 marks – For a good discussion that refers to at least two reasons why the findings can/cannot be considered valid. 1-2 marks - For a reasonable discussion that refers to at least one reason why the findings can/cannot be considered valid. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	Explain why Hancock et al.'s (2011) study into the language of psychopaths can be placed in the individual differences area. <u>Likely answers:</u> <i>Shows understanding of individual differences</i> • The individual differences area focuses more on those whose behaviour falls outside the 'normal', typical or expected range of behaviour • Emphasizes that people are unique and that behaviour is influenced by individual characteristics • The individual differences area considers that there are many differences between individuals, as well as similarities. • Differences between individuals can be measured/ quantified <i>Outlines a finding from Hancock et al.'s study:</i> • Hancock et al. found that psychopaths who had committed murder described powerful emotional events (their crimes) on a more primitive but rational level than non-psychopaths who had committed murder. • The psychopaths used significantly more words connected with food, drink, clothing and money (basic physiological needs) than the non-psychopaths who used significantly more words connected to family and religion (social needs) • Psychopaths also tended to use less positive or emotionally intensive language and showed more instances of callousness and lack of empathy in their narratives than non-psychopaths <i>Links Hancock et al.'s study to the individual differences area:</i> • Hancock showed that there are differences between psychopaths and non-psychopaths). • The language of psychopaths is not 'normal', typical or expected range of behaviour. • Other appropriate explanations should be credited.	3	3 marks – A clear and accurate explanation that: • Shows an understanding of the individual differences area. • Outlines a finding from Hancock et al.'s study. • Links Hancock et al's study to the individual differences area. 2 marks – A reasonably accurate explanation that refers to two of the above. 1 mark – A vague or partial answer, e.g. a mere description of the individual differences area with no supporting evidence from Hancock et al.'s study. 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
8			Explain why Gould (1982) considered Yerkes' research using IQ testing to be ethnocentric. <u>Answers could refer to the following</u> - Ethnocentrism is the assumption the IQ test is valid for non-USA citizens. <u>Elaboration</u>: visual images specific to USA, not using pencils before, for example, participants were expected to know how many legs a Kaffir has, be able to recognise a tennis court and a light bulb, know what Crisco is, etc. not familiar with pencils. - Non-USA citizens given tests <u>Elaboration</u>: some had emigrated from southern or eastern Europe (Russian, Poland), some from western and northern Europe (Italians) who would have been unfamiliar with much of the content of the tests and so scored badly. Also had not given Beta or verbal tests. - Consequences = thought to have low IQ, not able to compete test and not given optional tests, <u>Elaboration</u>: low IQ of USA citizens, low IQ of non-USA, length of time in America affected scores, assumptions about different ethnicities.	4	4 marks – One mark for each of the following - A clear understanding of the term 'ethnocentric' which could be implied ie culturally biased tests, only used in US, - Why the review is ethnocentric: reference to non us citizens taking the test could be by reference to country - Consequences of using biased tests - low IQ measures, deportation of immigrants, low rank/status in army <u>Elaboration</u> of any one of the above points. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Section B - Areas, perspectives and debates

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(a)	Explain <u>one</u> application of the cognitive area of psychology. <u>Possible applications:</u> • Interviewing of witnesses by police and lawyers. • Improving student revision techniques. • Cognitive Behaviour Therapy • Play strategies to develop perception • Techniques to increase recycling activities <u>Example answers:</u> • One application of the cognitive area is to improve the questioning of witnesses by the police/ lawyers (<i>identify application</i>). Within interviews they would avoid the use of leading questions/ ask more open questions in an interview to increase the accuracy of testimony. (<i>why/how used</i>). This is because Loftus and Palmer found that the way a question is phrased will influence the memory of an event (<i>concept of the area</i>), in their study the verb in a question affected the speed a witness 'remembered' a vehicle travelling (<i>elaboration of research/dev of theory</i>). • One application of the cognitive area has been to encourage schools/colleges to provide quiet areas for students to revise for exams (<i>identify application</i>). These study spaces would match the conditions of the exam as they are sat in silence (<i>how/why it is used</i>). The cognitive area is interested in factors influencing internal processes such as memory (<i>Clear understanding of principle</i>). Research has suggested that those learning in matched conditions have improved recall compared to mismatched conditions. • Other appropriate practical applications should be credited.	4	4 marks – A clear and accurate explanation of a relevant application of the cognitive area which contains these four features: • Identifies an appropriate cognitive application. • Explains the application – i.e. how/why it is used. • Shows clear understanding of a principle or concept of the cognitive area. • Elaboration on research/ development of theory 3 marks – A reasonable explanation of a relevant application of the cognitive area which contains 3 of the above four features. 2 marks – A limited explanation of a relevant application of the cognitive areas which contains 2 of the above four features. 1 mark – A basic explanation e.g. simply identifying an application of the cognitive area. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer. NB. <i>Appropriate cognitive applications from H567/03 (Module 3) should be considered creditworthy and marks awarded as given above.</i>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(b)	Outline ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific. Support your answer with evidence from any appropriate core studies. <u>Likely ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific, all of which should be supported by appropriate evidence:</u> - Interested in the biological processes/changes such as genetic testing, brain structure and/or hormones - Provide clear predictions which can be scientifically tested and proven/falsified. - Experimental method which means cause and effect can be inferred. - Use laboratory experiments where an IV can be manipulated/ a naturally occurring IV can be implemented to show its effect on a DV, providing empirical evidence for a hypothesis. - Produce quantitative data - Can use standardised procedures which enable replicability - Produce objective/emphasise objective measurement. - Usually take place in controlled environments, so the influence of extraneous variables is limited increasing the likelihood of causal relationships. - Reduces behaviour into its component parts and focuses on a single factor as being the main influence on behaviour. This single factor can be isolated and scientifically tested/examined to establish whether it is the cause of an individual's behaviour. - Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. Evidence should be provided from Sperry (1968), Casey et al. (2011), Blakemore and Cooper (1970) and/or Maguire et al. (2000). The evidence should be used effectively to specifically support the point being made, rather than just generally described.	8	7-8 marks – For a clear and accurate outline that: - Identifies at least two ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific. - Supports suggestions with appropriate evidence from at least two studies. 5-6 marks - For a reasonably clear and accurate outline that: Either - Identifies two ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific with only one suggestion being supported with adequate evidence. Or: - Identifies two ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific with evidence for both suggestions being weak/vague or only one study used. 3-4 marks – For a limited outline that: Either - Identifies one way in which the biological area can be considered scientific, supported with some evidence. Or: - Identifies two ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific but with no supporting evidence. 1-2 marks – For a basic/weak answer that merely outlines a way in which the biological area can be considered scientific with no supporting evidence NB. If only one way is considered, apply the guidelines given above, but award no more than 4 marks.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(c)	Compare the biological area with the social area. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies. <u>Possible similarities between the areas:</u> • Practical applications in the real world. • Research can be reductionist. • Deterministic conclusions in research. • Allow for the use of experiments where researchers can manipulate an IV to study its effect on a DV. • Can gather quantitative data. • Can use scientific methodology. <u>Possible differences between the areas:</u> • The biological area supports the nature side whereas the social area supports the nurture side. • The biological area supports the individual side whereas the social area supports the situational side. • There tend to be more ethical issues with research in the social area. e.g. studies in the social area often involve deception and fail to gain informed consent whereas studies in the biological area gain consent and do not deceive participants. • Although research in both areas can be scientific, research in the biological area tends to be more scientific. • Research in the biological area is objective whereas research in the social area can be subjective. • The biological area usually uses laboratory experiments which take place in controlled environments whereas the social area often uses field experiments. • The social area is more likely to gather qualitative data than the biological area. • The social area is more likely to gather ecologically valid data than the biological area. • Social area uses cross cultural studies whereas biological are often in one area/location • Other appropriate points of comparison should be credited.	8	7–8 marks - For a thorough comparison of both areas. The arguments are developed and coherent. There are clear and valid comparisons between the two areas. At least two points of comparison are made. Each comparison point is supported by appropriate evidence from both areas and elaborated. Or Three points which are not as well elaborated 5-6 marks - For a good consideration of both areas. At least two points of comparison are made. There is some coherency to the arguments made. Identified comparison points are supported by appropriate evidence from both areas but may lack elaboration. 3-4 marks – For a reasonable consideration of both areas. At least one point of comparison is considered and supported by appropriate evidence from both areas, though this may be somewhat vague. Or Two points of comparison with support from one area 1-2 marks - For a basic comparison of both areas. There is unlikely to be any appropriate supporting evidence 0 marks – No creditworthy response.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(d)	*	Discuss the individual/situational explanations debate in psychology. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies. Knowledge of individual/situational debate: - The situational explanation explains behaviour being caused by the environment a person is in. - The individual explanation explains behaviour being caused by dispositional/internal factors. Discussion of Individual explanation - Research from the Biological/ cognitive area supports individual explanations - Recognises freedom of choice/ gives people responsibility for their actions. - Provides opportunities to develop practical applications that focus on changing factors such as faulty cognitions, moralistic values. - Provides a holistic explanation for behaviour as it takes into account individual differences. - By attributing the cause of behaviour to individual factors can lead to socially sensitive research as the implications of the findings could suggest a person's race, age, gender, disability, etc cause behaviours/ can cause stigma and discrimination. - By suggesting behaviour is due to the personal characteristics and traits of an individual, the possibility that the environment/ other people have an effect on people's behaviour is ignored. it is reductionist. Discussion of Situational explanations - Situational explanations are supported by the social/ developmental area. - Suggests behaviour is predictable, so researchers can establish cause and effect. - Allows for prediction and control/infers that behaviour can be changed by improving the environment. - Recognises that people cannot always be held responsible for their actions.	15	12-15 marks - 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) of 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. 8-11 marks - For a good and 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. 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. 4-7 marks - For a limited discussion that is has some relevancy to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the points raised. There is evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. Evidence may be 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 - 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 is rarely appropriate. 0 marks – No creditworthy response. NB. Maximum of 8 without clear evaluation/discussion of the debate If only describing the debate, maximum of 2 marks If only evaluating the debate with no core study evidence cap at 7 marks

			• By suggesting behaviour is caused by the environment/ people in the surrounding environment, ignores the possibility that people's individual personality characteristics/ traits can have significant effects on their behaviour, i.e. it is reductionist. • By suggesting behaviour is caused by the situation personal responsibility is removed. • Other appropriate points should be credited. Evidence can be cited from any core study that supports the side of the debate under consideration.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Section C – Practical Applications

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(a)	From Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study, outline what 'diffusion of responsibility' means and how it relates to this article. <u>Diffusion of responsibility:</u> Setting: • More people present reduces help • Larger groups of bystanders lowers the chance of help Influence on behaviour: • Responsibility for helping is spread among those present • Less personal responsibility as expect others to help <u>Possible links to article:</u> • Large number of bystanders to the incident which happened at a train station, no one else helped as they believed others present would help the man who had a seizure • The responsibility of helping the man who fell onto the tracks was shared by 'many American bystanders' • Other appropriate outlines/links to the article should be credited.	3	3 marks – For a good answer that shows A clear understanding of 'diffusion of responsibility' including: • Reference to the situation 'more people reducing help' • Reference to how the setting influences an individual 'responsibility is shared/ expect others to help'. • A clear, accurate link to the article. 2 marks – For a reasonable answer that includes two of the three points 1 mark – For a basic answer that either shows a basic understanding of diffusion of responsibility Or Implies a link of diffusion of responsibility to the article 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(b)	From Levine et al.'s (2001) study of cross-cultural altruism, outline what 'simpatia' means and how it relates to this article. <u>Answers could include:</u> <u>Simpatia</u> • Simpatia is a cultural value where a culture favours helping and friendly behaviour • This cultural value is a norm in countries such as in Brazil, Mexico, El Salvador, Costa Rica or Spain • As opposed to non-simpatia countries such as America. <u>Possible links to article:</u> • In this article Carlos Ramirez is from Madrid in Spain which has a culture of simpatia which could explain why he was more likely to offer help than someone from New York. Other appropriate outlines/links to the article should be credited.	3	3 marks – For a good answer that shows: • A clear understanding of 'simpatia' (<i>cultural value</i> of friendly, nice, agreeable etc., over productivity, self) • Further elaboration of simpatia i.e. cultures with/ without the value • A clear and accurate link to the article. 2 marks – For a reasonable answer that shows: • An understanding of the term 'simpatia' e.g. friendly/helpful culture • A link to the article. 1 mark – For a basic answer that: Either: • Merely defines the term 'simpatia', i.e. there is no attempt to link to the article. Or: • Shows some understanding of the term 'simpatia' with the use of the article but it is implied rather than explicit. 0 marks – No or incorrect answer.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(c)	Explain how this article relates to the social area of psychology. Support your answer with evidence from the article. <u>Likely answers:</u> <u>Social area:</u> The social area holds that the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others (1) Good understanding The social area looks at how people interact with one another and how their behaviour can be influenced by others. (1) Good understanding The social area looks at how people communicate with each other, how they interact and how they behave in groups (1) It therefore looks at the behaviour of the individual within a context of interrelationships with others. (1) Developed understanding <u>Possible links to article:</u> There were a large number of bystanders on the subway when the man fell (what) and none of the American bystanders helped (who) On the platform in New York a young man had an epileptic seizure and rolled on to the track' (what) This led Carlos to demonstrate altruistic behaviour (who) Other appropriate explanations and links to article should be credited.	4	2 marks for a clear and accurate explanation showing a developed understanding of the social area 1 mark for an explanation showing a good understanding of the social area <i>Plus</i> 2 marks clear and relevant link using supporting evidence of why the article could be placed in the social area (what and who). 1 mark for a weak but relevant link using supporting evidence of why the article could be placed in the social area (who or what) 0 marks – No creditworthy information.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(d)	Outline the results from Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study and briefly explain how these results may relate to the article. Support your answer with evidence from the article. The cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) The drunk victim received spontaneous help 50% of the time (19/38 trials). White victims received spontaneous help 100% / Black victims spontaneous help 86% In all but 3 cane trials the victim received help before the model stepped in, Less spontaneous help was given in drunk condition/more spontaneous help was given in cane condition Median time for help in non-model trials was 5 seconds for cane and 109 seconds for drunk Results differed between teams of models and victims In 60% of (81) cane trials the victim received help from more than one person (no difference in race or drunk/ill victims) 90% of first helpers were males (60% of those in CA were male) 64% of first helpers were white Slight same race helping: 68% of spontaneous helper with white victims were white/ 50% of spontaneous helpers of black victims were white In drunk condition mostly black people helped the black victim. The early model elicited more help (9 times) than the later model (3) The critical area model elicited the same as the adjacent area model No one left the car on any trial On 21 of 103 trials (22%) someone left the critical area No diffusion of responsibility was found, response times were faster with larger groups. People left the area in a higher proportion of drunk trials than cane trials	7	<u>For the outline of the results of Piliavin al.'s study:</u> 5 marks – For an accurate outline of at least 5 different results or up to 3 results (2 elaborated) 4 marks – For an accurate outline of at least 4 different results (or 2 elaborated) 3 marks - For an accurate outline of at least 3 different results (or two results with one elaborated) 2 marks - For an accurate outline of at least 2 different results or one elaborated result 1 mark - For an accurate outline of at least one result 0 marks – no creditworthy response. PLUS <u>For application to the article:</u> 2 marks - For a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly explained. 1 mark - For a relevant link which is briefly explained 0 marks – no creditworthy response. NB. Exact quantitative findings are not required if suitable descriptions of the findings are given.

			People were more likely to leave area if help not given before 70 seconds Slightly more people left the area with the black victim than white victim • Examples of comments (mostly from women): 'It's for men to help him', 'I wish I could help him—I'm not strong enough', 'I never saw this kind of thing before—I don't know where to look'. You feel so bad that you don't know what to do • More comments from passengers in the drunk than the cane trials. • More comments were made if no help was given within 70 seconds. <i>Links to article:</i> • Individuals are often willing to help those they see in need of help, regardless of race or colour. Carlos Ramirez was a white man who put himself at tremendous risk as he tried to save a young black man who fell on the train track. (links to results about race) • Spontaneous help was seen in the article as Carlos 'impulsively jumped down to save the young man', (links to results about spontaneous help found) • Other appropriate results /links to the article should be credited.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
10 (e)	Using your psychological knowledge, suggest and explain at least two ways in which individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. <u>Likely suggestions:</u> • Use of positive reinforcement (rewards)/a token economy, e.g., medals, certificates, tokens to show helping others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds acceptable • Vicarious reinforcement, e.g., adverts/websites, TV programmes, books, etc showing how individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. • Use of observational learning/modelling, e.g., using popular celebrities and characters to show how individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. • Punishment, e.g., punishing individuals/children who fail to give help to others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds., e.g. fine those who don't help, prevent play times, deny those who don't help going on school/works trips, etc. • CBT/changing attitudes/schemas, e.g., individuals see that the benefits of being helping those from diverse social and cultural backgrounds outweigh the costs. • Other appropriate suggestions based on psychological knowledge should be credited.	8	7-8 marks - A good standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (<i>how</i>). <u>At least two suggestions</u> are covered. 5-6 marks - A reasonable standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). The suggestions are mostly accurate and some vague details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (<i>how</i>). <u>Two suggestions</u> are covered. 3-4 marks – A limited knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). This may be implicit rather than explicit. The suggestions are somewhat vague and lack in detail relation to how they might be implemented (<i>how</i>). 1-2 marks – A basic knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions, possibly with little or no information relating to either the (<i>why</i>) or the (<i>how</i>). The suggestions will have limited accuracy. 0 marks – No creditworthy information. 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
10	(f)	*	Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (e) using your knowledge of psychology. Evaluation might refer to: • Usefulness (including practicality, funding issues, effectiveness, appropriateness). • Ecological validity/validity. • Reliability. • Ethics. • Social sensitivity. • Scientific methodology. • Nature/nurture. • Freewill/determinism. • Individual/situational. • Other appropriate issues should be considered and credited accordingly.	10	GOOD 9-10 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. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e. More than one suggestion is evaluated. REASONABLE 6-8 marks for demonstrating reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments coherently presented in the main with reasonable understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e. LIMITED 3-5 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. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e. BASIC 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. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e. 0 marks – No creditworthy response. N.B. • If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be awarded. If only one evaluation point is made but is done well it can achieve a maximum of 4 marks. Award marks in line with the descriptors. • Make sure points credited in 10(e) are not double-credited in this question part, e.g. double-crediting the purpose of the suggested improvement. • Make sure evaluation points refer to improvements that have been suggested in 10(e), i.e. are not new suggestions which the candidate then evaluates.

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.