



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Wednesday 21 May 2025 – Morning

A Level Psychology

H567/02 Psychological themes through core studies

Time allowed: 2 hours

No extra materials are needed.



Please write clearly in black ink. **Do not write in the barcodes.**

Centre number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate number

--	--	--	--

First name(s) StemUp Model Solution

Last name _____

INSTRUCTIONS

- Use black ink.
- Write your answer to each question in the space provided. If you need extra space use the lined pages at the end of this booklet. The question numbers must be clearly shown.
- Answer **all** the questions.

INFORMATION

- The total mark for this paper is **105**.
- The marks for each question are shown in brackets [].
- Quality of extended response will be assessed in questions marked with an asterisk (*).
- This document has **20** pages.

ADVICE

- Read each question carefully before you start your answer.

Section A

Core studies

1

- (a) Outline **one** 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.

One difference is the size of the samples. Bandura et al. used a large sample of 72 children, 36 boys and 36 girls, who all attended the Stanford University nursery school in the USA. Chaney et al. used a much smaller sample of only 32 children, 22 boys and 10 girls, who were asthmatic children recruited from clinics in Australia. Bandura's children were aged 3 years 1 month to 5 years 9 months (mean 4 years 4 months), whereas Chaney's were aged 1.5 to 6 years with a mean age of 3.2 years.

[3]

- (b) Outline **one** 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.

Bandura et al. used an independent measures design (with matched pairs) whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design. In Bandura's study each child took part in only one condition; they saw either an aggressive model, a non-aggressive model or no model, and the groups were matched on their pre-rated levels of aggression. In Chaney's study every child took part in both conditions, as their medical compliance was measured first using their usual standard pMDI inhaler and then again after using the Funhaler, so each child acted as their own control.

[3]

2 With reference to Kohlberg's (1968) study into the stages of moral development:

(a) Give **two** reasons why children at the preconventional level say that Heinz should **not** have stolen the drug for his wife.

1 *Because he would be punished by the authorities, for example by being sent to prison, as stealing breaks the law.*

2 *Because stealing would not benefit Heinz himself; he would gain no reward and would only end up condemning himself.*

[2]

(b) Outline **one** conclusion that can be drawn from the findings of Kohlberg's study.

One conclusion is that the stages of moral development are sequential and invariant. Every child passes through the stages one at a time and always in the same order, and although children progress at different rates and may stop at any stage, no stage can be skipped. This pattern appeared in all the cultures studied (USA, Mexico, Taiwan, Turkey and Yucatan), so the sequence appears to be universal.

[2]

3 Outline the background to Moray's (1959) study into auditory attention.

Moray's study was based on the idea of selective attention. The world contains far more sensory information than our perceptual and cognitive systems can process, so we have to attend to some information and tune out the rest (Broadbent, 1958). Cherry (1953) investigated the 'cocktail party effect', where people can tune in to one voice or conversation in a noisy room while filtering out the others. Using dichotic listening tasks in which participants shadowed (repeated aloud) a message played to one ear, Cherry found they could remember almost nothing about the content of the rejected message in the other ear, only its physical features such as whether it was a human voice. Moray wanted to build on Cherry's work and test whether this attentional barrier could be broken through by an important message, such as hearing your own name.

[4]

4 Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory was a laboratory experiment.

(a) Describe **one** strength of using a laboratory experiment in this study.

One strength of a laboratory experiment is that a standardised procedure can be used so that every participant is treated in exactly the same way. In Grant et al.'s study all participants wore headphones, read the same two-page psychoimmunology article, had the same two-minute break and then completed the same 10 short-answer and 16 multiple-choice questions, so the only thing that differed was the noise condition. [2]

(b) Outline **two** features of the procedure in this study.

- 1 *Participants were randomly allocated to one of four conditions (silent-silent, silent-noisy, noisy-noisy or noisy-silent) so that they studied and were tested in either matching or mismatching conditions. All wore headphones, and in the noisy conditions they heard a tape of background noise recorded in a university cafeteria at a moderately loud level, while in the silent conditions they heard nothing.*
- 2 *Participants read an article on psychoimmunology once, having been told they would be tested on it, and were allowed to highlight or underline as they read. After a two-minute break they completed a 10-item short-answer recall test followed by a 16-item multiple-choice recognition test, and were then debriefed about the aim of the study.*

[4]

- 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'.

The key theme is about how people respond to those in authority. In Bocchiaro's study the authority figure was a researcher at VU University Amsterdam who asked participants to write a persuasive statement encouraging other students to take part in an unethical sensory deprivation study, and participants could report him to an ethics committee. The findings showed that most people obey authority even when the request is unethical: 76.5% obeyed and wrote the statement, 14.1% disobeyed and only 9.4% blew the whistle. This was very different from how people predicted they would respond, as only 3.6% of the comparison group said they would obey and 64.5% said they would whistle-blow. No HEXACO-PI-R personality trait predicted who would obey, so responses to authority depend more on the situation than on disposition. [3]

- 6 Briefly discuss the extent to which the findings of Maguire et al.'s (2000) study on taxi drivers can be considered valid.

The findings can be considered valid in several ways. First, the study had high internal validity because the 16 London taxi drivers were compared with a control group of 50 non-taxi-driver males matched on gender, handedness, age range and good physical and psychological health, so differences in hippocampal volume are unlikely to be caused by these variables. Second, the measurements were objective: the MRI scans were analysed using two independent techniques, VBM and pixel counting, and the pixel counting was carried out by a researcher who was blind to whether a scan came from a taxi driver or a control, which removes researcher bias. Hippocampal volume is also not something participants can fake, so demand characteristics cannot affect the results. However, the study was a quasi-experiment because the researchers could not manipulate who became a taxi driver, so it cannot prove that navigation experience caused the larger posterior hippocampus, although the positive correlation between years spent driving and right posterior volume strongly suggests this. Overall the findings are largely valid. [5]

- 7 Explain why Hancock et al.'s (2011) study into the language of psychopaths can be placed in the individual differences area.

The individual differences area studies how people differ from each other, particularly those whose behaviour falls outside the normal or expected range, and it tries to measure these differences. Hancock et al.'s study fits this area because it compared the language of 14 psychopathic murderers with 38 non-psychopathic murderers (classified using the PCL-R) as they described their crimes. They found that psychopaths used more subordinating conjunctions such as 'because', showing they viewed their crime on a more primitive but rational level, and used more words about basic needs such as food, drink and money, whereas non-psychopaths used more words about family and religion. Psychopaths also used less emotionally intense language. This shows measurable differences between psychopaths and other people, and that their language is not 'normal' or typical, which is what the individual differences area is about. [3]

- 8 Explain why Gould (1982) considered Yerkes' research using IQ testing to be ethnocentric.

Ethnocentrism means judging other cultures by the standards of your own and assuming your own culture's norms apply to everyone. Gould argued that Yerkes' Army mental tests (Alpha, Beta and individual tests) were ethnocentric because they assumed a test written for white Americans was valid for people from other countries. The tests relied on knowledge specific to American culture: recruits had to recognise a tennis court and a light bulb, know what Crisco is and how many legs a Kaffir has, and many recent immigrants had never held a pencil before. Immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, such as Russians, Poles and Italians, were unfamiliar with this content and so scored badly, and many who failed the Alpha were never given the Beta or an individual test as the rules required. As a result these groups were wrongly labelled as having low intelligence, with the 'darker peoples' of Europe ranked lowest, even though scores rose with years lived in America, showing the tests measured familiarity with US culture. These biased results were then used to support the 1924 Immigration Restriction Act. [4]

Section B

Areas, perspectives and debates

9

- (a) Explain **one** application of the cognitive area of psychology.

One application of the cognitive area is improving the way police officers and lawyers question eyewitnesses. In interviews, police are trained to avoid leading questions and to use open questions such as 'describe what you saw' rather than suggesting details, and the cognitive interview asks witnesses to mentally reinstate the context of the event and report everything they remember. This is done because the cognitive area views memory as an active, reconstructive process: information received after an event, such as the wording of a question, can be combined with the original memory and distort it. Loftus and Palmer showed this when participants asked how fast the cars were going when they 'smashed' into each other gave higher speed estimates (40.5 mph) than those given the verb 'contacted' (31.8 mph), and a week later the 'smashed' group were more than twice as likely to report seeing broken glass that was never there. Removing leading questions therefore increases the accuracy of testimony and helps to prevent wrongful convictions. [4]

- (b) Outline ways in which the biological area can be considered scientific. Support your answer with evidence from any appropriate core studies.

One way the biological area is scientific is that it uses controlled laboratory experiments with specialist equipment to produce objective, quantitative data. Sperry tested his split-brain patients in a laboratory using a tachistoscope that presented images to one visual field for only a tenth of a second, so he could precisely control which hemisphere received the information, and he objectively recorded whether patients could name or draw the stimulus. Casey et al. used fMRI scanning while participants completed a go/no-go task with happy and fearful faces, giving objective measurements of activity in the right inferior frontal gyrus and ventral striatum, and reaction times and false alarm rates were recorded quantitatively rather than relying on self-report.

A second way is that the area produces clear, falsifiable hypotheses and tests them by manipulating an independent variable so that cause and effect can be established. Blakemore and Cooper predicted that visual experience would shape the development of the visual cortex and tested this by raising kittens in either a horizontally or vertically striped environment from birth; they then recorded the orientation preferences of neurons in the visual cortex and found none responded to the orientation the kitten had never seen, showing the environment caused the change.

A third way is that biological studies use standardised procedures and objective measures that are replicable and free from bias. Maguire et al. scanned all participants with the same MRI scanner and analysed the scans with two independent techniques, VBM and pixel counting, and the pixel counter was blind to whether each scan came from a taxi driver or a control, so the finding of a larger posterior hippocampus in taxi drivers is reliable and could be repeated.

[8]

- (c) Compare the biological area with the social area. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies.

One similarity between the biological area and the social area is that both can use experiments and collect quantitative data. Blakemore and Cooper manipulated the kittens' visual environment (horizontal or vertical stripes) and measured the number of neurons responding to each orientation, while Milgram measured the percentage of participants giving the maximum 450 volt shock (65%) and Piliavin et al. recorded the frequency and speed of helping on the subway. However, the biological area usually uses laboratory experiments in highly controlled settings, such as Sperry's tachistoscope tasks, whereas the social area often uses field experiments in real settings, such as Piliavin's New York subway or Levine's helping measures on city streets, so social research tends to have higher ecological validity but less control.

One difference is the side of the nature/nurture debate that each area supports. The biological area explains behaviour in terms of innate physical factors: Sperry showed that the different functions of the two hemispheres depend on brain structure and Casey et al. found that differences in self-control were linked to activity in the inferior frontal gyrus and were stable over 40 years. The social area explains behaviour through the influence of other people and the situation: Milgram showed that the presence of an authority figure made ordinary people obey, and Levine et al. found that helping rates varied with the culture of the city, for example 93% in Rio de Janeiro compared with 45% in New York.

Another difference is that research in the social area tends to raise more ethical issues than the biological area. Milgram deceived participants about the shocks and caused extreme stress, and Piliavin's passengers could not give informed consent or withdraw, whereas Maguire's taxi drivers and Sperry's patients gave full consent and were not deceived, although Blakemore and Cooper's kittens did suffer harm.

- (d)* Discuss the individual/situational explanations debate in psychology. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies. [15]

The individual/situational debate asks whether behaviour is best explained by factors inside the person, such as personality, genes, cognition and brain structure, or by the situation they are in, such as the presence of other people, the environment and social norms. Individual explanations are supported mainly by the biological, cognitive and individual differences areas, whereas situational explanations are supported by the social and developmental areas.

There is strong evidence for the situational explanation. Milgram found that 65% of ordinary American men gave what they believed were 450 volt shocks to another person simply because an authority figure in a lab coat at Yale told them to, even though psychiatrists had predicted that fewer than 1 in 1000 would do so. This shows that the situation, not the personality of the participants, produced the behaviour. Similarly, Bandura et al. showed that children exposed to an aggressive adult model imitated the aggression towards the Bobo doll, whereas those who saw a non-aggressive model showed very little aggression, so the behaviour was learned from the environment. Piliavin et al. found that whether a victim received help depended on situational factors such as whether he appeared ill (cane) or drunk, with help given on 95% of cane trials but only 50% of drunk trials.

A strength of situational explanations is that they suggest behaviour is predictable, so psychologists can establish cause and effect and develop useful applications: if we know that environments cause behaviour, we can change the environment, for example by teaching people to resist authority or by removing violent role models from children's television. They also recognise that people cannot always be held fully responsible for their actions, which is more humane. However, situational explanations are reductionist because they ignore individual differences. Even in Milgram's study 35% of participants refused to continue, and in Bocchiaro's study 9.4% blew the whistle while 76.5% obeyed in exactly the same situation, which shows that something about the individual must explain why people respond differently. Situational explanations can also be seen as removing personal responsibility, which could be used to excuse behaviour such as aggression or obedience to unethical orders.

There is also strong evidence for individual explanations. Hancock et al. found that psychopathic murderers used more words about basic needs such as food and money and less emotionally intense language than non-psychopathic murderers when describing the same type of crime, suggesting their behaviour comes from a dispositional characteristic. Casey et al. showed that people who had been low delayers as children in the marshmallow test were still less able to resist tempting stimuli 40 years later and showed different activity in the inferior frontal gyrus and ventral striatum, implying a stable individual trait. Baron-Cohen et al. found that adults with autism scored lower on the Eyes test, showing a deficit in theory of mind that lies within the individual.

A strength of individual explanations is that they recognise free will and give people responsibility for their actions, and they lead to applications that focus on the person, such as CBT to change faulty cognitions or targeted help for individuals with low self-control. However, individual explanations can be socially sensitive and lead to stigma, as Gould's review of Yerkes showed: attributing low IQ scores to the innate inferiority of immigrants and black soldiers, rather than to culturally biased tests, led to discrimination and the 1924 Immigration Restriction Act. They are also reductionist because they ignore the fact that the environment can change behaviour, for example Blakemore and Cooper showed that the brain itself develops according to the environment the kittens were raised in.

In conclusion, the most convincing position is an interactionist one. Bocchiaro's finding that no HEXACO personality trait predicted obedience suggests the situation is powerful, but the variation in behaviour within the same situation shows dispositional factors matter too.

Behaviour is best explained as the product of an individual with particular traits responding to a particular situation, and psychologists should consider both when developing explanations and applications.

13
BLANK PAGE

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS PAGE

Turn over for the next question

Section C

Practical applications

© psychologytoday.com, Psychology Today. Item removed due to third party copyright restrictions. Link to material - www.psychologytoday.com/gb/blog/out-the-darkness/201310/why-do-human-beings-do-good-things-the-puzzle-altruism

10

- (a) From Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study, outline what 'diffusion of responsibility' means **and** how it relates to this article.

Diffusion of responsibility is the idea that the more people who are present when someone needs help, the less likely any one of them is to help. This is because the responsibility for helping is shared among all the bystanders, so each person feels less personal responsibility and assumes that somebody else will step in. Piliavin et al. expected to find this on the subway but found that help was actually faster when more people were in the carriage. The article relates to this because on the New York platform there was a large number of American bystanders when the young man had an epileptic seizure and rolled onto the track, yet none of them helped; each of them probably expected one of the many others present to act, leaving Carlos as the only person to take responsibility. [3]

- (b) From Levine et al.'s (2001) study of cross-cultural altruism, outline what 'simpatia' means and how it relates to this article.

Simpatia is a cultural value found in Spanish and Latin American countries such as Spain, Brazil, Mexico, Costa Rica and El Salvador, where being friendly, polite, agreeable and helpful towards others, including strangers, is expected social behaviour and is valued more highly than productivity or self-interest. Levine et al. found that cities in simpatia cultures were among the most helpful in their study, whereas cities in non-simpatia cultures such as New York in the USA were among the least helpful. This relates to the article because Carlos Ramirez, who impulsively jumped down to save the young man, came from Madrid in Spain, a simpatia culture, which may explain why he helped when the New Yorkers around him did not.

[3]

- (c) Explain how this article relates to the social area of psychology. Support your answer with evidence from the article.

The social area holds that people's thoughts, feelings and behaviour are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of other people. It looks at how people interact and communicate with each other and how they behave in groups and in different social situations, so it studies the individual within a context of relationships with others rather than in isolation. The article relates to the social area because it is about how people behave towards others in a social situation. A young man had an epileptic seizure and rolled onto the track at a New York subway station in front of many bystanders. The presence of this crowd seems to have influenced the Americans' behaviour, as none of them helped, while Carlos Ramirez showed altruistic behaviour by jumping down to save a stranger who was in danger. The article also explains his helping in terms of his cultural background, which is a social influence.

[4]

- (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.

Piliavin et al. found that the victim with a cane received spontaneous help, before the model acted, on 95% of trials (62 out of 65), whereas the drunk victim received spontaneous help on only 50% of trials (19 out of 38), and the median time for help was 5 seconds in the cane condition compared with 109 seconds in the drunk condition. The race of the victim made little difference to the cane victim, but in the drunk condition the black victim received less help and was mostly helped by black passengers, showing a slight same-race effect. 90% of first helpers were male even though only 60% of passengers in the critical area were men, and in 60% of trials the victim was helped by more than one person. The early model (70 seconds) produced more help than the late model, and there was no evidence of diffusion of responsibility: help came faster when there were more bystanders. Nobody left the carriage, although in 22% of trials someone left the critical area, and this was more likely in the drunk trials. Comments such as 'It's for men to help him' were made mostly by women. These results relate to the article because Carlos acted spontaneously and impulsively, jumping down within seconds to help someone who was clearly ill rather than drunk, just as people helped the cane victim quickly. He was also a male first helper, matching the finding that men were most likely to help. The article does differ in that the many American bystanders did not help, whereas Piliavin found no diffusion of responsibility, and Carlos, a white man, helped a young black man, which supports the finding that help was often given regardless of race.

[7]

- (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.

One way to encourage people to help others from diverse backgrounds is through observational learning, based on Bandura et al.'s social learning theory. Governments and charities could run advertising campaigns, TV programmes and school assemblies in which popular celebrities and characters that children and adults identify with are shown helping people of different ethnicities, religions and social classes, for example a well-known footballer helping an elderly immigrant who has collapsed in the street. Bandura showed that children who watched an adult model behave aggressively imitated that behaviour, and that imitation is stronger when the model is the same sex or admired. If people repeatedly see admired models helping people from other cultures, they will form a mental representation of this behaviour and imitate it when they meet a similar situation.

A second way is to use positive and vicarious reinforcement, based on operant conditioning. Schools could run a token economy in which pupils earn tokens or house points every time they are seen helping a classmate from a different cultural group, and the tokens are exchanged for rewards such as certificates, trips or prizes, while workplaces and councils could award medals and publicise 'good citizen' awards for people who help strangers. Behaviour that is rewarded is more likely to be repeated, and seeing others rewarded for helping (vicarious reinforcement, as in Bandura's later work) also increases the chance of imitation, so helping across cultures becomes a habit.

A third way is to change people's attitudes and cost-reward thinking using cognitive techniques. Piliavin's arousal cost-reward model suggests people do not help when the costs of helping, such as fear of being hurt or embarrassment, outweigh the rewards. Training sessions and first-aid courses could teach people simple, safe ways to help, for example how to deal with a seizure, and could challenge stereotypes about other groups through mixed-group contact, reducing the perceived cost of helping and increasing empathy for people from different backgrounds.

[8]

(f)* Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (e) using your knowledge of psychology.

A strength of the modelling campaigns is that they are supported by strong experimental evidence. Bandura's study was a controlled laboratory experiment with 72 children in matched groups, and it showed a clear cause and effect relationship between watching a model and imitating the behaviour, so there is good reason to expect that admired models helping people from other cultures would be imitated. Campaigns are also practical and cheap to deliver on a large scale through television, social media and schools. However, Bandura's findings have low ecological validity: the children imitated aggression towards a Bobo doll in an artificial nursery, and it does not follow that adults who watch an advert will intervene in a real emergency such as a man falling onto a subway track, where the costs of helping are far higher. Helping may also be situational: Piliavin's results suggest that whether people help depends on the victim's appearance and the setting, so a model seen on television may have little effect in the moment, and the effect of a campaign is hard to measure.

The token economy and reward schemes are useful because they are easy to implement in schools and the behaviour can be measured objectively by counting tokens, making it possible to test whether the scheme works, and operant conditioning has a strong scientific basis. However, rewarding helping may create extrinsic motivation, so people help only when there is a reward and an audience, and the behaviour may stop when rewards are withdrawn, meaning it is not genuinely altruistic. It would also be impractical to reward adults for helping strangers in everyday life, since nobody is there to observe them, so the scheme may not generalise beyond the classroom.

Deciding which groups count as 'diverse' is also socially sensitive and could create stigma or resentment.

The cost-reward training is more useful for real emergencies because it reduces the actual costs of helping: a person who knows how to deal with a seizure safely is more likely to act, which fits Piliavin's finding that the ill victim was helped far more than the drunk victim because the costs seemed lower. However, it relies on people choosing to attend training, which is expensive to provide widely and may attract only those already willing to help. It also assumes people weigh costs and rewards rationally, whereas Carlos in the article acted impulsively, and Levine's research suggests cultural values such as *simpatia* shape helping in ways short training may not change.

Overall the suggestions are most likely to work in combination, as each targets a different cause of not helping.

[10]

END OF QUESTION PAPER

[illegible]

Copyright Information

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third-party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

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

stemup.co.uk