



Examiners Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel

GCE Psychology 8PS0/02

Paper 2: Biological Psychology and Learning
Theories

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

June 2025

Publications Code 8PS0_02

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

The examination structure provided a range of question types over two main sections, Biological Psychology and Learning Theories. The final question required an extended response requiring candidates to address a question that covers both biological psychology and learning theories.

Candidates' overall coverage of both biological and learning was again consistent across the whole of the paper. There were very few unanswered questions and many of the questions were attempted in some detail, which benefitted the candidates when accessing level based higher marks.

Skill application across both areas was comparable to previous years and reflected that candidates were prepared for most areas that the specification covers. Knowledge and understanding in several areas did impede students' awareness of what the question was asking resulting in a restricted number of marks being awarded. Candidates seemed to manage their time well and centres must be congratulated on their continuing development in preparing candidates for this 1 hour 30-minute paper.

Application of scenarios again showed improvement for some and reflected a growing awareness that some candidates had of applying scenarios within their answers in a clearer format than previous series. This was improved on extended response questions. Some answers provided excellent knowledge and understanding of the question but failed to apply any areas asked for by the question, resulting in generic responses. This was seen in some practical questions.

Longer responses were generally well attempted, especially the evaluate taxonomy driven one - as expected with a continuing development towards understanding key taxonomy and what the question is truly asking. Conclusions embedded within answers for some candidates supported their answers, allowing them to access higher marks. Candidates who achieved higher marks supported their answers with research studies, theories, application, amongst other areas – especially in the 12-mark question.

There was a consistent awareness in candidates' understanding of most command verbs on this paper, continued refinement would support all moving forward.

Centres are directed to the support materials available online, which explore the various question types for questions in the examination and the taxonomy for each question type. The remainder of this Examiners' Report focuses on each individual question and gives specific examples.

The aim is to highlight areas of good practice and illustrate some common errors and thereby be used to help prepare candidates for future 8PS0 02 examinations.

Candidates should be reminded to write only within the spaces provided. Additional paper should be used whenever extra writing space is required.

Comments on Individual Questions and Examiner Comments

Section A – Biological Psychology

Question 1a

Many candidates were able to complete Table 1 with the correct name of the different parts of the central nervous system (CNS). Well answered responses included the neuron and neurotransmitter. Synaptic transmission was less well answered.

Some candidates attempted the question adding in other areas from biological, not specific to the definitions or central nervous system. Access to marks was clear in terms of the taxonomy of the question which nearly all were able to attempt.

- 1 (a) Complete **Table 1** with the name of the correct part of the central nervous system (CNS) in the space provided.

(3)

Definition	Part of the central nervous system (CNS)
These can be sensory, motor or relay. They transmit signals to different parts of the body.	neurons
The process by which one neuron / nerve cell communicates with another.	synaptic transmission
These are chemical messengers that support communication within the nervous system (NS).	neurotransmitters

Table 1

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 3 marks for a correct completion of naming all three parts of the central nervous system (CNS).

Question 1b

Candidates produced a variety of responses mostly focusing on two weaknesses of PET scans, however there was some confusion in candidate answers in the differences between fMRI, PET and CAT scanning techniques. Stronger candidate answers focused on comparisons to other scanning techniques or ethical issues such as distress.

At times, candidates' answers were fully developed, providing a thorough AO1 identification of the weakness followed by clear justification of it, which resulted in 2 marks being awarded. A significant number of candidates were able to grasp the AO1 mark for the identification of the weakness of the PET scan, however, justification was not expanded indicating a lack of understanding on the part of candidates.

This meant that candidates could not always be awarded the AO3 mark as their answers did not have the elaboration to explain why it was an actual weakness.

(b) Explain **two** weaknesses of the PET brain-scanning technique. (4)

1 PET brain scanning technique can be unethical as it uses the method of a radioactive substance being injected into the body

2

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 1 mark.

The candidate has identified one weakness of a PET scan as unethical as it uses a radioactive substance but does not justify their weakness with ethical development for the second mark.

Question 2a

Some candidates struggled at times to access marks on this question. For some, their knowledge of volunteer sampling was accurate but hindered in terms of marks awarded due to the generic nature of their answers.

Stronger answers identified a description of how Amari could use volunteer sampling to gather her sample through advertising a poster or equivalent, not all answers were developed for a second mark, leading to the second mark not being awarded.

Only a minority of candidates did not attempt this question. Moving forwards some candidates would benefit from additional practice of scenario-based questions like this.

(a) Describe how Amari could use a ~~volunteer sampling~~ technique to gather her sample. (2)

Amari could put up posters around her college, explaining the aim and briefly procedure (self report questionnaire) for example) asking for volunteers and leaving contact information for any people who wish to be a part of the study investigating the effect of time of year on emotional well being to gather her sample.

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 2 marks.

This response gets 2 marks as there is a clear description of volunteer sampling in context to the scenario in addition to a second descriptive mark for contact information for those who wish to take part in the emotional wellbeing study.

Question 2b

Candidates who were prepared for this type of question answered it very well, successfully providing the calculations needed for 4 marks to the requirements of the question.

The completion of columns D and D² were completed correctly by many candidates, although inaccuracies in calculations meant candidates lost marks later in their answers. Only a minority of candidates did not attempt this question, and centres must be congratulated on their continued hard work in ensuring their candidates are prepared for questions like this one.

You must give your answer to **one** decimal place.

(4)

Emotional wellbeing score in the middle of summer (1-10)	Rank 1	Emotional wellbeing score in the middle of winter (1-10)	Rank 2	d	d ²
3	2.5	7	4.5	-2	4
3	2.5	6	3	-0.5	0.25
5	5	7	4.5	0.5	0.25
6	6	8	6	0	0
4	4	5	2	2	4
2	1	4	1	0	0
Total:					8.5

$$1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Table 3

SPACE FOR CALCULATIONS

$$1 - \frac{6 \sum 8.5}{6(6^2 - 1)}$$

$$1 - \frac{51}{210}$$

$$= 0.7571428571$$

$$= 0.8$$

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient 0.8

Examiner Comments:

The response gained 4 marks overall.
All four parts are correct, and the final answer is accurate.

Question 2c

Many candidates attempted this question with some success in terms of providing two strengths of Amari's investigation on wellbeing. Some candidates correctly identified one strength of Amari's investigation but failed to develop a second strength. Some candidates attempted two strengths but at times one or both strengths were generic, failing to link any aspects of Amari's scenario into their answers.

Candidates who did provide clear reference to Amari's investigation did not always go on to justify their strengths in full for additional marks. The most successful candidates referred clearly to the standardised use of the same questionnaire, quantitative data use, amongst others relating closely to Amari's investigation. These were then sometimes successfully related to reliability, practical application, amongst other acceptable points.

(c) Explain **two** strengths of Amari's investigation.

(4)

- 1 One strength of Amari's investigation is standardised procedure, this is because she used the same self-report questionnaire with the same scale for all her participants, making her results more consistent and reliable, based on their rating on a scale of 1 to 10 on emotional wellbeing.
- 2 Another strength of Amari's investigation is that as it's a questionnaire with set scale, her results will be objective as ~~as~~ there is no interpretation for a number, this would make her results more valid on emotional wellbeing and not affected by researcher bias / interpretation.

Examiner Comments:

This response gets 4 marks.

The candidate has identified a strength of the standardised procedure using the same questionnaire which they go on to justify with a clear link. Their second weakness identified objectivity of the number scale which is justified with not affected by research biased and more valid; again linked.

Question 2d

Some candidates were able to identify at least one improvement to Amari's investigation on wellbeing, however many of these were either generic or not focused on the requirements of the question. Candidates who were able to identify an improvement in relation to Amari's investigation often could not justify their answer for any further marks.

Several candidates provided answers that incorporated weaknesses of Amari's investigation, the question clearly asks for two improvements – therefore could not be credited for their answers. Stronger candidates would apply their improvements to Amari's investigation including diversifying her sample, improvements to the rating scale, amongst others. They then went onto justify their answers with reference to, for example, population validity, representativeness, objectivity, amongst other justification options.

(d) Explain **two** improvements that Amari could make to her investigation.

(4)

1 ~~As she~~ ASK more open ended question to understand why they think that way.

2 use a random sample or stractified to so, that individuals are more anonymous and honest.

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 0 mark.

This candidate fails to identify or justify an improvement in relation to the context so gets no marks.

Question 3

Many candidates provided answers for twin studies e.g., Gottesman and Shields, Brendgen etc. The most common and well answered tended to select knowledge from sampling, matching of controls, validity and applications to society, amongst other points in their responses.

The best answers successfully incorporated AO1 and AO3 points throughout their answer, in addition to providing a balance of strengths and weaknesses in terms of their chosen twin study.

Some candidates' answers were affected by a lack of clear reference to AO1 knowledge from their chosen twin study, either describing the study without reference to AO3 or evaluating the study without reference to the knowledge. Balance in some candidate answers again limited their level in addition to an absence of logical chains of reasoning which then could not always be presented in a balanced conclusion.

As a levels-based question, it is important to note that an AO1/AO3 response was required which needed to show equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding versus evaluation and conclusion. Therefore, those candidates who scored highly on both skills were able to demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of their chosen twin embedding knowledge of the study e.g., standardised controls, sample, results alongside representativeness, validity, scientific credibility, amongst others.

^{7/10}
^{ER → retest → IR}
3 Evaluate **one** twin study that you have learned about in biological psychology.

(8)

Brendgen et al is a twin study, which aimed to investigate whether aggression is genetic or environmental and if one sociotype of aggression (social or physical) lead to another. Brendgen had 322 pairs of twins, but during the longitudinal study they had sample attrition which made them have 234 pairs of twins by the 6 years. They had MZ and DZ twins that were 6 years old by the end of the study, this was a large sample, therefore, they most likely had a representative sample of twins meaning any anomalies (such as a certain pair of twins are abnormally aggressive or are bullies) will not skew the results. However, the MZ twins and

DZ twins were put into their twin category by look meaning

there was not biological test in the study to ~~make sure~~ ensure same sex

the twins were in the correct group (MZ or DZ). Therefore,

it is hard to generalise the results towards identical

twins or non-identical twins as there ~~is a~~ lack of ~~know~~ accuracy

within the sample.

Brendgens study had high inter-reliability due to the

peer and teachers ratings, ~~with high internal reliability~~ ~~for each~~ In the study, each

peer and teacher of the twins were asked to fill out

questionnaire (or circle a picture in the peer rating) with questions

such as ~~But~~ 'does that child talk badly about others?' or

'does this child start physical fights?'. Therefore, Brendgen

was able to get multiple raters for the twins to collect

data of their behaviour, ~~using standardised procedures of questionnaires~~ However, this lacked ~~internal~~ ~~validity~~ internal validity.

~~reliability~~ as Brendgen did not have control over the

subjectivity. For example, in peer ratings, the peers of the

twins may have chosen the ~~re~~ wrong twin especially

if they look ~~very~~ similar or may have chosen one of

the twins because personally they may not like them. Therefore,

~~when~~ they may not be testing aggression of the twins,

they may be testing the relationships within the classroom.

The conclusion of the study was the MZ twins scored higher on physical aggression concluding aggression is genetic but ~~se-see~~ social aggression can lead to physical aggression. This therefore, aggression can be applied to real world ~~ex~~ life as it can be linked to genetics.

In conclusion, Brendgen twin study showed that aggression does have a genetic factor and used standardised procedures of questionnaires, therefore it has high ~~inter~~ external reliability, however it is hard to generalise the results due to lack of objectivity when grouping the MZ and DZ twins.

Examiner comments:

This response gained 6 marks.

This candidate was able to demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of their chosen twin study for AO1 – Level 3. AO3 was also Level 3 with the candidate's response providing developed chains of reasoning leading to a conclusion being presented, competing arguments with some balance.

Section B – Learning Theories

Question 4a

Many candidates were able to provide knowledge of the procedure of Watson and Rayner (1920). A minority provided knowledge of procedures from other studies however this was minimal.

Stronger answers provided knowledge of the different testing using a variety of objects, the presentation of the hammer and pairing of the rat and noise – with accuracy. At time there was confusion around the stages of the procedure which for some candidates led to inaccuracies in their answers. A minority of candidates left this blank, indicating they may not have been fully prepared for this study.

4 You will have learned about the classic study by Watson and Rayner (1920).

(a) Describe the procedure of the classic study by Watson and Rayner (1920).

(3)

Little Albert was scared of a loud noise:
They presented Little Albert with a
white rat which Little Albert was fine
with but when they presented Little
Albert with the white rat and loud
noise, Little Albert ~~went~~ was scared.

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 1 mark.

The candidate has described enough content from the procedure for 1 mark.

Question 4b

Many candidates were able to grasp the AO1 mark for identifying a weakness of Watson and Rayner (1920) study. The most common answers for Watson and Rayner (1920) study focused on a lack of generalisability, artificial laboratory environment, potential distress, validity issues amongst others.

For some answers, there was a lack of justification of the weaknesses being referred to which resulted in candidates only receiving partial marks for the weaknesses. In some cases, candidates provided generic answers of Watson and Rayner (1920) study which resulted in no marks being awarded. This could indicate that candidates did not fully know the knowledge of Watson and Rayner (1920) study therefore providing any identification knowledge was challenging.

Candidates also, at times, provided inaccuracies in terms of their AO1 knowledge from the study, for example, when referring to knowledge of the procedure, setting and infant involved. This quite often then transferred into an incorrect justification, again limiting marks that candidates could access for the weaknesses.

(b) Explain **two** weaknesses of the classic study by Watson and Rayner (1920).

(4)

1 The study of Watson and Rayner is highly unethical as Albert was continuously exposed to harm. After the association between the striking loud noise and furry objects was made, upon presentation, Albert would continuously cry and crawl away, showing the study caused large amounts of emotional harm was caused to him.

2

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 2 marks.

The candidate has identified a weakness of Watson and Rayner (1920) Little Albert study in terms him showing crying behaviour which was justified with unethical harm.

Question 5

Many candidates were able to grasp the AO1 mark for identifying a strength of classical conditioning. They often referred to supporting evidence from Watson and Rayner (1920), applications to society, therapies such as systematic desensitisation in addition to others.

Candidates sometimes went onto develop their justification mark as supporting classical conditioning theory, however this was not always accurate, which did limit the number of marks that could be awarded. In some cases, candidates provided genetic answers or answers that focused on strengths of studies and not classical conditioning theory itself.

There was a minority of candidates who left this question blank indicating that there may have been inconsistencies on time spent on other areas over this question.

5 Explain two strengths of classical conditioning.

1 one strength of classical conditioning is that it has supporting evidence from Pavlov's dogs. He used classical conditioning to successfully associate the ^(conditioned stimulus) metronome sound ^(unconditioned stimulus) with the idea of being fed (unconditioned stimuli) to achieve the dogs salivating (conditioned response) and hence ^{showing} ~~proving~~ evidence for classical condition.

2 Another strength of classical conditioning is that

Examiner Comments:

The response gained 1 mark.

There is an identification of Pavlov dogs study as support for classical conditioning theory however there is no clear justification for the second mark.

Question 6a

Many candidates attempted to describe their biological practical results – there was some confusion with results and conclusions which for some limited the number of marks they were

awarded. A minority of candidates provided results for alternative practical's which resulted in no marks being awarded or failed to link any parts of the answer to an actual practical itself – so often read as generic.

Most common results for quantitative data included, scatter graphs, scatter graph results, Spearman's, percentages, raw data comparisons amongst many others. Better answers provided a description of different types of results, providing at times clear numerical data to reinforce the context of their answers within the biological practical area they had completed for their practical.

Qualitative results were less well answered; there was an attempt at times by to address thematic analysis but often this was less developed than quantitative. A minority of candidates were able to provide an answer which reflected qualitative data description analysis, applying this to a relevant biological theory for some of the marks.

Candidates need to be aware that practical's need to be clearly embedded within their answers to avoid generic responses and that ethical standards of selected practical's have been maintained.

investigation when studying learning theories.

(a) Describe the results of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis from your practical investigation in learning theories.

(4)

We found that 60% of people held the door open with their hand when there was someone within 2 metres of them. And 100% of the people either said thank you or showed an appreciative gesture such as smiling or nodding their head. 70% of people held the door open with their foot, and 20% of people did not hold the door open.

Examiner Comments:

This response gained 2 marks.

There is description of quantitative results for 2 marks, however there is no qualitative results for additional marks. The context is identifiable from several areas therefore avoiding a generic response.

Question 6b

Many candidates attempted this question with some success in terms of providing a weakness of their biological practical investigation. Some candidates correctly identified a weakness of their biological practical but failed to make links to the biological practical itself, therefore providing generic responses. A minority of candidates provided a weakness for practicals that were not from biological psychology.

Candidates who did provide clear reference to their biological practical did not always go on to justify their weaknesses in full for additional marks. The most successful candidates referred clearly to data gathering, sampling, self-rating correlational questionnaires, planning decisions or lack of, extraneous variables, amongst others – focusing on biological practical areas. These were then sometimes successfully related to subject bias, invalid results, replication problems, and reliability problems amongst other acceptable points.

(b) Explain one weakness of your practical investigation in learning theories.

(2)

We only collected data on polite behaviour (opening doors for others and thanking/apologising to them) from our school, reducing generalisability as we cannot be sure that it's representative of a larger population – people from other schools/workplaces.

Examiner Comments:

This response gets 2 marks.

There is a clear identification of the weakness of a relevant biological practical which the candidate goes on to justify in terms of representative to large population from other schools/workplaces.

Question 6c

Some candidates attempted this question with some success in terms of providing strengths of their biological practical investigation in terms of validity. A minority of candidates provided strengths but did not link this to the validity requirement of this question. In addition, candidates correctly identified strengths of their biological practical but failed to make links to the biological practical itself, therefore providing generic responses. A minority of candidates provided strengths for practical's that were not from biological psychology.

Candidates who did provide clear reference to their biological practical did not always go on to justify their weaknesses in full for additional marks. The most successful candidates referred clearly to aspects of their practical such as helpful behaviours of students in their school canteen which then went onto to be justified in terms of their natural helpful behaviour environment and ecological validity for example.

Overall, candidates need to clearly focus on the question and all areas of what is being asked for in addition to linking it clearly to their practical topic area.

(c) Explain **two** strengths of your practical investigation in learning theories in terms of validity. (4)

A strength is

1 we did a field experiment, this allows for higher ecological validity - since we had no control of variables. ~~This allows for the~~ This means the study can be generalised to situations outside of the study itself.

2 Another strength is that we did not interact with our participants, this allows for higher internal validity as since the participants didn't know they were being observed this eliminated demand characteristics, hence making the results more valid.

Examiner Comments

This response gets 0 marks.

There are no links to any biological practical for identification or justification marks.

Question 7

This was a discuss question that required candidates to demonstrate an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding and application in their answer about the triplet scenario and social learning theory.

Candidates were required to show knowledge and understanding of social learning appropriate theories, concepts and/ or research and apply this to the scenario aspects that were relevant.

Many candidates completed this well in their responses, those who did this well described role models in terms of the triplets' sister, attention and association with the dad from the scenario amongst other relevant areas.

A minority of students only wrote about social learning theory with no reference to the scenario in their answers therefore limiting the marks they could be awarded. Alternatively, some candidates stated key terms from social learning theory but did not go on to elaborate their knowledge of them in relation to the scenario resulting in partially developed answers.

The strongest response demonstrated accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding of areas from within social learning theory which they developed in line with sustained application of the content within their answers resulting in a balanced and logical chain of reasoning. There was a good improvement in candidate answers for this question, illustrating excellent preparation by centres for this style of scenario-based question.

2 motivation.

You must make reference to the context in your answer.

(8)

(SLT)

social learning theory claims that we learn through observation. Bandura proposed 4 stages of SLT: attention, retention, reproduction and motivation. ~~we see this in the scenario.~~ Bandura proposed that we observe and pay attention to a model's ~~which we~~ behaviour and retain that information. we then reproduce that behaviour and are ^{either} motivated to keep doing the ~~actions~~ or discouraged from ~~doing~~ replicating the behaviour. we see this clearly in this scenario as the triplets (Mia, Tilly & and Nikki) observe their father - who is the model in this case - put their

toys away in the cupboard. They then watch their older sister, who is also a model, help their dad. The triplets have paid attention to this behaviour and retain it. They are all then seen to reproduce it after Mia first reproduces the behaviour by picking up her doll and putting it away. ~~the triplet~~ Mia is then motivated to do such behaviour as her older sister, Brittany, says "well done". This encourages all 3 of the twins to reproduce the observed behaviour.

Therefore, ~~a~~ SLT explains ~~the~~ why the twins began to put away their toys.

Another concept proposed ~~by~~ is vicarious reinforcement. This is when the observer sees ~~the~~ someone do an action or behave a certain way and then receive comfort or attention. This leads to the observer ~~repete~~ reproducing the observed behaviour. This can also be applied here as ^{just as the} ~~the~~ triplets observe Mia put away her doll into the cupboard and be given attention ~~by~~ from Brittany when she says "~~from~~ well done". This would incline the ~~first~~ two triplets to reproduce that behaviour and results in them putting

away their toys too, they do this so they too can receive praise and attention. However an alternative theory ~~could~~ such as operant conditioning may better explain that the triplets wanted to be rewarded for their actions, ~~can~~ explaining why they started picking up their toys.

In conclusion, SLT explains clearly why the triplets started putting their toys away, though there are alternative theories such as operant conditioning and classical conditioning that could better explain the triplets picking up their toys.

Examiner comments:

The response gained 6 marks.

AO1 – Level 3 for accurate knowledge and understanding of social learning theory.

AO2 – Level 3, showing a grasp of competing arguments, relevant evidence from the context with some imbalance.

Section C

Question 8

The majority of candidates were able to attempt this question with some success. In terms of each theory operant conditioning was well attempted with knowledge reference to positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, punishment; being mostly accurate. For some candidate's coverage of evolutionary theory was good, with the strongest candidates referring to survival of the fittest, inherited traits, genetic adaption – being the most used. The embedding of the scenario for AO2 seemed more accurate for operant conditioning than evolutionary theory.

Many candidates were able to not only demonstrate knowledge of either evolution or operant conditioning and then follow this with justification AO3 marks from supporting studies, alternative explanations, lack of credible evidence, amongst others. Some candidates provided knowledge without additional justification or alternatively supporting evidence for example without accurate and thorough understanding of the area. This also then affected candidates' ability to integrate the scenario in a sustained and relevant way.

Occasionally, candidates did not finish their answers to this question which may indicate timing issues for some. This was even more apparent in answers that provided an excellent overview of operant conditioning as an explanation for human behaviour but did not provide the same quality for evolutionary theory – or vice versa.

As a level-based question, it is important to note that an AO1/AO2/AO3 response was required which needed to show an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding versus application versus evaluation and conclusion.

Those candidates who scored highly on all skills were able to demonstrate accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding of evolutionary theory and operant conditioning. This AO1 knowledge was displayed with logical chains of reason throughout their answers, not just in the second half of the essay. Lines of argument were supported then with sustained application to evidence from the scenario and context was clear and relevant. This, therefore, allowed these candidates to demonstrate an awareness of logical chains of reasoning throughout their answer, enabling them to provide a balanced conclusion.

Operant conditioning is rewarding or punishing a behaviour, to either encourage or discourage the behaviour to happen again. When the visitors were told that they would be rewarded for their inconvenience, that already 32 visitors 'immediately' followed the instructions, this shows how the behaviour of using the alternative pathway ~~was~~ ~~was~~ was encouraged using positive reinforcement where, they ~~were~~ were rewarded for their actions, this can be supported by Skinner's box, where the rat noticed that when it kept pushing the lever it gains food; a reward to encourage the rat to repeat its behaviour of pressing the lever. This shows how operant conditioning could explain the

behaviour of the visitors.

However, evolutionary theory says how people tend to protect or defend what's theirs or what they want and so therefore fight for or go against things, by hurting others, and avoiding rules in place. This can be seen through the behaviour of the six visitors who ignored the safety sign, putting themselves in danger, evolutionary theory can explain their behaviour, as the visitors may have been male and so took look better or to look strong, they ~~may~~^{may} believe that taking risks is the better option, maybe it's a road that they always take or drive on, and so seeing this ~~&~~ danger sign made them feel ~~anger~~ angry, defending their own decisions and may have drove on, some of the other visitors out of the 32 ~~who~~ who took the alternative way could have observed the six visitors ~~to~~ being asked to leave the park; negative punishment, and so therefore avoided being asked to leave too.

Examiner Comments

This response gained 5 marks.

AO1 – Level 2 demonstrated mostly accurate knowledge and understanding.

AO2 – Level 2 – occasionally supported through the application of relevant evidence from the contexts.

AO3 – Level 2 some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material.

Paper Summary Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Make sure that all key areas within the theory, studies, methods and practical sections are fully covered in preparation for any exam paper, especially key terminology.
- Make sure that justification is provided within the questions to access AO3 marks when required.
- When being asked about AO2 – skill application to a specific context – it is important that responses are very clearly linked, to avoid generic answers.