ResultsPlus

edexcel

Examiners' Report
January 2012

GCE Psychology 6PS01 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at www.edexcel.com. For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at www.btec.co.uk.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/

ResultsPlus

Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.
To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk .

January 2012

Publications Code US030807
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

This paper provided the usual mixture of surprises in candidate's responses and in the main those who read the questions correctly did very well. The Milgram variation study caused problems for less prepared candidates, as did cue dependency in basic accuracy and depth. It was clear some candidates had not learned the Milgram variation in an appropriate format or in enough detail.

Once again it was interesting to see just how many candidates failed to score maximum on the Multiple Choice section. Q1 appeared one of the most troublesome and Q11 saw some candidates just choose one instead of two.

There was an indication that candidates are better at recalling actual figures in results, eg in 12 (b) for Godden and Baddeley.

How science works and the practical questions are now commonplace and Q13 had been asked in the past under the guise of the social practical, however this time candidates were asked about their cognitive experiments. There were still those who gained no credit because they mixed up the two and talked about surveys. Others were writing clearly made up or generic problems they came across for Q13 (bi). However Q13 (a) was answered quite well with a large proportion of candidates understanding the requirements. Only a small number of aims and/or null hypothesis were seen. Candidates were also able to correctly identify the type of hypothesis they had written. Nearly all candidates showed no evidence of operationalisation of variables and it was evident that this area required more focus.

Q16 about cue dependency is very common and yet again some were finding it difficult to access the last couple of marks, only the minority top end, seemed able to. Too many were including Godden and Baddeley's study or evaluating the theory for no credit.

Q17 was the cognitive key issue using a now familiar stimulus response scenario. Candidates are getting really good at this type of question as evidenced in recent papers. There was a wide spectrum of cognitive concepts being used and many scored well. Candidates seem to be getting better at applying their knowledge to a question in a plausible way and making sure they keep linking back to the scenario described in the question. There were very few examples of a candidate not linking back to the scenario.

All the possible theories on the mark scheme were used equally well. In addition it was quite common to see specific reference to the weapons focus (with candidates suggesting that a weapon of some sort might have been used).

Q18 the essay, was a little different but clearly accessible for all. Agency theory tended to be described quite well but the evaluation differentiated better from less able candidates. The better answers included evolution, moral strain and socialisation. The candidates mentioning more than the two states tended to be able to handle the evaluative side better – by using the findings of studies to show agentic states etc. However, quite a few candidates merely described 'supporting' studies without really telling us why they support agency (or go against it). However, there were some amazing answers that gave a thorough description and chose a range of clear and well presented evaluative points. A minority of candidates did simply write about Milgram's original study in great detail obviously misreading the question.

Question 11

Candidates needed to remember to read the instructions and choose TWO answers here.

For question 11 choose TWO answers from A, B, C, D and E.

11 Which **two** of the following best define cognitive psychology?

Cognitive psychology is concerned with

- ☒ **A** how the mind processes information
- ☒ **B** the effects of groups on behaviour
- ☒ **C** how the nervous system works
- ☒ **D** why we remember and forget
- ☒ **E** cultural differences

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A typical example of a correct answer.

Question 12 (a)

Most could score one for the first marking point on the MS but many failed to take it any further to gain the second mark (no mention of land and water for instance). Less able candidates wrote about Milgram or Craik and Tulving.

(2)

Goddenand Baddley (1975)'s study involved 18 participants, who were divers. They did an experiment to test whether words learnt in one environment were recalled better in the same invironment. Thus, the experiment took place 18feet under water and on a Beach.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got two marks. There was one clear mark for 'whether words...' (second sentence) which is a clear aim - see mark scheme. The last sentence added a bit more - on water or on land - see mark scheme.

Question 12 (b)

Unfortunately many candidates failed to read the question carefully and did **not** use figures or data. These received no credit. Others who did use figures were either not accurate with the mean figures in particular or got them confused with the percentages. More able candidates were awarded both marks by outlining the first two points in the mark scheme, or drawing simple tables highlighting the results from textbooks.

(b) Using figures/data, outline the results of Godden and Baddeley's (1975) study.

(2)

The results showed that participants recalled better when in the same environment.
learn dry + recall dry = 32%
learn wet + recall wet = 37%
learn dry + recall wet = 23%
learn wet + recall dry = 24%

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got no marks. The figures are the wrong way around so no marks awarded. No mark for the first sentence as marks are all for figures.

(b) Using figures/data, outline the results of Godden and Baddeley's (1975) study.

(2)

They found that about 50% more words were remembered if recall took place in the same environment that it was learnt in.
40% less words were accurately recalled if the environment was different to the one they learnt the words in.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got two marks. These two marking points were straight from the mark scheme so no problem - one mark each.

Question 12 (c)

Overall candidates gave mixed responses in regards to this question. Very few scored maximum marks with the majority scoring one mark for each strength and weakness.

Many candidates had correct evaluation points; however they were generic and not applied to the study. There were some very good responses, a significant number of candidates were using correct terminology and applying it to the fact it was a field experiment, but they did not make enough references to the actual study to put their response fully in context. Most candidates were able to correctly identify key strengths of the experiment, for example candidates' stating the experiment was 'ecologically valid' and being able to provide an appropriate elaboration for the response. However it appeared many had difficulties with identifying appropriate weaknesses.

A large proportion of candidates chose to write about the experiment not being generalisable due to the sample size. However they failed to provide an appropriate elaboration, for example not stating that the sample size was not 'representative' of a whole population and as a result many candidates lost out on marks.

There was a large focus on cheating as a weakness, thus not being able to gain credit.

Also candidates seem to think that the water temperature differed dramatically during the study. In common with question 15b, a lot of candidates relied heavily on the composition/ size of the sample for their marks.

More able candidates were able to provide a suitable weakness, for example 'it was difficult to maintain strict control over variables' and were able to elaborate on their responses and even provide suitable examples. This enabled them to obtain the maximum mark for the question. Few answers included practical applications such as candidate's revision/ exams although more included police interviewing. These better answers easily explained a strength and/or weakness in the context of the study and were impressive.

GRAVE.

(c) Outline **one** strength and **one** weakness of Godden and Baddeley's (1975) study.

(4)

Strength

It has high levels of ecological validity. This is because it was a field experiment, and divers are in their natural surrounding (underwater), so are used to the setting. ~~Moreover these findings can be app~~

Weakness

Only 18 participants were used. This is a limited sample size, and therefore cannot be generalised to the whole population. Also 13 of the participants were males, making this sample androcentric. Also this ~~s~~ sample can be seen as being as ethnocentric as it is biased towards Scottish people, the sample is not representative.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got three marks. Strength: see point five in the mark scheme - there was sufficient elaboration for two marks. Includes the term, shows what it means, mentions the natural environment itself (underwater). So two marks were awarded for strength

Weakness: The mention of sample size has detail - number of participants, not generalisable and (at the end of the answer) not representative (though slightly out of context), so one mark - see mark scheme (final mark under weaknesses).

The male/female split was not enough in this study (13-5) to be androcentrism. The idea of Scottish participants and ethnocentrism is not really going to affect memory either. So just one mark for the weakness.

Question 13 (a)

Generally this question was answered quite well. There were very few three mark answers, with most candidates receiving two marks. The majority of candidates were successfully able to identify the direction of their hypothesis, but most failed to operationalise either the IV or DV. A few candidates referred to their social practical or gave an aim.

Most hypothesis referred to LOP or context dependent forgetting, some candidates did not make clear all aspects of the IV, eg not comparing the two environments the words were learnt in. Some seemed to have done quite vague cognitive experiments, testing things like the effect of gender on memory, which doesn't have real theoretical backing and made it hard for candidates to gain more marks by explaining their hypothesis fully.

Many candidates got stuck at two for just producing a clear, but not thorough, hypothesis. Only a few candidates mixed up the direction of their hypothesis with what they claimed the direction to be.

More able candidates were able to state their hypotheses of the cognitive experiment and were able to provide a detailed response in which both independent and dependent variable could be identified. They were able to state whether their hypothesis was directional or non directional.

13 As part of the course requirements for cognitive psychology you will have conducted an experiment.

(a) State the experimental/alternative hypothesis of your experiment **and** state whether it is directional (one tailed) or non-directional (two tailed).

(3)

There will be a difference in recall of words after ~~30 seconds~~ prevention of rehearsal is varied from 7 seconds to 30 seconds. This is ~~an~~ non-directional hypothesis.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got three marks. Note that this was marked using levels. This answer had the DV - recall of words (better than just 'recall'), and the IV in detail (7 secs or 30 secs rehearsal time) and the direction (non directional). A clear hypothesis, both IV and DV and appropriate - so top level and 3 marks.

13 As part of the course requirements for cognitive psychology you will have conducted an experiment.

(a) State the experimental/alternative hypothesis of your experiment **and** state whether it is directional (one tailed) or non-directional (two tailed).

(3)

hypothesis - to see whether words which ~~were~~ would be prosessed semanticly on a list of words rather than structurally. this is a one tailed hypothesis.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got no marks. This is an 'aim' not a 'hypothesis' - not well expressed. 'One tailed' (directional) does not relate to what is written.

Question 13 (b)

Majority of responses centred on confounding variables (noise) and (opportunity) sample. Only a minority included an appropriate elaboration. Solutions were rarely fully developed to be able to award the full 2 marks.

Many candidates were able to provide a small description of problems they had encountered during their practical; however some candidates failed to provide suitable elaboration points for their answers. For example, if candidates mentioned their experiment may have resulted in demand characteristics they did not elaborate on the term and as a result lost out on one mark.

In many answers it was difficult to understand what a candidate was trying to say and some answers did not constitute a 'problem' as it was a part of the study i.e. individual differences in IQ of participants (one candidate said they had undertaken an IQ test to ensure the participants were intelligent enough to take part in the study).

Most candidates could at least identify a problem but the majority never elaborated on it to push it in to the 2 mark bracket. This also applied to the second part of the question. However, there were some meticulous answers that clearly explained a real problem and then sorted it all out in part ii.

It may be useful to review mark differentials, eg to say, 'the room was noisy' in (i) and 'we found a quieter room in (ii) does not warrant any marks in an AS Psychology paper.

(b) (i) Outline **one** problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out your experiment.

(2)

We used an opportunity sample of students so not only did that reduce generalisability but it also meant that order effects such as fatigue could have occurred and affected our results.

(ii) Explain how you might have addressed (or did address) the problem you outlined in (b)(i) when planning and/or carrying out your experiment.

(2)

~~If we were to repeat the experiment~~, the sample would be changed. I'd use a random sample so it can be representative of the whole population. This was addressed as we repeated the experiment using a random sample and this also increased reliability as we repeated it ~~an~~ at least three times.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got two marks. bi: one mark. The use of an opportunity sample perhaps affecting generalisability is taken as the answer and in the levels for one mark. The mention of order effects and so on are ignored.

bii - one mark. Solution was included - random sampling would solve the problem. This is in the mark scheme. The solution was not clearly appropriate and not elaborated (eg fair or equal chance of being chosen could be mentioned) so just the one mark awarded (the answer does not match the levels for two marks).

(b) (i) Outline **one** problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out your experiment.

(2)

As I used a opportunity sample, which was to experiment on P's that were available my sample may have been biased therefore making it less representative, to the wider population. As most participants I approached were ~~mutual~~ friends

(ii) Explain how you might have addressed (or did address) the problem you outlined in (b)(i) when planning and/or carrying out your experiment.

(2)

To adress the problem I could have used another sampling teqnique for example random sample this is more representative than opportunity sampling as you randomly select participants. Also ~~the~~ for random sampling it is ~~v~~ likely to be unbiased. I could have chosen another location where people did not know me.

(Total for Question 13 = 7 marks)

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got four marks. bi: two marks. The problem with opportunity (and being friends) and then why this was a problem.

bii: two marks. The solution was expanded upon - likely to be unbiased and so on.

Question 14

Generally this question was answered well, with most candidates scoring either two or three marks. Candidates showed a good understanding of the difference between qualitative and quantitative data and the majority of candidates were able to mention that it was easier and could therefore be compared (first point on mark scheme). Some candidates wasted time by describing each type of data before addressing the set question. Many candidates used weaknesses of qualitative data to show why quantitative data is preferred, which was fine when it was explained. Few candidates were able to go beyond arguments about 'ease of analysis' or 'faster to gather using closed questions', however many just kept on repeating themselves with the same point.

The best responses were able to bring in arguments about objectivity and making strong comparisons between groups and were able to answer the comparative element of the question to some extent, therefore achieving at least some marks.

14 Explain why in psychology using a research method that produces quantitative rather than qualitative data might be preferable.

(4)

Quantitive data is numerical and can easily be statistically analysed, whereas qualitative data is not numerical and therefore can be difficult to statistically analyse.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got two marks. The first paragraph got just the one mark as the second part about qualitative just reverses what was said about quantitative and does not say more - one mark.

Closed and objective for quantitative - one mark.

Reversing and saying qualitative are more subjective was not worth an additional mark on its own (no more said) so no mark awarded there. Adding that quantitative are more reliable was not explained enough for a mark on its own so no mark awarded there. The answer suggests that objective was more reliable but this was not stated, needed more.

14 Explain why in psychology using a research method that produces quantitative rather than qualitative data might be preferable.

(4)

Quantitive data provides data that is easier to analyse as it produces numerical data which can be shown in graphs or tables whereas qualitive data produces in depth answers which may be unique to every person so would be very time consuming to analyse. It is also easier to come to a conclusion when analysing quantitive data so it easier to either reject or accept the null hypothesis whereas you may never come to a conclusion if Qualitive data is used.

Quantitive data will also be less time consuming to analyse and creates reliable results as the survey can be carried out again to see whether it produces the same results whereas Qualitive data is not very reliable as it is harder to replicate

(Total for Question 14 = 4 marks)

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got four marks. Numerical in graphs/tables - one mark. The opposite for qualitative (as it was clearly explained not just 'whereas...') - one mark. Harder to come to a conclusion for qualitative and easier to analyse quantitative - one mark. Reliability for quantitative - surveys can be carried out again to see if the same results are found - one mark. No additional mark for contrast with qualitative at the end as that would need more than just 'whereas qualitative are not replicable'- and full marks have of course been given anyway.

Question 15 (a)

The responses did demonstrate that wide teaching of the variations had taken place and this was reflected in the wide variety of responses which were given. Virtually every variation Milgram did was covered. However, it looked like many candidates were not aware of the marking criteria for studies – so many just wrote about the procedure and nothing else. Also, a worrying amount simply named a variation and then just said 'the procedure was the same as Milgram's original' without going any further.

There were some very thorough answers that gained maximum marks though; they were able to provide detail in their responses which included aims, procedure, results and the conclusion of the experiment. The majority of candidate's responses included at least two aspects of these details; the most able candidates were able to comment on each of the four criteria.

A small minority of candidates seemed to think that a variation was by another psychologist, eg Hofling or Meuss and Raaijmakers.

A few candidates described the original or other studies (non Milgram) into obedience and so gained no marks.

Few answers gained full marks, mainly due to not having the correct percentages in the results or for spending too much time on the method and missing out information such as the aim/results.

The best of the possible answers were on the obedient/rebellious stooges and the variation in the Bridgeport' - run down office block and where candidates had an excellent knowledge of all aspects of the study scored 4 marks.

15 Milgram carried out a number of variations of his original (1963) study of obedience.

(a) Describe **one** of Milgram's variation studies of obedience. You must clearly identify which variation study you are describing.

(4)

Variation study Liberating effects of group pressure (1965)

Milgram wanted to investigate positive conformity and see in what conditions pps were more likely to disobey orders to administer electric shocks from an authority figure. The 1963 original experiment acted as a baseline to compare his results to and everything was the same but there were 2 conditions. In the obedient stooge condition 2 confederates (acting as pps) obeyed all orders to administer electric shocks to Mr Wallace, the learner up to the max 450V without protest. In the rebellious stooge condition 2 confederates (both acting) disobeyed or refused to continue. One confederate stopped at 150 v at the other at 210v. The experiment was said to be about the effect of punishment on learning. The results showed that in the obedient stooge condition 72.5% of pps went to 450v and in the rebellious stooge condition 15% went to 450v and 50% stopped at 150v–210v. Milgram concluded that the presence of obedient stooges did not have much effect on obedience levels whereas when rebellious stooges were used pps were more likely able to break free of the agentic state and go into the autonomous state, acting as agents of the authority figure, so disobedient stooges (peers) can have a liberating effect on individuals.

→ If near boundary of disobeying, the rebellious stooges helped them feel disobedience was acceptable

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got four marks, (see mark scheme - max two marks for aim, method, results and conclusions separately).

The first sentence got one mark for the aim. One method mark for the obedience stooges going to 450 volts.

One method mark for what the rebellious stooges did. One result mark for 72.5% in condition one going to 450 volts. This is now full marks and there were more possible marks. 15% went to 450 volts in the rebellious condition was one mark. 50% stopped at 150 to 210 volts would be another mark. And there were conclusion marks.

Question 15 (b)

In response to this question candidates were able to pick up two or three marks. Stronger candidates showed a good understanding of Milgram's experiment and responded well; either evaluating the original or the variation experiment giving a range of points. Candidates showed a very good understanding of the methodology that Milgram used, with most responses drawing on ecological validity, reliability and the sample used.

Less able candidates did not explicitly link the points to the study, eg 'it lacked ecological validity because it was an artificial task' but not saying what exactly was artificial about it (as electric shocks are not an everyday task). Some candidates did not read the question properly and gave non methodological evaluation points which did not gain credit, talking about practical applications instead.

(b) Evaluate any **one** of Milgram's studies of obedience in terms of methodology.
Do not include ethical issues in your answer.

(3)

Milgram's original study - This study cannot be generalised because the experiment took place in America therefore it's ~~androcentric~~ ethnocentric biased towards America. This experiment is also androcentric, biased towards males because only males took part. It's reliable because it was a laboratory experiment and so all conditions were kept the same. However it lacks validity because it was a laboratory experiment and therefore it's not a everyday setting.

(Total for Question 15 = 7 marks)

↳ which causes demand characteristics, and forces them to act in ~~cert~~ certain ways which they wouldn't normally. There was also a confederate giving verbal prods such as 'this experiment requires you to go on' and 'you must continue', forcing the ps to continue.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got two marks. Hard to generalise and ethnocentric bias and why (in America) got one mark (this included the mention of androcentric - because the two points were not elaborated separately enough for a second mark - add something like 'therefore cannot be said to be true for females' perhaps).

The point about reliability needed more - perhaps saying more about being replicable, so no mark. Another mark is given after 'normally' because the point about validity was elaborated upon, discussing forcing participants to act as they would not normally act. After 'normally' there are no marks as 'right to withdraw' etc is about ethics.

Question 16

This was answered well, with the majority of candidates showing they had at least a basic understanding of this theory, in turn demonstrating that clear teaching had been covered in this area. Nearly all candidates were able to attain at least some marks by demonstrating an understanding of cue dependency.

Full marks required an in depth understanding and so was achieved by few, as would be expected.

Some candidates were able to gain four marks by describing both state and context dependent forgetting with an example for each. A lot of candidates talked about the 'tip of the tongue phenomenon' but failed to explain this point fully enough to gain credit for it.

Quite a few could never really explain the first marking point on the mark scheme (most answers seemed to ignore the fact the cue had to be there at encoding). Occasionally other theories of forgetting were substituted here, though pleasingly these were fewer than in previous years.

Stronger candidates were able to comment on the idea that this theory is about inaccessibility of memory due to the failure of retrieval cues and provided great detail about state and contextual cues. They were also able to describe what cues are and provide a suitable explanation. Many also knew about Tulving's encoding specificity principle.

16 Describe the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

(5)

Cues are things that help us ~~remember~~ remember things that trigger our memory. There are two types of cuse, State cues + Context cues. State ~~cuse~~ cues are to do with ~~they to~~ the way you feel, your emotions e.g. happy, angry, sad etc. The cue dependent theory of forgetting says that if you learn something in one state and recall it in the same state you are more likely to remember it e.g. If your revising for an exam + your happy and cheerful and if whilst taking the exam you are in the same state, happy and cheerful you will be more likely to remember. Context cues are about the environment so when you learn something in 1 environment + recall it in the same you are more likely to remember. e.g. when you go back to visit your high school and you see the walls + corridors all your memories come flooding back. The cue dependent theory of forgetting says that sometimes you don't have the right cues present to remember or recall things.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got five marks. One mark for stating cues and saying what they are, such as emotions. One mark for the idea of remembering more in the same state. One mark for the example of state. One mark for saying we remember more if in the same context. One mark for the example of context dependency. This has full marks by now (although the last sentence would also gain a mark - see first bullet in mark scheme).

Question 17

The majority of candidates understood what was required to successfully answer the question and so scored marks. Some fabulous answers for this and a lovely variety of theories were used. Candidate responses showed that they had good knowledge of the key issue of the cognitive approach.

The marks allocated for this question ranged from two to five marks. Many candidate's responses included at least three key theories or aspects of the cognitive approach in order to explain the scenario given. Key theoretical perspectives which were used ranged from cue dependency, levels of processing, trace decay, MSM, reconstructive theories and Freud's theory of repression. Some candidates were even able to use their knowledge of Loftus and Palmer's misleading questions and weapon focus in order to explain the event.

Less able candidates spent a long time describing theories and then failed to link to the stimulus material therefore gaining no marks. Other candidates made brief links to the stimulus material, but again spent too much time generally describing the theories before making any links therefore only picking up one mark for each theory.

Candidates took the differences in recollections to refer to the storekeeper, the two friends and themselves, all of which were acceptable.

SECTION C

Answer ALL questions. You are advised to spend approximately 25 minutes on Section C.

17 You and a friend are queuing up at the local supermarket when you hear cries of 'Thief! Stop! Help!' and look around to see a man running off with a bag. The next day you and your friend go back to talk to the store manager and find that you recall things differently.

Using theories of forgetting and/or memory, explain these differences in your recollections.

(5)

The LOP would suggest that the way I encoded ~~IE is likely that I did not encode the information~~ the crime has an affect on my recall. As I witnessed the crime ~~structurally~~ visually, it is more likely to be forgotten easily. I would be able to recall the witness better if I had encoded the information semantically - as it uses the most cognitive work.

Cue-dependency theory would suggest that as I am not in the same environment or state when recalling the information, it is likely that I ~~do~~ would ~~not re~~ not recall well enough. To get reliable data I would have to be in the same environment or state, so that the cues-information needed would trigger my memory.

Barlett suggests that memory is reconstructive this is when you form a new memory by including schemas - personal imagination of something. Therefore what I recall might be my schema e.g. if the theif was white my schema would be that the theif is black.

~~were~~ Therefore my recalling would not be sufficiant.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got four marks. One mark per paragraph:encoding information semantically... 'I witnessed' so linked - one mark. Cue dependency trigger 'my' memory - one mark. 'My' schema about the thief and example of his race - one mark. Weapon focus 'my focus on thief' - one mark (even though a gun is not there, the idea of a criminal situation is and lends itself to the idea that there might be a weapon so credited as the concept 'fits').

Question 18

Most candidates showed a good understanding of Milgram's agency theory and were able to describe the two states and moral strain clearly.

Some candidates fell into the trap of simply describing Milgram's study which on its own did not gain credit. Many candidates were able to give good detail in describing the theory, but many did not go beyond defining the two states and relating this to the concept of moral strain. Very few were able to make references to the impact of socialisation in the development of the agentic state etc. Many candidates failed to understand that moral strain refers to the feelings experienced and suggested that moral strain is a third state of being.

Most candidates had some good evaluation points such as application to real life and supporting research, however few were able to use this effectively. Many candidates gave supporting research such as Hofling but failed to say how it supported agency theory.

Throughout the evaluation section of the essay candidates failed to gain credit by name dropping studies that support the theories without explanation of **how** they support the theories. Candidates regularly mentioned that the theory could be applied to explain events such as the Holocaust without saying **how**. Those candidates who did manage well elaborated evaluation often only gave brief descriptions of the theory.

With regards to the levels/bands most candidates were able to achieve the level 2 or 3 band of marks. For those candidates who were awarded marks in the level 2 band depicted answers which gave a brief explanation of the agentic and autonomous state and some candidates not being able to mention the concept of moral strain.

Those candidates achieving marks in the level 3 band were able to give more detailed responses and were able to mention other key aspects of the agency theory. Candidates were able to provide a detailed account of both the agentic and autonomous state as well as moral strain. Candidates were also able to mention other aspects of the theory for example 'from an early age we are taught to obey orders' and 'Milgram believed that obedience to authority was a way of maintaining stability in society'. Evaluation points for those who achieved marks in band 3 were able to give a more detailed evaluation and included a range of material for example supporting evidence and application. Many candidates used knowledge of World War Two and Abu Ghraib in order to explain behaviours which were evident during this time.

The minority that achieved band 4 were, however, most impressive. The language used suggests widespread knowledge of (and interest in) the topic, which can quite easily be developed to attain a higher grade with skills training.

A small proportion of candidates did not respond fully to the essay and it was evident that these candidates may have run out of time.

***18** Milgram developed the agency theory to help explain the high levels of obedience in his studies.

Describe Milgram's agency theory and evaluate it as an explanation of obedience.

(12)

Milgrams Agency theory suggests that we go through stages before we finally obey. The first stage is Evolution, where we have learnt to obey authority figures, like parents and teachers. Then there is the Autonomous state where the person is in a complete state of free will. Next is the Moral Strain, which is emotional tug of war, when we know the order is wrong but we feel like we need to obey it. Then there is the Agentic shift, where we begin the order and obey, and finally Agentic state, or responsibility shift where we tell ourselves that it is not our fault because we were told to do it.

found that 21 out of 22 nurses in an American hospital were willing to administer an overdose of a drug called Astroten, because they were told to by an authority figure. These nurses also showed signs of moral strain as fulfilling the task meant going against proffessional standards. This study therefore supports the Agency Theory.

However, the nurses were all American females, so it could be argued that it lacked population validity. This means the results can not be generalised, making it less reliable support for the Agency Theory.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got six marks.

The description was not quite right but the main concepts are there – level 2 though as not done 'well' and some inaccuracy. Evaluation – two supporting studies , Hofling and Milgram – though some inaccuracy. Links Hofling to agency theory, which was creditworthy. Some evaluation of Hofling as a supporting study which was also creditworthy.

Level 3 evaluation just about as there are two studies and they are related to the theory, with a bit of evaluation too. With description level 2, this means a level 2 answer. Some useful concepts and terms, and both parts are there and not bad – so top of level 2 and 6 marks.

***18** Milgram developed the agency theory to help explain the high levels of obedience in his studies.

Describe Milgram's agency theory and evaluate it as an explanation of obedience.

(12)

Agency theory was proposed by Milgram to explain obedience, to help explain why the rate of obedience was high in his study. He found that many participant went through moral strain, this is an unplesant feeling caused by doing an immoral act by obeying authority. He also identified the autonomous state which is when someone has free will to do what they want but still obeying rules of society. From the autonomous state there was an agentic shift to the agentic shift, which is when someone has no control over what they are doing due to obeying authority, they have no free will. Milgram found that many of his participants went through this type of state has they had to obey the experimenter in the study. This also explains why the level of obedience was so high.

Supporting evidence for Milgrams agency theory comes from Blass. He showed a edited film of Milgrams study to his students. The students all saw Milgram as authority figure and the person who was responsible

for the shocks.
The agency theory can be applied to real life to explain obedience, in events such as the Holocaust. As then ~~[illegible]~~ Hitler was the authority figure and everyone who obeyed him was in an agentic state.
Various studies done by Hofling and Meeus and Raaijmaker can also support agency theory as in their studies the ~~[illegible]~~ participants fell in an agentic and obeyed authority, although the rates of obedience in their studies were much higher than Milgrams.
However, there is also evidence to refute the agency theory for example in Hoflings study none of the nurses ~~fell into an agentic~~ went through moral strain. Also Milgram's own study contradicts his theory as 35% of the participants did not obey and did not fall into an agentic state, he has not provided an explanation as to why this happens.
Further refuting evidence comes from French and Raven who suggest that there are other types of social powers ~~in which~~ which lead to a person obeying

authority. These social powers are coercive, legitimate, Expert, Referent and Reward. overall, Milgrams agency theory is very influential as it provides explanation as to why people obey authority blind foldly and the high rates of obedience in his study However there is several evidence which also refute his study for example French and Raven suggest there are various other social power.

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got nine marks.

The description is there and terms are understood and explained though not done 'very well' as some bits not clear enough, eg moral strain as 'unpleasant' and mention of 'no control'. So level 3 not level 4.

The evaluation - there are supporting studies and application too, which linked to the theory. The alternative explanation of social power was good and made this evaluation level 4, taken with the other material. As the description was in level 3, both are not level 4, so level 3 is the mark. But top level 3 and 9 marks as the evaluation was so good. Also terms and writing were good enough, so top of level 3.

Paper Summary

It’s pleasing to note that candidates and centres are showing continual improvements for questions with specific requirements and responding well to issues raised on previous examiner reports. Most importantly candidates are responding better to the stimulus response type questions which cannot be, in essence 'pre prepared'. This will stand them in good stead for level 4 study.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481
Email publication.orders@edexcel.com
Order Code US030807 January 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Rewarding Learning