

Examiners' Report
June 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 visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



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 us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

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.

June 2012

Publications Code US032837

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

Introduction

This paper provided the usual mixture of candidate responses and in the main those who could read the questions correctly did very well. The questions around how science works were answered less well than others and are still an Achilles heel for less able candidates.

On the multiple choice questions nearly all candidates correctly answered Q8 (moral strain) and Q10 (context cues). However the more methodological based questions such as Q2 (randomisation) and Q6 (participant designs) in particular, were only correctly answered by more able candidates, demonstrating their depth of knowledge.

Q12 (a) and 14 (a) are studies in detail and as such candidates needed to have a depth of understanding of these.

With 12 (a) more candidates described Craik and Tulving's experiment than either of the other two offered. Peterson and Peterson's study was attempted by more candidates than Ramponi et al. Where Ramponi was chosen, it was done quite poorly. Quite a few candidates left the question blank or wrongfully described a study other than the ones asked for.

This question proved quite challenging and very few candidates scored four marks. Many candidates described the whole study rather than just the procedure.

In the case of 14 (a) some candidates still just repeated the same comment in both aim and conclusions which is not going to be credited twice.

Q12 (b) Many responses showed a general weakness in lab experiments and not linking to the particular study being evaluated. The majority of answers made reference to ecological validity as the main weakness. Many candidates were able to gain one mark, but often points were weakly referring to 'artificiality' of environment, and 'low ecological validity', with only more able candidates making reference to the validity of the task.

Q13 (b) Many candidates failed to achieve full marks on this item due to the use of vague language in writing the hypothesis, e.g. "groups" or failure to mention both IV and DV. Others were able to gain one mark with a weak hypothesis, but very few made reference to both the IV and DV in any recognisable form which limited the quality of answers preventing both marks being given.

Q13 (d) (ii) There were quite a few candidates who clearly did not understand the concept of a research design and offered obscure answers, ranging from methods to samples.

Others got confused with repeated measures over the actual design used, with some referring to it as repeated measures, although there were many candidates who correctly identified it as independent groups meaning many candidates were able to pick up some marks on this question.

Q14 (a) The majority of candidates described Sheriff's study but only more able candidates gave the correct aim/s for the study. The procedure was generally described well, although less able candidates described the two groups as being aware of each other from the beginning. The results were usually written in quite a brief way and there was often repetition in the conclusion.

Tajfel was the next most popular answer but was not executed as successfully as Sherif-based answers. Many candidates seemed to have problems understanding the exact nature of the DV and could not describe the conditions under which points were assigned. Reicher and Haslam were rarely chosen and some gave confused answers over exactly what had occurred with the participants in the prison simulation.

Q15 is a common one on SIT and most candidates were able to pick up three easy marks on this question including the three elements of the theory of prejudice. Many more offered football based elaborations that gained them a further two marks. There were only

a handful of answers misinterpreting the question offering full-blown descriptions of the Robber's Cave study.

Q16 candidates were accessing marks well but only more able ones were getting the 5th and 6th mark. The question was asking to compare and each marking point should have been a comparison to gain credit. The point must also be relevant and explained. Although there were a lot of good responses to this question (and the inevitable number of responses quoting another USA-based study), there were a number of candidates who lost marks comparing variations that Milgram had conducted on his own study with variations done in other studies – most notably Meeus and Raaijmakers.

Q17 Generally, there was a disappointing set of responses to the essay with candidates betraying the fact that they had simply rote learned information and tried hard to fit it into whatever question appeared on the paper. Most answers chose to describe and evaluate the Multi-Store Model but few candidates achieved maximum marks. The major problem with answers was that most failed to give more than a rudimentary description of any model of memory, with many able to give a basic description of the Multi-Store Model, offering descriptions of STM and LTM but not its sensory component. Some candidates could give a good and thorough description of the Multi-Store Model but could add no evaluative points at all. A large number of candidates did not understand the difference between a model of memory and theories of forgetting. Far too many candidates had rote learned information and were unable to apply it successfully, meaning that many answers were not substantiated appropriately with supporting case studies, research or practical applications of the model itself. Some answers offered Reconstructive Memory but could not give detailed descriptions and only offered the War of the Ghosts study in evidence. Many candidates offered Cue Dependency and were unaware this was based on retrieval of information.

Question 12

Question 12 (a)

Quite a few candidates confused the studies with the original Levels of Processing, which added to the problem unless good detail was included. Many candidates forfeited marks by attending to results, conclusions and aims of the studies with minimal attention to procedure.

Candidates who chose to describe Craik and Tulving tended to be the candidates who were getting the higher marks on this question; these tended to focus on the equipment used to present the word list and the recall task. Many responses referred to participants being asked to remember a list of words, rather than being given questions which required different types of processing.

Those who chose to describe Peterson and Peterson tended to lack clarity, for instance many spoke as though trigrams were presented in blocks rather than one at a time. On Peterson and Peterson, marks were often poor as there was much confusion over the procedure, with candidates seeming unsure of the use of trigrams (often referred to as word lists), often saying they were given a list to learn and then recall, and showing little understanding of the use of the distracter task to prevent rehearsal.

Question 12 (b)

As is usual, many candidates repeated rote learned 'catchphrases' for ethics or generalised strengths and weaknesses that could be applied to many types of research method; too many candidates identified good points but failed to back them up with specific information from the study chosen.

The most popular criticism of all studies was the lack of ecological validity which most candidates were able to explain for two marks but some were more general explanations of ecological validity not linked directly to the study limiting them to one. Quite a few candidates commented on problems with the experimental design used by Craik and Tulving such as order effects but didn't take into account the design was counterbalanced.

SECTION B

Answer ALL questions. You are advised to spend approximately 40 minutes on Section B.

12 You will have learned about one of the following studies in detail from cognitive psychology:

- Peterson and Peterson (1959).
- Craik and Tulving (1975)
- Ramponi et al (2004)

Choose **one** study from the list.

(a) Describe the procedure of your chosen study.

(4)

Name of study Craik and Tulving (1975)

The aim was to see if learning and recalling words are going to be recalled in different levels depending if the word was learned by its structure, phonetic or semantic.

60 words were learned by different levels of processing, then participants had to pick those words from a list with 180 words.

The results showed that the semantic words were recalled better, then the phonetic words and then the structural words.

The conclusion was that we store better or worse by the levels of processing.

(b) Outline **one** weakness of your chosen study.

(2)

It was a laboratory experiment, the situation was unrealistic so the results are not valid. (low ecological validity)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got 1 + 1 .

12 (a) One mark for learning by different levels and choosing from 180 words (middle paragraph), but the rest is aim and results, so not relevant to this answer.

12 (b) One mark for this fairly generic mark - the mark scheme has a bit more for two marks, bringing in something about the situation that is not realistic, so one mark not two.

SECTION B

Answer ALL questions. You are advised to spend approximately 40 minutes on Section B.

12 You will have learned about one of the following studies in detail from cognitive psychology:

- Peterson and Peterson (1959)
- Craik and Tulving (1975)
- Ramponi et al (2004)

Choose **one** study from the list.

(a) Describe the procedure of your chosen study.

(4)

Name of study Craik and Tulving (1975)

Craik and Tulving wanted to see if semantic processing
Participants were given a list of 60 words
leads to the best memory. 60 words were shown to 24 participants
and each word had a question to go with the word. The question
was either structural - ^{the} physical appearance of the word e.g.
capital letter or lower case, phonetic - the sound of the word, or
semantic - the meaning behind the word. The participants did the
recognition task and at the time they were unaware there would
be a recall test. 24 hours later the participants were shown
a list of 180 words and they had to say which of the 60 out of
the 180 words were the original words they learned.

(b) Outline **one** weakness of your chosen study.

(2)

One or more of the words could be distinctive to a particular participant and so ^{even if the} ~~one~~ word was ~~shown~~ the participant could remember the word better because it stands out, decreasing the validity of the experiment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got 3 + 2.

12 (a) This answer gained three marks. One mark for saying 24 participants and given words that had questions with them (after second sentence); one mark for the three levels and explaining them all, although the mark would have been gained by explaining even just one of them. (There is no mark for an answer giving just the three terms - the mark scheme shows a mark for something else added to the three, such as 'shown questions'). The idea of doing a recognition task and not knowing they would have to recall is a bit muddled as participants did not know they would have to identify the words either. One mark for the 180 words and having to identify the words they saw.

12 (b) This answer gained two marks - the point that someone might see a word that means something to them - a good point - and linked to validity too - first point on mark scheme.

Question 13 (a)

More able candidates had no problem with this typical IV and DV question. Importantly they could give more than just one word answers, such as group or recall. They were also able to elaborate on the DV in particular, and make reference to 20 questions. Less able candidates were not detailed enough in their answer or got the two mixed up.

13 A group of students decided to test the Levels of Processing theory of memory during one of the events in the Olympic Games.

In order to see which type of processing led to better recall they decided to use family and friends for their sample, and split them into three groups. Each group had a different activity to carry out. Then all the participants were asked the same 20 questions about the event to see what they remembered.

Figure 1: Table to show activities for each group with their type of processing

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Type of Processing	Structural	Phonemic	Semantic
Activity	Looking at pictures about the event in newspapers	Listening to radio reports about the event	Writing an article about the event

(a) Identify the independent variable (IV) and dependent variable (DV) in this study. (2)

IV The type of activity

DV ~~The way they processed the events~~
How deep they processed the event and how much they remembered



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer got 0 marks.

IV - the answer needed to show there were three types of activity or at least that there were different types of activity (see mark scheme) so no mark was awarded.

DV - this added a bit more about how deep they processed and although the answer mentioned both the event and how much they remembered, this was not expressed clearly as one operationalised DV so no mark was awarded. It is as if the answer was 'how deeply they processed the event' because that is the first answer, which supports the decision to give 0 marks.

13 A group of students decided to test the Levels of Processing theory of memory during one of the events in the Olympic Games.

In order to see which type of processing led to better recall they decided to use family and friends for their sample, and split them into three groups. Each group had a different activity to carry out. Then all the participants were asked the same 20 questions about the event to see what they remembered.

Figure 1: Table to show activities for each group with their type of processing

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Type of Processing	Structural	Phonemic	Semantic
Activity	Looking at pictures about the event in newspapers	Listening to radio reports about the event	Writing an article about the event

(a) Identify the independent variable (IV) and dependent variable (DV) in this study.

(2)

IV The type of processing used being either structural, phonemic or semantic.
DV How many questions the participant was able to answer correctly.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got 2 marks. One mark for IV which is clear and explained - see mark scheme and one mark for DV - which is also clear and precise - see mark scheme.

Question 13 (b)

The majority of candidates were identifying the IV well in their hypotheses but didn't make reference to the DV. Better answers referred to the DV as the number of questions answered correctly out of 20. Some candidates hadn't read the question correctly and gave a two-tailed hypothesis. Most candidates gained 1 mark. Far fewer were able to obtain 2 marks.

(b) Based on your knowledge of Levels of Processing, write an appropriate directional (one tailed) hypothesis for this study. (2)

The deeper the level of processing, the better the recall will be.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer gained one mark. Level 1 basic and appropriate - see example of a 1 mark answer in the mark scheme.

(b) Based on your knowledge of Levels of Processing, write an appropriate directional (one tailed) hypothesis for this study. (2)

~~The activity chosen for each course will~~
The Activity chosen for each course will have an effect on the amount of questions they get right (or the information they recall)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer gained 0 marks. It is a non-directional hypothesis - so even if anything else suits when the hypothesis is non directional.

(b) Based on your knowledge of Levels of Processing, write an appropriate directional (one tailed) hypothesis for this study. (2)

~~The~~ Group 3, who processed the information semantically (writing an article about the event) will have ~~the~~ the highest level of recall (test scores) than the rest of the 3 groups



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer gained two marks. This answer gives a lot of detail; Level 2 is clear and appropriate - with good elaboration.

Question 13 (c)

Lack of elaboration let many candidates down here. It was evident that they knew the appropriate strength and weakness of opportunity sampling, but were just unable to express it well enough. More able candidates could make a point and elaborate on it in both cases.

(c) The students used an opportunity sample in their Levels of Processing study.

State **one** strength and **one** weakness of opportunity sampling in general.

(2)

Strength

It is ~~is~~ often not time consuming compared to other sampling such as stratified sampling.

Weakness

It may not be representative of the wider population as you are just using participants that are available and able for the study at the time, therefore it lacks population validity.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gained two marks.

Strength: this got one mark see mark scheme - the comparison was enough for the mark (just).

Weakness: this got one mark for the idea of using who was available so not representative and lacking population validity. See mark scheme.

The use of terms strengthens the mark even though the actual problem was not spelled out (e.g. they are the same type of people).

Question 13 (d) (i)

Well answered by all those who had read the stimulus correctly and clearly understood the requirement for different groups of participants. Inevitably some still didn't know the difference between a design and a method and wrote lab/field incorrectly. This did have a knock on effect for the next question.

(d) (i) Identify the participant/experimental design being used in this Levels of Processing study. (1)

Independent design
~~Learning about pictures in events / structurally~~
~~balanced balanced~~ ~~Processing~~



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This gained one mark - you can ignore what is crossed out.

Question 13 (d) (ii)

The candidates who were picking up higher marks were usually those who were able to expand points for two marks such as the issue of order effects. Few answers commented on economical issues or incorrectly thought that this design would be more economical than repeated measures design.

More able candidates were able to evaluate independent measures, with the majority referring to the lack of order effects, demand characteristics and the need for more participants. Not all candidates were able to successfully explain their evaluation points which stopped them achieving the higher marks.

A large number of candidates offered standard answers that merely regurgitated criticisms of experiments without any understanding or elaboration on the points made.

It's still evident that there is confusion for less able candidates about what a design is, with a few referring to 'lab experiment' or 'field experiment' (i.e. 'it was an experiment so lacked mundane realism'; 'it was an experiment so the task wasn't true to life').

(ii) Evaluate the design you have identified in (d)(i).

(4)

This design is good in the fact that the participants will not gain practice effects from taking part in all three conditions as they may then be able to find a better way to remember the words.

On the other hand participant variables can affect the results when using independent measures design as participants may be in different states and may be better at remembering words than others. So if someone in the structural group was much better at remembering words than someone in the semantic groups then this would have an effect on the results.

There would be less demand characteristics in this design as the participants wouldn't have worked out the aim from the first group, but if they were in all conditions they may go through

demand characteristics as they may guess what the outcome of the results should be.

(Total for Question 13 = 11 marks)

ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got 4 marks.

Not being practice effects - first paragraph - the point was elaborated sufficiently so got one mark. People being different was given one mark as was 'better than remembering words than others'. One more mark for elaborating that point - giving the example, plus one mark for demand characteristics.

(One at the end for elaboration if another mark was available- one mark)

Question 14 (a)

This question was completed well by most candidates. However some described the procedure well but failed to offer aims, results and conclusion.

The most popular was Sherif's study which candidates answered well, those who described Reicher and Haslam tended to be either excellent gaining full marks or very poor, no in between. Answers on Sherif tended to be better with candidates seeming clearer on the procedure and findings of this study in comparison to Tajfel. Only the more able candidates were able to gain full marks by giving details of the aim and/or conclusion as well as procedure and findings.

Candidates who answered with reference to Tajfel's study tended to get confused with the procedure and a number of candidates thought the points allocation task was related to judging paintings of other group members.

14 You will have learned about one of the following studies in detail from social psychology:

- Sherif (1961/1988) – cave
- Tajfel et al (1970/1971) – minimal group studies
- Reicher and Haslam (2003/2006)

Choose **one** study from the list.

(a) Describe the study you have chosen.

(5)

Name of study Sherif (1961, 1988)

22 boys were taken on a trip and were separated into groups. The aim of Sherif's study was to see if merely separating boys into groups would affect their prejudice and discrimination. After the boys had been separated they were left for a week, in this time they made up names for their groups and created flags. After the second week they had been introduced to the other group and some problems had occurred like simple name calling. After this they were introduced into a competition and this resulted in some extreme behaviour. The boys burnt each other's flags and committed themselves to being discriminative.

of the other group. The group that won also had things stolen from their camp. Conclusively Sherif stated that even just being in separate social groups can cause severe discrimination and prejudice towards another group.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer got three marks.

One mark for the aim though Sherif did not just look at creating groups to see if there was prejudice, he looked at the effect of introducing conflict and then co-operation. But the mark scheme aim has two marks, and what is here has enough for one mark.

One mark for 'leaving them for a week and then introducing them to one another, leading to name calling and then competition and extreme behaviour' - one procedure mark that has a lot here but there was a lot of detail missing (Rattlers, Eagles etc...) so just the one procedure mark.

One mark for the results - the flag burning and discrimination, as well as taking things from the camp - put together a results mark.

The conclusion does not suit Sherif enough - it was about a) competition and b) co-operation - although he did show that simple groups did lead to prejudice and the aim mark has acknowledged this.

14 You will have learned about one of the following studies in detail from social psychology:

- Sherif (1961/1988)
- Tajfel et al (1970/1971)
- Reicher and Haslam (2003/2006)

Choose **one** study from the list.

(a) Describe the study you have chosen.

* The aim of the study was to investigate whether two clearly identifiable groups who are not in direct competition, would still display in-group favouritism.

Name of study Tajfel et al (1970/1971)

(5) aim

* There were 61 participants, they were all school boys around the ages of 14-15 years old. Participants believed they were participating in a study about vision. The boys were shown a cluster of dots on a screen and asked to estimate the number of dots.

The participants were given the task of allocating points to each other based on the accuracy of the estimates.

The participants were split in two groups, where they believed it was overestimators and underestimators, however they were actually randomly split.

The boys were told that the points could later be turned into money.

The boys did not know which boy they were allocating points to only their estimate and group. They had three conditions

Condition 1, where they had to choose from 2 boys in their in-group,

Condition 2, where they had to choose from 2 boys in their out-group and condition 3, they had to choose one boy from each.

The results showed the boys overwhelmingly allocated points to the boys in the same group as themselves. This demonstrates that even without competition participants still displayed in-group favouritism.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer got 5 marks.

One mark was given for the aim.

Two procedure marks - there was enough here for two marks - a lot of good detail including how groups were formed.

One mark was given for results - allocated points to their own group.

One mark for conclusion - 'even without competition' adds that bit more.

Question 14 (b)

However good the description of these studies was, it was rarely matched in evaluation. Far too many generic points were made which could equally apply to any study, others simply failed to elaborate on good starting points. Terms such as ecological validity, generalisability and ethnocentric were strewn about without any real context or understanding. Only the more able candidates could do this and most importantly made fewer points in depth instead of lots of brief evaluations.

(b) Evaluate the study you have described in (a).

(4)

Strengths

The experiment was a field experiment and the boys were in a natural environment ~~set~~ and did not know they were being studied and were more likely to act natural so this study is high in ecological validity

The study had strict controls i.e. a script so the study could be replicated and hopefully produce the same results.

Weaknesses

The study encouraged children to act in a stressful, violent way, which is an ethical issue itself teaching children violent traits



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer gained one mark only.

One mark for the mark scheme point about natural environment - did not add as much as the mark scheme two mark point.

There was no script, not clear, so no mark there. They did not encourage violence though the boys did burn flags etc - it was rather weak and needed linking more to the study (burning flags, name calling?).

There was nothing generic that was specific enough - that could apply to any of the three - so no generic marks.

(b) Evaluate the study you have described in (a).

(4)

The study was ecologically valid as the camp was a familiar natural setting to the boys. However, the boys were not told the true aim of the study and were not asked for consent. But, as in Milgram's case it would have made a nonsense of the study! The study only consisted of young males making it unrepresentative for the wider population. Because it lacked population validity, the study cannot be generalised to older people and people from other cultures. Despite this, the study was high in experimental validity as the boys were unaware they were being observed, meaning they were not subject to demand characteristics.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer gained 4 marks.

One mark for the ecological validity point - see mark scheme which gave a two mark example - this did not have the same amount of information so has one mark not two.

One mark for not told true aim so not asked for consent - a fair ethics mark.

One mark for young males so cannot generalise to older people (wait for that clarification).

One mark for not having demand characteristics and saying why this was the case.

Question 15

Almost all candidates were able to identify the correct theory and show some understanding of it. Candidates mainly answered this question well the majority were able to describe the three component parts well, stronger answers commented on the claims of the theory and gave clear examples of social identification or social comparison. Most candidates scored around 3 marks, often when describing social categorisation this was too brief to show any real understanding. Many candidates gave a definition of prejudice, which was not needed. Many also led on to talk about discrimination which was also unnecessary.

15 Describe the social identity theory of prejudice.

(5)

A social identity comes from how people see themselves in relation to their groups memberships. There are three stages of social identity; social categorisation, when you group people according to their memberships, social identification, when you internalise the norms and values of your in group, and social comparisons, when you compare different groups. Tajfel believed that social identity led to prejudice as the formation of an in group also created an out group and people would be hostile towards the out group creating prejudice. Prejudice can be defined as an attitude towards someone built on a stereotype of their group memberships. Tajfel also believed that the extent of in group favouritism and out group hostility or prejudice ~~meets~~ ^{relies} on; the extent to which the individual identifies themselves with the in group, the amount of comparisons to the out group and the relevance of comparisons to the out group. Prejudice can lead to discrimination which is a behaviour rather than attitude.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer got three marks.

There was some introduction and then the three terms were briefly outlined.

One mark was given for social identification explained enough (the other two were not explained/elaborated enough for marks).

One mark was given for in group out group hostile and prejudice.

One mark was given for the idea of hostility and in group favouritism but not two marks as this was a little list like and more elaboration was needed for a second mark.

The social identity theory was devised by Tajfel. He says that prejudice can arise simply from the mere existence of another group.

There are 3 stages to the social identity theory:

The first stage is social categorisation. This is when you categorise yourself within a group because you feel you like them or are similar to them e.g. when someone joins a football team and starts to support them. The second is social identification, this is when you identify yourself with the group and begin to take on role, aspects or characteristics e.g. when a football supporter wears a scarf for his football team. The final is social comparison, this is when you begin to compare yourself with other groups e.g. when one team goes against another and they one team tells another they are better than the other. This can lead to discrimination when people do acts which show that they feel they are better or do not like the other group. The theory says that ~~the theory~~ one group is prejudice or discriminative towards another group to try to boost their own self-esteem, and to make themselves feel better than the out-group.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer gained five marks.

One mark was given for mere existence of another group - the 'mere' was what made this rich enough.

One mark was given for categorising and the example - not enough without the example but there was elaboration and not taken as a standalone example so that mark was still available (see mark scheme).

One mark was given for identification, which was well described.

One mark was given for the example following identification; this was the example mark - max 1.

One mark was given for social comparison with the elaboration up to one team thinking they were better. (If there were more marks available the last sentence could have gained a mark - boosting self esteem and so on)

Question 16

The majority of answers offered were based on the Meeus and Raaijmakers study and were done quite well with only a handful comparing to Slater's study.

Those doing less well failed to offer comparative information for both studies and based their description solely on Milgram, suggesting they knew Meeus and Raaijmakers but not in enough detail. A minority of answers offered Hofling so gained no marks and one or two offered variations on Milgram.

Generally the quality of comparison was good with many candidates achieving at least 3/4 out of 6. Some candidates still don't seem to understand how to compare, giving a description of one followed by a description of the other, but these were much less common. Some candidates described the chosen study before comparing it, which was not necessary. The most common comparisons revolved around the aim, procedure, setting and results. The more able candidates could highlight similarities as well as differences comfortably.

16 Milgram's original (1963) study was carried out in the USA.

Compare Milgram's (1963) study of obedience with **one other** study of obedience that was **not** carried out in the USA.

Comparisons include considering similarities and/or differences.

(6)

Milgram's study can be compared with Meeus and Raaijmakers who did a similar study to Milgram.

The similarities between them are that they both were trying to show obedience to an authority figure when they had to do something harmful to another person.

They both used a confederate who acted when being physically or ^{psychologically} ~~mentally~~ abused. But the participant did not know this.

Both were lab experiments so they had control over extraneous variables and both could be replicated so the experiment was repeatable.

However they were not ecologically valid.

Neither of the studies participants knew the true aim of the study which means they were deceived.

However the differences between the studies are that Meeus and Raaijmakers used a more up to date way and instead of

physically hurting some ^{one} they were ~~physically~~ psychologically hurting them instead.

They also had two rebellious people come into the interview which decrease the percentage of people who abuse the confederate. Whereas in Milgrams he only had a situation where the experimenter was not there but there was still a high percentage of people who went all the way.

Both of the studies showed that people do obey to authority figures but Meeus and Raaijmakers percentage was higher as they had 92% who went all the way but Milgram only had 65%.

(Total for Question 16 = 6 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gained 5 marks.

First check the study being compared with - this was Meeus and Raaijmakers.

One mark was given for the idea of both aiming to show obedience.

One mark was given for the idea of the confederate and some detail. One mark was given for replicable and so on.

Then there was the mark about neither having the same aim so both being deceived - the mark scheme talked about how they were deceived - see mark scheme - no mark given for this point.

One mark was given for physical v psychological, this was well expressed.

The next material was a variation of Meeus and Raaijmakers, which might be okay if their variation was compared with his main study but it was compared with one of his variations so no mark. The questions asked for a comparison with Milgram's main study.

One mark was given for comparing their results with the figures.

Question 17

The overwhelming majority of candidates chose to answer using the Multi-Store Model with many also including diagrams of the model as part of their answers. Where this was done, the diagrams were often only partially explained in the written response. Weaker evaluations often referring to case studies like Clive Wearing or research into Primacy-Recency, but not being able to adequately use them to evaluate the theory. Better responses were able to link evaluation points back to the theory as most evaluations ended up as a list, those who were getting into higher bands were also commenting on the application of the theory and problems with research supporting a theory.

Candidates describing and evaluating reconstructive memory tended to only refer to schemas and then relate answers either to the War of the Ghosts research, or EWT which some were able to do effectively, while others became muddled.

Quite a lot of candidates incorrectly used cue dependency as a theory of memory, and a few used Trace Decay meaning they were credited with no marks.

*17 Describe and evaluate **one** theory/model of memory **other than** Levels of Processing.

(12)

One Model of memory is the 'Multi-store model' Atkinson and Shiffrin 1968. There are three, fixed memory stores. Our first memory store is called the Sensory memory. Here, incoming senses (sensory input) such as taste, touch, smell, hear and sight bombard our perceptual system, as the sensory memory acts as a buffer to organize incoming senses. Iconic (Things we see) can last in the sensory memory for 1 second and echoic sensory memory can last up to 2 seconds. In order for information from the sensory memory to transfer onto the short term memory store, the information must receive attention. This information which is attended to is stored in the short term memory with a capacity of 7 ± 2 , and can hold information between 15 to 30 seconds. The information stored in the short term memory must be repeated in order to transfer into our long term memory store. Information repeated in the short term memory will be transferred to the long term memory which has a capacity of information lasting from a few minutes to many years. The information in terms of what it can hold is unlimited, despite the capacity in the sensory and short term memory stores being only limited. Information loss in the sensory memory store decays. In the short term memory store information loss, decays

and their is displacement. Finally information loss from the long term memory is decay and interference.

In terms of evaluation, HM and Clive support the model. Both these individuals had both their hippocampuses of the brain damaged and therefore, they could not store any information into the long term memory. The information they could store in their memory was for only 30 seconds maximum. This supports the model, as it suggests that if information is not repeated, information will be unable to transfer from the short term memory to the long term memory store. It states that information in the short term memory will have a maximum capacity of holding information for a maximum of 30 seconds.

Another support for the model is the serial position curve. This states that when we read a list of words we remember the words at the end of the list better and tend to forget those at the beginning and in the middle. The position of this serial position supports the model, because, the list of words at the end of the list is what is stored either in our sensory memory store or short term memory. It's the fact that we can retrieve information for up to 1 second if it's iconic / 2 seconds if echoic (sensory memory) and from 18-30 seconds in the short term memory. The words at the beginning and middle of the list decay due to them not being newly repeated in order to transfer them to the long term memory.

Some studies believe that the idea of their being ^{separate} a short term memory and long term memory store is inaccurate. Studies believe it should be unitary. The Multi-store model believes that ~~that~~ \exists does not explain for explicit memory, events such as 9/11

which are retrieved without having to store them in the long term memory by repeating it.

There are real life applications to using the multi-store model, which can help with revision and trying to remember information. It is a way of understanding that by merely repeating information, can help, allow information to be stored in our long term memory.

There are unfavourable comparisons to the study. The levels of processing model suggests that the way we interpret information and what we do with it is what affects our ability to remember information. The levels of processing model criticizes the multi-store model, suggesting that it is more effective to semantically process information, therefore by understanding the meaning of information, it represents how the memory can hold information for. The levels of processing model shows how the memory's durability of information can be stored used more effectively than by merely repeating information which has no relevant information to it.

A criticism for the model is the fact that many of the studies used to prove its validity and reliability is the fact that they are done using laboratory experiments. This therefore lowers the ecological validity and the ability to generalize it to the population.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gained 11 marks right in the middle of the top level.

Both description and evaluation were done 'very well' with lots of detail and depth.

The description included detail such as iconic and echoic memory alongside the more standard capacity and duration information.

The evaluation did have minor inaccuracies (serial position curve only partially correct) but this did not penalise the rest of the excellent evaluation - however it did prevent it getting full marks.

Paper Summary

It was 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.

Overall candidates appeared to understand the nature of the paper and the areas of the course drawn through the questions.

Generally most candidates had a good attempt at all questions, which was very pleasing.

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 US032837 June 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