

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCE Psychology 6PS01 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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 2013

Publications Code US036691

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

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

It was the first time an essay on how science works (AO3) had been set. Candidates included detailed, thorough and appropriate evaluations of qualitative/quantitative methods, but did less well in explaining them. This is more a matter of skills training, rather than a reflection of candidates' understanding of the concepts of both sets of data, which is impressive on the whole.

Some candidates still find it difficult to provide relevant psychological research and instead rely on anecdotal information which is not creditworthy. However, there are continuing signs of a gradual improvement in this area.

Overall, candidates were able to give succinct responses with remarkable clarity given the pressures of an examination, but others would benefit from improving the way they communicate their answers and use extended prose.

Question 10

A number of candidates did not read the instructions and only put a cross in one box instead of two.

In the main, candidates who did cross two boxes achieved both marks.

Question 11

The majority of candidates could identify moral strain as the feature. Most of these could then elaborate on the feature, with better candidates able to make two points for full marks. The main reason candidates did not pick up the final mark was due to lack of elaboration.

Where candidates did not score full marks, it was mainly due to one or a combination of the following:

Lack of elaboration

Calling it a different feature, typically agentic or autonomous state, or simply writing about Milgram's study.

Naming the incorrect feature yet describing moral strain underneath.

Moral Strain

Description

Moral strain occurs when a person is asked by an authority figure to carry out an action that is in direct conflict with that person's moral values and expectations. In order to carry out the orders the person must act in the agentic state - an agent of that authority. This causes moral strain to develop as a person's actions are inconsistent with their values and beliefs.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 marks were awarded for this response:

1st mark for identification

2nd mark for the opening sentence of the description. The next sentence is about the agentic state and is not describing moral strain

3rd mark for the final sentence which is just enough because it talks about inconsistency with values and beliefs



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The quote in the box is there to help but should not be copied word for word into your answer. You will not gain marks from repeating information provided within the question.

Moral Strain

Description

Moral strain is when an individual is put in a situation where their own morals, values and beliefs are questionable. They feel as if they should not be doing something they are doing, but are doing it because they feel pressured into doing so.

An example of this is stealing. Someone might steal something even though they know it is wrong.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

2 marks were awarded for this response:

1st mark is for the identification mark

The opening sentence is not creditworthy as it is incorrect.

2nd mark comes from the second sentence about being pressurised into doing something they would not choose to do.

The example is not creditworthy because it does not demonstrate moral strain.

Milgram's original study of obedience 1963

Description

80 white American males, aged 18-65, working class volunteered for an advertisement, with a reward of \$4. A stooge was the learner, and the participant the teacher, with each wrong answer the teacher gave the learner an electric shock. Ranging from 15V to 450V. When they protested they were encouraged to carry on by the experimenter "you must go on" results showed that 100% went to 300V and 65% went to 450V. This shows that under an expert influence, destructive obedience would be carried out.

(Total for Question 11 = 3 marks)



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There were no marks awarded to this response because it is a pure description of Milgram's experiment which is not moral strain.

Question 13

This was well done on the whole. Many candidates gained full marks easily by outlining all three levels of processing with elaborated examples *plus* giving the order correctly. The elaboration usually took the form of a question used by Craik & Tulving.

Other candidates could outline all three briefly and then rank them appropriately. However, some candidates were confused about the difference between structural and phonetic processing. References to the actual study revealed some misunderstandings about the process as a revision/study technique rather than an indication of an incidental learning process. Only a few candidates offered elaborations such as maintenance rehearsal for shallow processing or elaborative rehearsal for more lasting memories.

There are three levels of process in the levels of Processing framework. The most effective ~~process~~ process is semantic because it requires elaborative rehearsal to learn the meaning of the word therefore has ~~the~~ a deep encoding. ~~This is followed by phonemic process, where words are processed by its sound therefore it has an intermediate encoding.~~ This is followed by phonemic process, where words are processed by its sound therefore it has an intermediate encoding. The least effective level of process is structural because words are learnt by looking at the structure of the word, therefore has shallow encoding, since elaborative rehearsal is not required.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Level 3 - 3 marks

At least 2 of the LOP show depth (semantic and structural). The second and final sentences make it perfectly clear. The sentence on phonemic processes is less well elaborated. However, since two are elaborated and the ranking is correct (most effective/least effective) this achieves Level 3 - 3 marks.

After looking at the study by Craik and Tulving that tested the levels of processing; semantic processing would be placed as the most effective level. This is because looking at the meaning of something and processing it semantically is a form of elaborative rehearsal and is the deepest form of processing so ^{leads to} ~~creates~~ the most durable memory. Phonetic processing would be ranked after semantic, structural would be placed as the least effective as it is the shallowest form of processing.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Level 2 - 2 marks

Only one LOP is mentioned in depth (semantic), others are mentioned and ranking is correct. The final two sentences on phonetic and structural processing are not elaborated enough as compared to semantic.

Structural processing, which is based on remembering ^{information} ~~through~~ through how ^{it} ~~it~~ looks, "will result in the least effective memory, as it uses the most shallow form of processing and the least cognitive work, therefore it would be ranked lowest. phonetic processing, which is what the information sounds like, is said to be more effective than structural because it uses ~~more~~ deeper processing, so it would result in better memory and be ranked higher. Finally, semantic processing, according to the levels of processing theory, is the deepest form of processing, as it uses the most cognitive work. It is based on what the information means, and the more meaning which is extracted from information, the better it is remembered, so semantic processing would be ranked highest for memory recall.

(Total for Question 13 = 4 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Level 4 - 4 marks

An accurate description of three LOP given with at least two expanded (structural and semantic - cognitive work) showing depth and breadth. Ranking is correct and effectively shown. The structural example uses terms such as how it looks, most shallow, least cognitive. The semantic example uses terms such as deepest, cognitive, meaning which is extracted. Both of these are examples of very good elaboration.

Question 14a

All candidates were able to describe this study, and almost all candidates gained a mark for describing the four conditions, however few provided the in-depth detail required. Very few candidates quoted any numbers accurately and few described the procedure (i.e. what the participants actually did) with enough clarity to know what happened if you were not familiar with the study. There were some errors including stating it was independent groups or confusing this with Craik & Tulving (or merging the two!).

There were some candidates who described the whole study without paying particular attention to the procedure of the study and therefore wasted time with aims and results. There appeared to be some confusion over the research design of the study, but the more able candidates did recognise that repeated measures ensured that the data could be compared accurately.

Many candidates did not recall exact details from the study to support their answers making it difficult for them to achieve marks, eg 'lists were given to be remembered and recalled'. There were some very strong answers from a few candidates who knew the procedure in great depth. These answers gave details on sample, materials and experimental design.

(4)

40 divers ^{from Scotland} were used in the study. There were four conditions into which they were divided into ~~3~~ to learn and recall words: on land learning and recall, underwater learning and recall, onland learning and underwater recall and underwater learning and onland recall. It was therefore a repeated measures design has all participants (pps.) experienced two conditions.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

1 mark

The number of divers is incorrect so no credit is given for the first sentence. The second sentence is correct (about the four conditions) and achieves a mark. The final sentence is incorrect as there were four conditions not two.

A repeated measures design was used.

There were 18 participants; 13 male and 5 female from a university diving club.

There were 4 conditions that each participant had to do. 'wet-wet' 'wet-dry' 'dry-dry' 'dry-wet'.

The participant had to learn a list of 38 unrelated words with 2-3 syllables. They then had to recall them in either condition.

A special piece of equipment was used for the underwater condition.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 marks

The first mark is awarded for the first two sentences put together (repeated measures design and sample). The third sentence gets the second mark for identifying the four conditions. The rest of the answer is not creditworthy as 38 unrelated words is not accurate (it should be 36). There needs to be a more specific response about the 'special piece of equipment'.

18 participants, 13 male and 5 female on a diving holiday in Scotland, they were asked to learn a list of 36 words on land and underwater, then they had to recall the words on 'dry' land or 'wet'. The aim was to see if context acted as a cue in ~~remember~~ recalling the words. There were four conditions wet-learning dry-recall, dry-learning wet-recall, wet-recall, wet-learning, dry-learning, dry-recall. The list were taped and played underwater, there was a practise session in order for the divers to practice their breathing so it did not hamper their hearing of the words. ~~At~~ the list was played twice, after the second time the divers had to write down 15 numbers in order for the list not to stay in their short term memory. There was at least 24 hours between each condition.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response achieves 4 marks

1st mark for the first sentence about sample and learning 36 words.

The next sentence is an aim so no marks.

The third sentence achieves 1 mark for identifying the four conditions. The next sentence achieves the 3rd mark (practice session/breathing).

The next sentence achieves the 4th mark (play twice/15 numbers).

This is a good answer which has enough detail to be awarded a 5th mark - had there been one.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

With questions on important studies like this one, always check which part of the study you should be writing about. In this case it is the procedure only. Writing about aims, results and conclusions just wastes time and are not worth any marks.

Question 14b

As expected this question assessed candidates' ability to evaluate. Several candidates robotically went through GRAVE making points that were not relevant to this study such as 'it was ethically good'. Others did not include enough for each category eg they would say the study 'had a standardised procedure, so it was reliable'.

The majority were able to evaluate the study, but lacked context in their answers which just left generic evaluation. Most candidates gained at least one mark for applications to real life, with the most popular example being "student revision". Many candidates made simple statements that could have applied to many different studies. A minority of candidates did not refer to the study at all. Many included generalisability without using the term 'representative'. Many also referred to ecological validity instead of task validity.

Unfortunately, the term 'ecological validity' was used to describe the task being unrealistic and when it was used to describe the environment, it was not always made specific to divers being in water.

There was some confusion over the reliability of the study. Some candidates acknowledged controls that were set but also the inability to control other aspects. No candidates were aware of the relevance of the study to North Sea oil rig divers, which would justify such unusual procedures. Use of correct psychological terminology was not always apparent or used appropriately, particularly with regard to the task itself.

The study had a lack of control over extraneous variables such as diving location and diving equipment faults. It also was not standardised. This is a weakness as it means the results are unreliable.

The nature of the change between environments could also have effected the results as it could have interfered with participants rehearsal of words while those who do not change ~~of~~ environments could rehearse words more, making results unreliable.

The study has high ecological validity as the environment was a realistic open water environment which makes it more like where the divers would usually be.

The researchers also tested divers in pairs which ~~makes results more reliable~~ eliminates the participants cheating to learn the word list.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response receives 4 marks with 1 mark per paragraph.

1st mark is for examples of extraneous variables (see mark scheme).

2nd mark is for interference and its effect on the divers. 3rd mark is for ecological validity and for the open water environment.

The last mark is about cheating (see mark scheme).



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try and give an example of a variable that was not controlled when evaluating studies. Just saying 'it lacks control over confounding/extraneous variables' is not enough. In this case the answer clearly gives a good example about the diving equipment.

A strength of Godden and Baddeley's study was that it had ecological validity because when the divers recalled words under water they were in their 'natural environments' and was a field experiment.

The study had set controls ~~in~~ during the experiment therefore it could be replicated and tested for reliability.

A weakness includes that the participants that took part were on holiday and therefore the study used an opportunity sample which the results can not be representative ~~to~~ to the whole target population.

The study also lacks validity because ~~the~~ it is hard to tell what words are trying to be recalled under water which could lead to experimenter subjectivity.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is awarded 2 marks.

The first mark for the first paragraph about ecological validity and natural environments.

The second paragraph is not creditworthy, as it needs examples of set controls.

The third paragraph is just worth one mark, because correct terminology is used (opportunity sample/representative). The point the candidate is making is not really well expressed but can be inferred.

Godden and Baddeley's study was a field study, meaning that it had some validity as it was the divers' familiar surroundings, ~~there was~~ However the study lacks generalisability as it can only be generalised to divers. Also because of the time between the conditions could have effected the location of the different conditions. The study can not be repeated as it would be ~~and~~ near on impossible to recreate the same environment, so it has little credibility.

The study does have reliability because it was carried out ~~in~~ by professional experimenters, however because it can not be recreated it loses some of this reliability.

The conditioned words do cause it to be more ~~all~~ credible because it is unlikely to be down to cue-dependency.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response receives 0 marks.

There are a lot of generic evaluation points that are not elaborated or just incorrect. The first point made needs to refer to ecological validity and real life behaviour. The second point about generalisability is too brief and not elaborated. Similarly, the third point about time between the conditions needs elaboration. The fourth point about replication is too general and needs to refer to variables. The final two points are confused.

Question 15

Most candidates used Sherif and Tajfel to answer this question, with only a few candidates offering alternative studies.

Most answers were restricted to Tajfel's own study and that of Sherif together with a brief mention of revision techniques. Some candidates were very vague when describing the minimal group's studies and at times it was difficult to identify which study they were using. The social identity theory was described by some candidates or an example/study was given, but how it supported or did not support SIT was not included. Other candidates described these studies, often in rather too much detail, without identifying any particular aspect of the theory that it supported. Relatively few candidates quoted specific findings from the studies.

When Sherif was quoted it was not made obvious that the pre-competition phase supported SIT and that the prejudice seen after competition could be put down to Realistic Conflict Theory. Only a few cited Lalonde (1992) and even fewer mentioned Jane Elliott and the coloured eyes study. Some candidates did not include any research and simply focused on real life phenomena eg football hooliganism. There was some focus on methodological flaws of Tajfel's research but this was limited.

Candidates who understood the question cited at least two studies and included findings about how they supported or refuted SIT. They would then make appropriate points about methodological flaws with these studies.

The Social Identity Theory states that there are three stages of prejudice; Social categorisation, when a person begins to categorise themselves into an in-group which consists of that person's perceived social category, and an out-group. The second stage is social identification when a person identifies with their in-group, ~~adopting~~ adopting the group's norms and values. The third stage, social discrimination occurs when a person's values and norms have completely merged with their in-group and favour their group over others as it boosts their self-esteem.

One main criticism of the theory is that it does not adequately explain what causes people to initially categorise people. Another argument against the theory is that prejudice can be better explained evolutionarily.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is awarded 0 marks.

The first half of the answer is descriptive not evaluative, so cannot be given credit. The final two points made at the bottom of the page need to be elaborated more.

Sherif et al. showed how Social Identity Theory (SIT) is applicable in every day life by splitting 22 ~~It~~ white, middle class, protestant, 11 year olds into 2 groups on a summer camp. What he noticed was that as soon as the 2 groups were aware of each other they showed hostility towards the other group to a point where ~~violence~~ some children were almost violent. This proves SIT by showing how when categorised into 2 groups the groups immediately showed out group hostility towards the other group and in group favouritism towards their own group, believing they were better than the other group. They also identified with their group under mottoes and flags.

However this study isn't generalisable as it was ethnocentric with all the participants being 11 year old white middle class protestant boys, and so this study can't be applied to the rest of the population. A rather problem is that hostility dramatically increased when competition was introduced which undermines how much SIT explains prejudice without competition.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response achieves 3 marks.

The first half of the answer is given 1 mark, for demonstrating how Robber's Cave supports SIT.

The final paragraph receives 2 marks for the two separate points made.

1 mark is given for ethnocentrism which is explained well.

1 mark is given for the point made about competition and although it is not expressed clearly, the candidate is trying to compare it with realistic conflict theory.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When being asked to include research in your answer, always make it explicit that it is your own research so the examiner knows you have addressed this part of the question.

Question 16

Q16 (a)

Most candidates were able to answer this question well, referring to MSM, a minority referred to reconstructive memory and rarely candidates referred to working memory. Most of the candidates who chose MSM nearly all referred to capacity and duration of stores. Other candidates found it difficult to have two, non-overlapping, features. Using this model, candidates frequently had too much information, so many answers gave a full description of the model for feature 1, incorporating multiple features, and then struggling to pick out a clear second feature. Many did choose STM then LTM but many were overlapping concepts too much to gain full credit. Those who described the SS and the STM were usually the most successful. Candidates selecting Reconstructive Memory often did not identify two clear features, although schemas were generally well described.

Generally, candidates also referred to rehearsal but few mentioned attending to information. This was quite difficult for candidates this year. There were some who focused their response on theories of forgetting in particular cue dependency. Candidates who responded using an alternate model were unable to demonstrate the features. The most popular response was that of the multi-store model, but there is a growing number of candidates writing detailed answers about the reconstructive theory and scoring highly. Working memory is the less frequent response.

Some candidates seemed unsure about the term 'feature' and threw in everything they knew about MSN and Reconstructive Memory. The latter was difficult to unpick. A few compared the mind to a computer which was not creditworthy. Some included elaborative rehearsal as a feature of MSM. When Bartlett had been used, answers tended to be brief and did not gain full marks. The few who attempted Baddeley and Hitch were even briefer and poorly done. Occasionally, concepts from Baddeley & Hitch were used in MSM.

Q16 (b)

Some candidates clearly did not understand the question and made general points about applicability. When research was cited better, candidates gained full marks. The most common evidence described was brain-damaged case studies, especially Clive Wearing as well as support from studies such as Peterson and Peterson. Better candidates could effectively use studies like Peterson, Glanzer and Clive Wearing to make really good points regarding capacity, duration and existence of stores. However, many saw it as an opportunity to just write more about MSM. A minority knew that case studies of HM, FK and Clive Wearing were connected but could not really explain why.

Multistore Model of Memory

First feature, ^{information}

~~Some~~ The ~~things~~ [↑] we pay attention to are ~~stored~~ stored in our Short-term memory. It is usually stored in audio form. The duration of short-term memory is 15-30 seconds and the capacity is ± 7 items.

Second feature

The memory in Short-term memory is then transferred into the Long-term ~~memory~~ memory ~~to~~ through elaborative rehearsing, or else the memory is lost. Long-term memory stores information in semantic form. The duration and the capacity of Long-term ~~memory~~ memory is limitless.

Feature Short-term Memory

Information first needs to be saved on this store before being transferred into the long-term memory ~~at the~~. The information needs to follow the sequence of sensory register then into the short-term memory and finally into the long-term memory through elaborative rehearsal; however, if ~~is~~ ~~not necessary~~ the short-term memory storage is damaged, people are still able to save information in the long-term memory.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

16(a) 3 marks

The first feature (STM) is worth 2 marks

1 mark for capacity/duration and 1 mark for audio form.

The second feature is long term memory which is only worth 1 mark for duration/capacity. The middle sentence is not elaborated enough and needs to refer to acoustic or visual storage.

16(b) 0 marks as the response was mainly descriptive without evaluation.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

With two part questions like this, always read ahead to see what the next part is asking. This prevents repetition, and in this case helps you decide which features to choose.

First feature

Short term memory - has a capacity of 5-9 pieces of information with a duration of 18-30 seconds and stays in the acoustic form. The multi-store model suggests that through rehearsal, this information can move to the long-term memory store.

Second feature

Long-term memory - has a potentially infinite capacity to hold information and can store it for up to a life time, and stays in the semantic form. The multi-store model suggests that through rehearsal information will move into there and can be recalled at anytime.

Feature short-term memory

Clive Wearing could remember motor skills in his long-term memory and could learn new motor skills, but his short term memory was severely damaged suggesting that information may not necessarily have to go through the STM to get to the LTM suggesting there may be separate stores and that it's more complex.

(Total for Question 16 = 6 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

16(a) 4 marks

The first feature is short term memory which is given both marks for capacity and duration plus acoustic form.

The second feature is long term memory which is also given 2 marks for capacity and duration plus rehearsal form.

16(b) 2 marks for including Clive Wearing supports the existence of a separate STM and there is some reverse amplification regarding the learning of new motor skills.

Question 17

Most candidates did well when references were made to atrocities. Many candidates could use at least SIT or Agency effectively to make some links back to the source material. There was still a minority not linking it back to the source for each concept they introduced. These candidates tended to describe the theories in isolation from the scenario with a sentence tagged on the end to say 'this explains how atrocities are caused'. Supporting studies were not always explicitly linked to the concept.

Diffusion of responsibility and the theory of competition were also mentioned but not always fully explained. A full range of answers were included by all, but individual candidates tended to restrict their own answers perhaps due to lack of attention to examination technique. As the mark scheme required each example to be linked to atrocities, many candidates only achieved a few marks as they did not continue to link atrocities to all examples offered after mentioning these once or twice.

Agentic states and SIT (in-groups/out-groups, social comparison to enhance self-esteem) were the most frequently used concepts, with many candidates able to link these successfully to Hitler and WWII atrocities, and to events in Abu Ghraib. More able candidates accurately linked atrocities to realistic conflict theory and Iraq/USA competition over oil.

Most answers gave reasonable descriptions of agentic state and social comparison as explanations and only occasionally these were not linked to atrocities/terrorism. Better answers referred to transfer of blame to authority figure and moral strain, social identification and categorisation. The best answers included these points with the addition of realistic conflict theory. The number of responses referred to a charismatic leader but these were rarely elaborated sufficiently to gain credit. There was a wide variety of atrocity examples although some answers used football hooliganism instead.

The reasons for terrorist atrocities are complex, however, there are several theories to help explain. Social identity theory states that people can be categorised into groups and will eventually discriminate between the groups. ~~There are~~ The three stages of social identity theory are social categorisation - this is when people separate themselves and others into in-groups and out-groups. The next stage is called social identification - this is when people start to identify with their in-group and start to assume its norms and values. The third stage is social discrimination, this is when people begin to discriminate against the out-group and favour the in-group. This happens because the person's norms and values become so intertwined with the group that



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is given 2 marks.

The first page is a summary of SIT with no reference to the question (atrocities), so no credit can be given. 2 marks are given for the final paragraph - 1 mark for agentic state and 1 mark for moral strain.

The people who commit the atrocities are obeying (6)
a figure of authority.
Agency theory can help explain this because the people who commit the atrocities are likely to be in an agentic state: this means that they merely see themselves as agents of the authority figure, lose their freewill and do not take responsibility for their actions. Like Eichmann said at his testimony, 'I only did what I was told to do.' Some people will feel unpleasant feelings after the ~~events~~ ^{immoral acts committed} due to a feeling of moral strain.

However, some people may stay in an autonomous state where they keep their freewill, by not following orders which they believe to be wrong, and take full responsibility for their actions.

The atrocities may have begun due to prejudice⁴, which is when we form an ~~opinion~~ opinion on someone based on little or no knowledge of them. This leads to discriminations which are the actions based on the prejudice, which in this case, are the acts of terrorism.

Finally, social identity theory (S.I.T) can be

atrocities against fellow human beings.

The people who commit the atrocities are obeying (6) a figure of authority. Agency theory can help explain this because the people who commit the atrocities are likely to be in an agentic state: this means that they merely see themselves as agents of the authority figure, lose their freewill and do not take responsibility for their actions. Like Eichmann said at his testimony, 'I only did what I was told to do.' Some people will feel unpleasant feelings after their ~~actions~~^{immoral acts committed} due to a feeling of moral strain.

However, some people may stay in an autonomous state where they keep their freewill, by not following orders which they believe to be wrong, and take full responsibility for their actions.

The atrocities may have begun due to prejudice^A, which is when we form an ~~opinion~~ opinion on someone based on little or no knowledge of them. This leads to discrimination which are the actions based on the prejudice, which in this case, are the acts of terrorism.

Finally, social identity theory (S.I.T) can be



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is given 4 marks.

1 mark for linking atrocities to agents of authority figures.

1 mark for the example of Eichmann linked to immoral acts committed.

The next paragraph about the autonomous state is not linked therefore is not given any credit.

The third paragraph is given 1 mark as it links atrocities to prejudice and discrimination.

The final paragraph achieves 1 mark as it links social comparison to these horrific events.

Question 18

All candidates attempted this question and were able to describe and evaluate quantitative and qualitative data. Some candidates did not extend their answers to gain more marks. Consequently answers lacked detail or the required number of discussion points to gain all the marks available.

Psychological terminology tended to be restricted to a few popular expressions except in the best answers. Only a handful of answers mixed quantitative and qualitative data.

Candidates were able to evaluate both types of data equally well, but the description of data lacked detail and prevented most candidate answers from reaching the top band. Quantitative data was often supported with examples from Milgram's study but examples of qualitative data were rarely cited.

Some candidates equated data qualitative with interviews and quantitative data with questionnaires. This tended to occur in the evaluation even when there was a correct explanation of qualitative data including open questions and quantitative data including closed questions. Quantitative data is anonymous and larger samples can be used through the internet, while qualitative data is subject to social desirability responses set due to interpersonal interaction.

Most candidates offered only simple generic explanations of the two types of data, and most did not offer any examples at all. Candidates who did offer examples often gave hypothetical non-psychological survey questions. The best answers did refer to Milgram's study as an example where both types of data were collected and candidates who did this were able to make the point very effectively.

Many candidates tried to turn this into a 'describe and evaluate survey methods' question, rather than focus on the type of data derived. Candidates saw this data question as being in the Social Psychology box, entirely linked to open/closed questioning, without seeing how this applied across approaches/methodologies. Very few candidates linked quantitative data to experimental techniques or with descriptive statistics. No candidates described analysis of qualitative data by emergent themes, with most candidates describing qualitative data in terms of unique case study type data, which could not be interpreted or generalised.

Description was usually very weak. When candidates did give more information about what qualitative and quantitative data are/how they are collected/examples of studies that collect each, they did very well, but these were rare. Some candidates could only acknowledge a survey as a research method and not others that are used to gather qualitative and quantitative data accurately. The evaluation points tended to focus on lack of objectivity and reliability of data. The more able candidates also acknowledged the idea that qualitative data could be beneficial as this could be converted into numerical data as well as giving large amounts of data about an individual.

Some responses were very repetitive, focusing on hard/easy to analyse, subjective/objective. Some responses strayed into an evaluation of research methods such as unstructured interviews saying how they are quick to construct but take a long time to answer.

Many answers were limited by discussions of questionnaires alone, ignoring the whole of scientific endeavour in Psychology, and giving irrelevant discussion of their relative merits.

Examples given overwhelmingly identified Likert scales to collect quantitative data. Only a few candidates could identify quantitative data with mean, median and modes, central tendencies and statistical analysis. Better answers referred to subjectivity of interpretation, use of statistical analysis, demand characteristics and replicability.

Quantitative data is factual, numerical data gathered by psychologists in a standardised procedure. Qualitative data is data that consists of letters but is rich, detailed and in-depth. Quantitative data is highly reliable as the strict, rigid procedure performed by psychologists means that other psychologists can repeat the experiment with the confidence of having similar findings. Qualitative data is highly valid as it collects detailed information and causes in factors such as emotions and feelings, something that quantitative data does not do, making quantitative data highly superficial. A disadvantage with qualitative data is that it cannot be replicated due to the non-standardised procedure it has, as the flexibility of the qualitative data means that it cannot easily be representative of the general population as qualitative data are difficult to repeat and the studies are usually unique. A great fact about quantitative data is that the data can easily be transferred into numerical results, which can then reveal cause-and-effect relationships, something which cannot be achieved by qualitative data. The ^{numerical} data can be transferred into percentages and can represent the general population, making quantitative data have high generalisability.

Psychologists who favour laboratory settings tend to favour quantifiable data, and psychologists who favour natural settings favour qualitative data.

Quantitative data is more scientific and the survey method of questionnaires mean that they can give p's a set of pre-questions stated in the same order meaning all p's get the same experience, making quantitative data have a good standardised procedure. Something which is liked by psychologists who favour the laboratory environment.

Qualitative data produces a more accurate view of how people feel, as it covers in factors such as emotions (unlike quantitative) but is difficult to analyse. The psychologist may also get too involved when conducting qualitative data, resulting in experimenter bias when analysing data.

Quantitative data may be collected in the form of questionnaires (surveys) but the experimenter may create subjectivity as the presence of the researcher, hand gestures and facial expression may create validity issues, something which is less likely to occur in qualitative data as the flexibility and openness of the method mean p's can express themselves better.

Both however are good in ethics as they guarantee confidentiality of p's, however quantitative data is less applicable in every-day life situations due to it's

artificial environment, and the task allocated in the laboratory may not be applicable to everyday problems.

Quantitative data is all converted into numerical data means if published the p's confidentiality is guaranteed as the individual results are not presented. Both high in ethics as p's who don't want their data used have their data destroyed.

Overall both qualitative & quantitative have both strengths & weaknesses but are important for all psychologists.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Level 2 - 5 marks

Explanation in this response is very limited (1 sentence on each type of data) so it cannot go beyond Level 2, regardless of the evaluation which in this case is also Level 2. Also there are some inaccuracies in places.

Some of the points relate to ethics and generalisability which are not appropriate so this is in the middle of Level 2.

- Qualitative data is information which is written in words and it is usually about people's opinion and attitudes towards a particular event.

- Qualitative data ~~mostly~~ ^{mainly} come from open-ended questions.

Interview is a way of getting qualitative data as it usually gives the respondents freedom to explain their answers.

~~Qualitative data is usually are richer, and more detailed because they come from open questions as and open questions allow the respondents to expand and explain their answers.~~

~~Qualitative data~~

- A typical question which may ~~also~~ collect qualitative data is "what do you think of the government policy?". ~~This~~ Respondents can say what they want to say in the place given and be able to explain ^{the reasons} why they think so.

- Qualitative data can be reduced as quantitative data. For ~~example~~ example, how many people think it is right to increase the tax and how many people think it is unacceptable, and researchers were able to categorise the reason respondents gave to a particular issue.

- Quantitative data is about ~~is~~ numbers, percentages ^{or} rankings etc. ~~Q~~ For example, how many people ~~is~~ ~~pe~~ prefer pork than beef.

- Quantitative data can be summarised in tables or graphs in order for the experimenters to analyse. For example, trends and relationship between two variables can be shown on a ~~graph~~ graph.
- Quantitative data mainly come from close-ended questions.
 - ~~Close~~ Closed-ended questions are those which have fixed answers for respondents to choose from and are not as flexible as open questions.
- ~~Open~~ Closed-questions mainly come from questionnaire as it has a set of answers for ^{respondents} ~~respondent~~ to choose. ~~Thus~~ Therefore, researches using questionnaire & mainly collect quantitative data.

Evaluation of Qualitative data:

Strength:

- Qualitative data ~~is~~ are more valid as they are from open-questions which allows the respondents to ~~say~~ say what they want to say and have the chance to explain and ~~to~~ expand their ~~own~~ answers.
- ~~Basic~~ Qualitative data are more detailed and richer and ~~int~~ interviews ~~is~~ gives ~~the~~ respondents more chance to say more ^{and} give a reasons. ~~Questionnaire using open question~~

Weaknesses:

- Qualitative data are more difficult to analyse as answers might be so different and ~~differe~~ difficult to categorise them.

- Qualitative data open to subjectivity as when researchers analyse them, they need to use ^{their} interpretation and ~~it~~ ^{they} might put their personal opinions, which causes subjectivity.
- Qualitative data might not be reliable, as interview is ~~it~~ difficult to ~~replicable~~ replicate because each one ~~is~~ tends to be unique.

Quantitative:

- Strength:
- It is easier to analyse because they can be summarised in tables and graphs, so trends and relationships are clear.
 - It is ~~easy~~ ^{easier} to compare because data are in numbers or percentages.
 - It is objective because everyone can analyse ~~it~~ it as they are all ~~using~~ numbers and ~~are~~ are straightforward.

Weaknesses:

- It is not valid, because respondents do not have time to space to explain ~~they~~ their answer. Also questionnaire have a pre-set ~~question~~ ^{answer}, which respondents might not agree with.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Level 4 - 10 marks

This response includes both explanation and evaluation relevant points, regardless of the number of bullet points. Most of these bullet points are actually well elaborated and would gain credit had the bullet points not been there. The answer shows both depth and breadth regarding both types of data. However, the writing style does not have the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing or clear organisation preventing the candidate achieving the top of the level. However the content is sufficient to deserve Level 4.

Paper Summary

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

- Always check to see whether the multiple choice questions are asking for one or two answers to be crossed
- Do not just simply copy what has been given to you in the stimulus material directly into your answer
- Always define the three levels of processing and give an example of what each means
- When asked about the procedure of a study it is not necessary to time write about its aim, results and conclusions
- Always tell the examiner why a study cannot be generalised or has poor control over variables using examples
- Always refer to psychological research in questions that ask you to do so
- Read both parts of a two part question before starting to write your answer
- Use psychological terminology at all times throughout the paper, especially in the essay

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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