

Mark Scheme (Results) January 2011

GCE

GCE Psychology (6PS01) Paper 01

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

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

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

January 2011

Publications Code US026610

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate

General Guidance on Marking

All candidates must receive the same treatment.

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for incorrect or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing correct application of principles and knowledge.

Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even unconventional answers may be worthy of credit.

Candidates must make their meaning clear to the examiner to gain the mark. Make sure that the answer makes sense. Do not give credit for correct words/phrases which are put together in a meaningless manner. Answers must be in the correct context.

Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the Team Leader must be consulted.

Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

- an idea of the types of response expected
- how individual marks are to be awarded
- the total mark for each question
- examples of responses that should NOT receive credit (where applicable).

- 1 / means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.
- 2 () means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.
- 3 [] words inside square brackets are instructions or guidance for examiners.
- 4 Phrases/words in **bold** indicate that the meaning of the phrase or the actual word is essential to the answer.
- 5 TE (Transferred Error) means that a wrong answer given in an earlier part of a question is used correctly in answer to a later part of the same question.

Quality of Written Communication

Questions which involve the writing of continuous prose will expect candidates to:

- show clarity of expression
- construct and present coherent arguments
- demonstrate an effective use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Full marks can only be awarded if the candidate has demonstrated the above abilities.

Questions where QWC is likely to be particularly important are indicated "QWC" in the mark scheme BUT this does not preclude others.

Unit 1: Social and Cognitive Psychology

Section A

Question Number	Question	
1	The mode is defined as	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A the measure which is most common in your data set</p> <p>B the measure which has as many scores above it as below it</p> <p>C the measure which is obtained by adding up all the scores and dividing by the number of scores</p> <p>D the measure which is obtained by taking away the smallest score from the largest score</p>	(1 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
2	The histogram can be used to	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A demonstrate the amount a score is different from the mean</p> <p>B demonstrate the number of scores above the median</p> <p>C show what score each individual participant gets</p> <p>D show the frequency distribution of scores</p>	(1 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
3	A disadvantage of quantitative data is that it tends to	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A produce rich, detailed information</p> <p>B produce narrow, artificial information</p> <p>C be harder to replicate due to lack of controls</p> <p>D be focused on one unique individual</p>	(1 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
4	A procedure which is common and identical for each participant is known as	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A experimental</p> <p>B random</p> <p>C valid</p> <p>D standardised</p>	(1 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
5	Why is it important to debrief participants in experiments?	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A To ensure they understand the true purpose of the experiment.</p> <p>B To pass on names and addresses of other participants.</p> <p>C To make sure they understand what they are going to have to do.</p> <p>D To make sure they do not ever tell anyone about the study.</p>	(1 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
6	Hofling et al's (1966) study of nurses' obedience to hospital rules is an example of a	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A natural experiment</p> <p>B field study</p> <p>C laboratory experiment</p> <p>D cross-cultural study</p>	(1 AO1)

Question Number	Question	
7	Classifying people, including ourselves, as part of particular groups is also known as	
	Answer	Mark
	A social categorisation B social comparison C social facilitation D social identification	(1 AO1)

Question Number	Question	
8	In psychology, obedience can best be defined as	
	Answer	Mark
	A following your own social conscience B obeying anyone who tells you to do something C conforming with someone of a higher status than you D following orders from an authority figure	(1 AO1)

Question Number	Question	
9	The process of recalling a stored memory is also known as	
	Answer	Mark
	A storage B retrieval C encoding D forgetting	(1 AO1)

Question Number	Question	
10	Which one of the following uses the deepest level of processing?	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A Rucksar is reading her notes to prepare for the Psychology test.</p> <p>B Emily is reading and summarising her notes to prepare for the Psychology test.</p> <p>C Stavros is reading his best friends notes to prepare for the Psychology test.</p> <p>D Henna is reading her notes out aloud to prepare for the Psychology test.</p>	(1 AO1)

Question Number	Question	
11	The cue dependent theory of forgetting came from	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>A Atkinson and Shiffrin (1968)</p> <p>B Bartlett (1932)</p> <p>C Tulving (1974)</p> <p>D Craik and Lockhart (1972)</p>	(1 AO1)

Section B

Question Number	General Instructions
12	Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider 'or words to that effect'. Each bullet point is a marking point unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be clearly and effectively communicated.

Question Number	Question	
12 (a)	Describe one study of obedience which is from a different country than Milgram's (USA).	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Possible studies include:</p> <p>Meuss & Raaijmakers (1986) Slater et al (2006) Kilham & Mann (1971) There are others Must be a published study</p> <p>REJECT Hofling et al (1966)</p> <p>Aim, procedure, results, conclusion max 2 in each case</p> <p>E.g. Meuss & Raaijmakers (1986)</p> <p><u>AIM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To see whether more modern psychological-administrative violence creates more /less obedience as compared to Milgram's method/eq; To see whether Milgram's findings can be replicated twenty years later in a more liberal Dutch culture/eq; To see if harm would be done if participants clearly understood they would be causing damage/eq; <p><u>PROCEDURE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 39 (24) participants responded to a newspaper advert and were paid for their time/eq; The research took place in a modern university building where participants were led to believe that they were taking part in a study into stress & performance/eq; Participants believed that the Psychology department had been commissioned to select candidates for a job and each applicant was to take a test which would be administered by the participants/eq; The test was vital to success, if applicants(who were confederates/stooges)failed the test they lost the job/eq; Participants were asked to make 15 increasingly distressing 	(5 AO1)

remarks to the applicants regarding how they were getting on with the test "If you continue responding like this, you're going to fail the test."

- It soon became obvious that the 'applicant' was getting extremely distressed and that they would fail the test (and, therefore, not get the job)/eq;
- Two thirds of the way through the test the 'applicant' accused the researchers of giving false information and withdrew his consent to continue/eq;
- If the subjects refused to continue to make the stressful remarks they were prodded to continue by the experimenter/eq;

RESULTS:

- 92% (22 out of 24)of the participants obeyed the experimenter to the end and made all the stress remarks/eq;
- In the control condition (and when experimenter not present) levels of obedience dropped significantly/eq;
- When there were two peers that rebelled, obedience dropped significantly/eq;
- The participants reported that they 'intensely disliked' making the stress remarks/eq;
- The participants were convinced that the applicant's test scores had been seriously affected by the stress remarks/eq;
- 73% of the participants were sure that they were dealing with a 'real' situation/eq;
- 96% of the participants were either sure or not quite sure that it was real (4% was convinced it was a hoax)/eq;

CONCLUSIONS:

- The researchers conclude that the level of obedience in their study was considerably higher than in Milgram's study/eq;
- Furthermore, this shows that it is easier "to obey orders to use psychological-administrative violence than to obey orders to use physical violence"/eq;
- It was concluded that levels of obedience were still as high even in other cultures as Milgram found twenty years earlier/eq;

E.g. Slater et al (2006)

AIM:

- To study human responses to interaction with a virtual character using similar conflict created by Milgram's study/eq;

PROCEDURE:

- 34 participants were recruited by posters and email on the campus at University College London, mean age was 29/eq;
- 23 were allocated to the Visible Condition (could see and hear virtual learner) and 11 to the Hidden Condition (could not see or hear her answers came through texts)/eq;
- Their task was to read out 32 sets of these 5 words to the learner, the first of which was a cue word and the others one of four possible words/eq;
- The learner was supposed to have memorised the words with the cue word beforehand/eq;

- On 20 out of the 32 trials the Learner gave the wrong answer, the later trials more likely to result in a wrong answer than the earlier ones/eq;
- The participant was instructed that each time the learner gave an incorrect answer he or she should press the shock button which was increased by one unit each time/eq;
- In the Visible condition the learner responded to the shocks with increasing signs of discomfort, eventually protesting that she had 'never agreed to this' and wanted to stop/eq;
- In the second Hidden condition the learner was not seen or heard apart from a few seconds of introductions at the start of the experiment/eq;
- Various physiological indicators (e.g., 'trembling or shaking', 'face becoming hot', 'perspiration') were measured via a questionnaire/eq;
- It was administered to participants in both groups before the experiment and then after the experiment/eq;

RESULTS:

- High scores on the questionnaire were found to correlate positively with anxiety, heart rate, skin conductance responses, respiration, face temperature, and blood volume/eq;
- All participants were aroused (skin conductance analysis), this was associated with stress (ECG analysis)/eq;
- The intensity was greater for those in the Visible condition compared with those in the Hidden condition/eq;
- Participants became distressed at giving shocks and even showed care for the well being of the learner/eq;

CONCLUSIONS:

- This shows that in spite of their knowledge that the situation was artificial the participants responded to the situation as if it were real/eq;
- It was concluded that levels of obedience were still as high even in other cultures as Milgram found forty years earlier/eq;

Look for any other reasonable marking points.

Question Number	Question	
12 (b)	Outline one strength and one weakness of the study you described in (a).	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>In each case 2 marks for a complete answer, 1 mark for a partial answer (2 for strength and 2 for weakness).</p> <p>TE: If 12(a) is blank/insufficient for identification but strength / weakness in (b) is clearly identifiable as an appropriate study from a country other than the USA full marks can be given. If the strength / weakness do not relate to a study stated in (a) but is clearly identifiable as a study of obedience from a country other than the USA then max 2 marks. If (a) is incorrect e.g. Hofling and the strength / weakness refer to (a) then max 2 marks (must still be a study of obedience).</p> <p>E.g. Meuss & Raaijmakers (1986)</p> <p>Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were given full information about the design and purpose of the experiment and were debriefed a second time by mail a year later and again asked to fill out a questionnaire about the experiment/eq; (2 marks) • In neither debriefing were any indications seen that the subjects had suffered any serious negative effects from their participation in the experiment/eq; (1st mark) This enhances the ethical validity of the experiment and demonstrates how participants were not harmed/eq; (2nd mark) • There is validity in that the setting is a real university and the task is a job application, which is a real life task/eq; • The study followed a standardised procedure which meant each participant received the same experience and negative comments (1st mark) this means it can be repeated and tested for reliability/eq; (2nd mark) <p>Weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many participants were caused distress by their involvement they made it clear that they found the treatment of the applicant to be unfair, intensely disliked making the stress remarks, were relieved that the victim was not a real applicant and they had not in reality caused someone harm/eq; (2 marks) • Participants were deceived as they thought the study was on 	(4 AO2)

	<p>stress and performance-not obedience (1st mark) and that the applicants were real when in fact they were just actors/eq; (2nd mark)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is lack of validity in that the situation is artificial in a lab setting and the participants are taking part in a study and would not normally be asked to give stress comments/eq; (2 marks) • The sample used was a volunteer sample which means the participants may have been more motivated to do well / obey/eq; <p>E.g. Slater et al (2006)</p> <p>Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtual environments can provide a useful tool in psychology by providing an alternative methodology for laboratory based studies/eq; (1st mark) This method could also be used beyond simple obedience studies and look at reasons for bystander behaviour in street violence (useful given the current level of perceived crime)/eq; (2nd mark) • There was no need for deception here as all participants were made fully aware of the virtual learner. This is in stark contrast to the Milgram experiments where participants were deceived on two counts/eq; (2 marks) <p>Weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were caused increasing discomfort as witnessed by their physiological responses and later comments during the post-experimental interviews, several participants withdrew from the experiment before the end due to simulator sickness/eq; (2 marks) • The sample is too small and biased to be generalisable to others as all the ps were recruited from one university which means they may have shared similar characteristics. Furthermore the ps were not allocated equally across both conditions which may have led to skewed results/eq; (2 marks) <p>Look for any other reasonable marking points.</p>	
--	---	--

Many parents complain that their children eat too much junk food such as burgers and chips. Imagine you have been asked to carry out a survey to investigate teenagers' attitude to healthy eating.

Question Number	Question	
13 (a)	What is meant by a survey?	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>2 marks for a complete answer, 1 mark for a partial answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys are questionnaires and/or interviews to find out what people think about an issue/eq; • There are two types of questionnaire using open questions or closed questions/eq; • There are also two types of interview using a structured or unstructured set of questions/eq; • A survey gathers information by asking questions of a large number of people, using written questionnaires and/or through face to face interviews/eq; (2 marks) 	(2 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
13 (b)	Write an open question you might ask participants in this survey about healthy eating.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Reject closed questions such as yes/no questions. If more than one question accept first unless crossed through. Question needs to refer to healthy eating/junk food and allow a free response. Reject a closed question followed by something like 'explain why?'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you think the media /your parents can help reduce the amount of junk food eaten?/eq; • What advice would you give to a friend who was eating too much junk food?/eq; • Why do you think some teenagers prefer junk food to more healthy food?/eq; <p>Look for any other reasonable marking points.</p>	(1 AO3)

Question Number	Question	
13 (c)	Write a closed question you might ask participants in this survey about healthy eating	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>If more than one question accept first unless crossed through. Question needs to refer to healthy eating/junk food and elicit a <u>restricted</u> response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many times a week do you eat chips / burgers / junk food?/eq; • Eating junk food is to blame for the obesity epidemic: yes or no?/eq; • Parents should take responsibility for educating children about healthy eating: strongly agree; agree; don't know; disagree; strongly disagree/eq; • Do you eat five portions of fruit/veg daily?/eq; <p>Look for any other reasonable marking points.</p>	(1 A03)

Question Number	Question	
13 (d)	Outline two weaknesses of surveys in general.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>If technical term is used appropriately e.g. demand characteristics, it can gain 2 marks. Any weaknesses of own particular survey are acceptable if relevant. If more than 2 weaknesses given mark all and credit best. No marks for strengths.</p> <p>Possible Points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants may not answer honestly because they do not take it seriously/do not want the researchers to know their true beliefs/eq; • Participants may give socially desirable answers based on what society expects them to say, that are more favourable, acceptable good/eq; (2 marks) • Answers may be a result of demand characteristics where the interviewee tries to please the interviewer (1st mark) as it may be possible to guess from the questions the desired answer/eq: (2nd mark) • Open ended questions are difficult and time consuming to interpret /eq; • Closed ended questions offer little opportunity for explaining the response/eq; • Qualitative data obtained from unstructured interviews may not be easy to analyse (1st mark) and may be subjective and open to misinterpretation (2nd mark) • People who return questionnaires may be only those who have time to do so which can lead to a biased sample (1st mark), which is not representative of the general population. (2 marks) <p>Look for any other reasonable marking points.</p>	(4 AO3)

Question Number	General Instructions
14 - 17	Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider 'or words to that effect'. Each bullet point is a marking point unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be clearly and effectively communicated.

Question Number	Question	
14 (a)	<p>You will have learned about one of the following studies in detail from cognitive psychology:</p> <p>Peterson and Peterson (1959) Craik and Tulving (1975) Ramponi et al (2004)</p> <p>Outline the aim(s) and conclusion(s) from one of these studies.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>The answer must describe one of the three specified studies or zero marks. If more than one study is described mark all and credit the best. One point per description unless otherwise indicated. 2+1 or 1+2 marks can be given. Credit should be given for aim and/or conclusions drawn from the study only. Ignore procedure and results.</p> <p>E.g. Peterson and Peterson</p> <p><u>Aim:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To investigate how long information can be retained in STM/eq; To test the duration of STM by measuring the retention of items in STM when rehearsal is prevented for differing lengths of time/eq; (2 marks) To see how interference affects recall ability in the short term memory/eq; <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the absence of rehearsal then STM's duration is very short even with very small amounts of information/eq; If a more difficult distracter task is used it can be made even shorter/eq; When rehearsal is prevented items in STM are lost quickly/eq; <p>E.g. Craik and Tulving</p> <p><u>Aim:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To determine whether recall is affected by the way information is processed/eq; To investigate whether words processed structurally, phonemically or semantically would affect recognition of those words/eq; 	(3 AO1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To test whether words that were processed for their meaning would be better remembered than words that were processed for information about their appearance or sound/eq; (2 marks) <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition was greater for those words processed at a semantic level/eq; • The deeper the processing the greater the recall/eq; • Semantic processing, which involves thinking about the meaning of the words, leads to deeper processing which in turn leads to them being better remembered than shallow processing/eq; (2 marks) <p>E.g. Ramponi</p> <p><u>Aim:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate whether age affects the ability to process information at different levels/eq; • To investigate the extent to which deep processing and age influence how well words are recalled under voluntary and involuntary conditions/eq; (2 marks) <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that older adults' performance in intentional tests is impaired because they are less able to bind the encoded representations to the episodic context at study/eq; (2 marks) • Age affects the ability to encode meaningless information that we do not process at a deep level/eq; • Where two words are strongly associated with one another, one word will trigger the involuntary recall of the other regardless of how they were processed at the time of learning/eq; (2 marks) 	
--	--	--

Question Number	Question	
14 (b)	<p>Evaluate the study you have used in (a).</p> <p>You might want to consider issues of: reliability validity application to real life.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>TE: If 14 (a) is blank/insufficient for identification but evaluation in (b) is clearly identifiable as an appropriate study from the list full marks can be given.</p> <p>If (a) is incorrect e.g. a study not on the list and the evaluation refers to (a) then max 2 marks (must be a cognitive study).</p> <p>If the evaluation does not relate to the study stated in (a) (as long as (a) is a study from the list) but is clearly identifiable as a different study from the list, then max 2 marks.</p> <p>E.g. Peterson and Peterson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The researchers had control over the variables which makes the study easier to replicate and so it can be tested for reliability/eq; • The researchers had control e.g. using trigrams with no meaning which makes the study easier to replicate (1st mark) and so it can be tested for reliability/eq; (2nd mark) • The study does have supporting evidence from other studies which have also shown rehearsal to be necessary for recall giving it reliability/eq; • The study was a laboratory experiment which looked at memory of nonsense trigrams which is not an everyday task/eq; • It suffers from low ecological validity because it is an artificial setting/eq; • Demand characteristics may seriously threaten the validity of the experiment participants may try to behave in some way that they perceive as being helpful to the researcher/eq; (2 marks) <p>E.g. Craik and Tulving</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study does have a practical application to real life; giving meaning to material is one way of improving your memory (1st mark). E.g. students can be taught to make notes which have meaning rather than just reading to help them revise/eq; (2nd mark) • As a laboratory experiment the study has tight control of extraneous variables which also makes it more likely that the IV influenced the DV/eq; • Even shallow processing could lead to better processing if the material was distinctive/eq; (1st mark) E.g. you may see something so distinctive that it creates a mental image/eq; (2nd mark) • There are too many problems with actually defining deep processing and why it is effective/eq; (1st mark) i.e. material which has been deeply processed will be remembered better BUT you could say material is well remembered because it must have been processed deeply/eq; (2nd mark) 	(5 AO2)

	<p>E.g. Ramponi</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There were very strong controls such as random allocation to either intentional or incidental association/order of word pairs/eq;• Random allocation meant each participant had an equal chance of being selected so it was fair/eq;• The study is laboratory based with thorough details about procedure and strict controls so it would be replicable and easy to test for reliability/eq;• There may still be individual differences, such as familiarity with the words / experimental procedure between the participants other than age which effect the DV/eq;• The study was a laboratory experiment which looked at memory of word pairs which is not an everyday task/eq;• It was artificial and so suffers from low ecological validity/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable ways of expressing this answer</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Question	
15 (a)	<p>You will have studied a key issue from the Cognitive Approach.</p> <p>Describe one key issue from the Cognitive Approach</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>1 mark per point / elaboration. 1 mark for identification of an issue 3 further marks for elaboration of the issue. Marks here are for outlining the issue not explaining it e.g. 'EWT' is not itself the issue. How reliable or unreliable it is, is. If more than one issue mark and credit the best. Answers must identify the issue to get full marks. Max 2 marks if issue can be discerned but not fully expressed.</p> <p>REJECT SOCIAL KEY ISSUES</p> <p>Possible key issues include:</p> <p>Is EWT reliable? Is flashbulb memory a special type of memory? Does the cognitive interview aid witness recall? Do psychology students revise more effectively? How can memory be improved in...those with amnesia...(must have a context)?</p> <p>There are others.</p> <p>Possible marking points</p> <p>Is EWT reliable? (ID mark)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EWT refers to the recalled memory of a witness to a crime or incident/eq; • Some argue that it is so unreliable it should not be the basis of criminal convictions/eq; • E.g. Beth Rutherford claimed her father had sexually abused her, but this was later found to be false/eq; • Others believe jurors are more likely to rely on witness testimony than scientific proof or forensic evidence/eq; <p>Why should psychology students revise more effectively than non-psychology students? (ID mark)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who study Psychology are taught certain topics which might give them an advantage when it comes to revising for exams/eq; • Studying how memory works and what causes us to forget means Psychology students can apply their learning to everyday life to benefit them/eq; • Non psychology students may well be using revision techniques that are not appropriate for them due to no fault of their own, but just based on their subject choice/eq; <p>Is flashbulb memory a special type of memory? (ID mark)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some believe flashbulb memory is a special memory created by 	(4 AO1)

	<p>intense emotion/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are detailed memories of particular events such as national tragedies like the London bombings (etc.)/eq; • Others argue they are just rehearsed memories which are not in fact unusual at all/eq; <p>Does the cognitive interview aid witness recall? (ID mark)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cognitive interview is a technique used by the police during witness interviews to help them recall more/eq; • It makes the witness focus on the detail of what they witnessed by using a range of different questioning techniques involving all 5 senses/eq; • Some believe the cognitive interview does not lead to better recall and is actually an ineffective tool used by the police/eq; • Police ask the witness to recall events in an unusual order, for example, or use a reconstruction of the event/eq; <p>Look for any other reasonable marking points.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Question	
15 (b)	<p>Imagine there has been a TV programme about the key issue you have described in (a). You receive an e-mail from your friend about the programme.</p> <p>Write a short email that you could send to your friend to help explain this key issue using one concept (idea, theory or research) from the Cognitive Approach.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>3 marks for explanation of the issue using just one concept from the Cognitive Approach. <i>If more than one concept used mark all and credit the best.</i> 1 mark per point made/subsequent elaboration of point.</p> <p>Find the concept before marking (see brackets below) - award where possible.</p> <p>Concepts can include definitions, theories, models, methods and findings of studies. DO NOT credit descriptions of studies.</p> <p>IGNORE responses that do not correspond with the issue outlined in part (a). If (a) is blank/or a key issue is not discernible within cognitive psychology, and an appropriate issue is identifiable in (b) then (b) can gain credit up to full marks. If the issue or debate in part (a) is incorrect (e.g. non cognitive key issue) then (b) does not gain credit.</p> <p>Must make at least one reference to friend/tv programme/email e.g. 'Hiya mate' /signature... or max 2.</p> <p>Is EWT reliable? <i>(Leading questions is the concept)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loftus and Palmer showed that memories are often reconstructions based on subsequent information/eq; • Leading questions can cause false or distorted recall e.g. the word 'smashed' made ps believe the cars were going faster/eq; • This showed that witness memory can be seriously altered by post event information in the form of misleading questions/eq; • Its difficult to generalise the findings of most EWT research as its typically laboratory based involving video footage which lacks real life emotions/eq; • Loftus and Zanni also found that changing a word can affect memory recall/eq; <p>Why should psychology students revise more effectively than non-psychology students? <i>(Levels of Processing is the concept)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychology students have been taught that semantic processing leads to better recall when revising/eq; • They know that an understanding of information is more likely to result in better memories than purely reading notes /eq; • LOP has taught them elaborative rehearsal will result in deeper processing/eq; 	(3 AO2)

Is flashbulb memory a special type of memory?

(Brown and Kulik's research is the concept)

- Brown and Kulik found we retain a vivid memory for distinctive and emotionally charged events even though we may encounter few cues after the event/eq;
- They suggest the emotion activates a different way of encoding that leaves a more permanent and resilient memory trace/eq;
- Others argue these memories are no different to other stored memories and are just likely to have been repeated because of vast media coverage/eq;

Does the cognitive interview aid witness recall?

(Cue dependency is the concept)

- The interview involves ps recreating the context and reporting every detail of the incident in any order and from different perspectives/eq;
- Geiselman found it yielded 35% more information than standard interviewing techniques with no difference in error rates/eq;
- Others argue it can actually lead to incorrect recall when speculating from a different perspective/eq;

Look for any other reasonable marking points.

Section C

Question Number	Question	
<p>16 QWC i,ii,iii</p>	<p>Refer to levels at the end of the indicative content.</p> <p>As part of the course requirements for cognitive psychology you will have conducted a practical using an experiment.</p> <p>Evaluate your experiment. You may wish to look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • your sample • how you controlled variables • your research design decisions • any ethical issues 	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Appropriate answers might include some of the following evaluative points, but this list isn't exhaustive.</p> <p>No credit for description of the experiment.</p> <p>REJECT SOCIAL PRACTICAL</p> <p>Refer the marking uses the levels overleaf and this list is for guidance only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the sample was opportunity we could have deliberately picked people we knew had the desired characteristics • We all used the same standardised instructions which increases the reliability of our study • It was carried out in a quiet classroom, which is a natural setting for the participant so increasing ecological validity • Some participants may have told others about the study so they may have tried to give us the results they thought we wanted • All participants were 16 to 18 so we cannot generalise the results to older people • As it was an experiment so we don't know if the participant's behaviour was natural or a result of demand characteristics 	<p>(5 AO3)</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-2 marks	Candidate makes at least one appropriate evaluation point (strength and/or weakness) The answer should be adequately communicated for the 2 marks.
Level 2	3-4 marks	Candidate gives at least two appropriate evaluation points (strengths and/or weaknesses) both of which are suitably communicated . The candidate has referred to their own study in some way at least once. There may be some irrelevance (e.g. description of what was done).
Level 3	5 marks	A thorough answer, giving very good strengths and/or weaknesses, comprehensively communicated . The candidate has referred to their own study in some way at least once. Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the information is present.

Question Number	Question	
17	<p>After the release of a popular vampire film some teenagers have split into two groups. One group loves vampires ('The Vamps') whilst the other group loves werewolves ('The Howlers').</p> <p>This situation is causing tension and college staff are concerned about the amount of name-calling and hostility between the groups. This prejudice between 'The Vamps' and 'The Howlers' can be explained by Social Identity Theory.</p> <p>With reference to the case above, describe and evaluate Social Identity Theory as an explanation of prejudice.</p>	
	Indicative Content	Mark
QWC i,ii,iii	<p>Refer to levels at the end of the indicative content. Start marking at Level 4 and work down to Level 1.</p> <p>A01: (Description) Knowledge and understanding of SIT. A02: (Evaluation) Application/strengths and weaknesses of SIT.</p> <p>Appropriate answers might include the following knowledge points, but this list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>Description</p> <p>Only the findings of research are relevant (must say how findings support...), no credit for description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prejudice between 'The Vamps' and 'The Howlers' can be explained by their tendency to identify themselves as part of a group, and to classify other people as either within or outside that group • Conflict may not even be necessary for prejudice to occur, merely being in a group and being aware of the existence of another group is sufficient for prejudice to develop • <i>Social categorisation</i> → we categorise ourselves and others as members of particular social groups • <i>Social identification</i> → we adopt the identity of the group we 	

	<p>have categorised ourselves as belonging to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Social comparison</i> → this is the final stage, once we have categorised ourselves as part of a group and identified with that group, we compare that group with others • We deliberately put down others to try and raise our own self-esteem <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>Evaluative points of supporting studies can get some credit (though not if continued with for too long...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The theory has evidence from minimal group studies such as Tajfel (1970) demonstrate that being part of a group is sufficient to lead to prejudice against people not within that group • However, this particular study is a laboratory experiment which suffers from low ecological validity as it is carried out in an artificial setting • It underestimates the importance of individual differences, some people have a much greater tendency than others to favour in-group over out-group, depending on their personality • The theory can explain wide range of real life phenomena ranging from support for football teams to racism and can be applied to a wide range of social situations. • E.g. football violence occurs because fans compare with other fans (of other teams) to raise their own self-esteem • Sherifs' Robbers Cave study provides further evidence for SIT in that the two groups showed prejudice before competition was introduced and showed in group favouritism <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		A01: (Description) Knowledge and understanding of SIT including the case given. A02: (Evaluation) Application/strengths and weaknesses of SIT including the case given.
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-3 marks	Candidates will produce brief answers , making simple statements showing some relevance to the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description includes attempt at definition of SIT. • Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question. Lack of relevant evidence OR insufficient elaboration of evaluation points. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.
Level 2	4-6 marks	Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other (unless both are at least good in which case Level 3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good attempt at defining SIT with some appropriate elaboration. • Some appropriate evaluation with some reference to appropriate methodological and/or practical and/or ethical points Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.
Level 3	7-9 marks	Candidate has attempted and answered both injunctions in the question well . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description includes breadth and/or depth e.g. 3 component parts defined well. • Good evaluation, likely to include methodological and/or practical and/or ethical points in relation to actual theory and/or supporting studies. • Candidate must have made at least one appropriate reference to stimulus The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.
Level 4	10-12 marks	Candidate has attempted and answered both injunctions in the question very well . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description includes breadth and depth, e.g. 3 component parts defined well with appropriate elaboration • Very good evaluation, likely to include methodological, practical and ethical points in relation to actual theory and/or supporting studies. • Candidate must have made at least one appropriate reference to stimulus The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning. Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the information is present.

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US026610 January 2011

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

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH