



Examiners' Report

January 2009

GCE

GCE Psychology 6PS01

ResultsPlus
Helping you to raise attainment
www.resultsplus.edexcel.com

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 Examiners' Report 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/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated [subject] telephone line: [telephone number]



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2009

Publications Code US020975

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Contents

6PS01

General Comments	2
Questions 1–10	3
Question11	3
Question 12	3
Question 13	4
Question 14	4
Question 15	5
Question 16	14
Question 17	20
Question 18	20
Grade Boundaries	32

Unit Test 6PS01/01 (UT1)

1.1 *General Comments*

This was the first exam assessing the new 2008 specification. The two major changes to note being the introduction of a new multiple choice section and two questions, including the essay, being marked through levels / banding.

It was also the first time candidates could be entered for an AS exam in January after completing only one term of the course.

The first striking difference was the number of pages left blank and unanswered by candidates. These were extremely rare. One might have expected the opposite given the new cohort's early entrance to assessment. Generally most candidates had a good attempt at all questions, which was very pleasing.

There were some real discriminators on the paper. Questions 4-6 on the multiple choice which dealt with A03 skills were only correctly answered by better candidates. Both questions on evaluating Agency and Social Identity theories proved to be very difficult for weaker candidates as did the specific requirements for the essay.

Evaluation still remains a problem for the majority of candidates and this was clear in some of the questions with an AO2 requirement. When it came to anything other than describe or outline, some candidates in the main struggled. The main distinction between more and less able candidates always has been the ability to elaborate. Higher scoring answers could back up a point with general and specific examples of research. Others find it difficult to provide relevant psychological research and instead rely on anecdotal information which is not creditworthy. There are continuing signs of a gradual improvement in this area but it still remains the main differentiator amongst all candidates.

There was a wide range in the quality of candidates' written English. Some students were able to give succinct responses with remarkable clarity given the pressures of an examination. At the lower end, candidates' ability to communicate their answers was poor given the level of study they have undertaken, with some unable to construct a legible sentence let alone extended prose. Some candidates' writing became very difficult to read.

There is still a small problem in reading scripts from candidates who have written in pencil or used faint pens. Candidates need to be reminded to use dark blue or black pens as to avoid legibility problems in marking.

Questions 1-10 Multiple Choice

This is a new feature of assessment and immediately became a differentiator between better and weaker candidates. Most did not find this as easy as they expected and others struggled throughout the whole section. However those that took the allotted time, read the question and all the possible options, did very well. There were many instances where candidates changed their minds and put a line through the box, only to go back and cross it later. It should be made clear that these questions are not meant to trick candidates but at the same time are not give away marks.

Questions 4-6 were where some candidates struggled to decide on the correct answer. The themes of these 3 questions revolved around their practicals; designs, variables and hypotheses. Marks given were inconsistent as compared to the other multiple choice questions which were answered very well. However for question 6 which required two answers, nearly all candidates did cross two boxes and so had read the injunction correctly which was pleasing.

Questions 7-10 which were based around non methodological questions were answered correctly by nearly all candidates. This perhaps indicates a preference to A01 over A03.

Question 11

This was typically answered very well with most candidates scoring both marks. It's clear these findings have been rote learned by all centres. The few that did not score full marks either got the figures the wrong way round or simply left the first finding blank.

Question 12

This was the first of the short answer questions that dealt with new material taught for the new specification and where it was answered correctly, it was largely done well. The most popular variations cited were the influence of rebellious stooges; the rundown office block and distant authority figure variations.

Of those that did correctly describe one of the variations done by Milgram, there were a fair number who simply conflated different variations and consequently were not able to gain full marks.

There were a number of cases where candidates described the original experiment or described Hofling's experiment in its entirety as a variation. Meuss & Raaijmakers was the other study described by those who had misread the question.

Question 13

Part (a) was typically well answered and most candidates did manage to score full marks by defining the agentic state and citing an appropriate example. Weaker candidates were still in the main able to access the first mark but found it difficult to elaborate or go beyond simply stating "obeying an authority figure".

There were those of course who mixed agentic up with autonomous but pleasingly these were far fewer than in previous years.

In part (b) a number of candidates unfortunately just described Milgram's agency theory (particularly the agentic and autonomous states) without getting to the evaluative element. Others who also misread this question evaluated Milgram's study of destructive obedience, but in both cases these were in the minority.

There were some good evaluations, often with reference to other explanations for obedience which is not on the specification and so demonstrated a greater depth of understanding of the topic. Illustrative examples were often used such as Agency theory being an explanation for atrocities such as the Holocaust or the Mai Lai massacre, but only the better candidates really demonstrated how these examples illustrated Agency theory in action. Candidates who scored highly used evidence from real life situations such as the soldiers in WWII acting on Hitler's behalf and were thus in an agentic state.

Where marks were lost, it was typically because candidates made the relevant point i.e. "it has real life application" without expanding. This was a shame as one often had the sense that the candidates had the information available but just did not go far enough in its provision. Others had prepared evaluative comments which were very weak (i.e. just naming studies without further elaboration of how they supported the theory).

Question 14

In part (a) the majority of responses related to Craik & Tulving's study and candidates appeared to know this very well. Most picked up at least 3 marks, many gaining 4-5. However candidates should by now be fully aware that they cannot achieve full marks for just describing the procedure which many did. Others were spending too much time outlining the aims and procedures (max 3) and running out of time/space to give results and conclusions.

Some candidates seemed confused about the procedure of the experiment, referring to independent groups learning semantic, phonetic and structural words, showing no real understanding that it is the levels of processing, not different types of words, which was being tested. A number of candidates stopped after explaining the procedure and method, giving no results of conclusion where, again, one had a sense that this information was available to them. Better candidates followed the aim, procedure, results, conclusion formula thus demonstrating breadth of knowledge.

Those candidates who did the Ramponi study had similar problems with the procedure. As the study itself has so many different components candidates that opted for this choice tended to dwell on how it was carried out. However one had a sense of generally stronger candidates attempting this and some were typically complex in description.

A minority of candidates who described Peterson & Peterson did very well but others seemed to struggle with the concept of trigrams and referred to these as word lists. Weaker candidates described other cognitive studies which were not on the list, such as Godden and Baddeley.

In part (b) candidates are still failing to spot the injunction to outline one strength and one weakness. Several candidates tried to claim that a strength of the study was that it supported a theory; there was evidence throughout this question and in other places on the paper of a continued confusion between study

and theory.

Most evaluation centred on issues of ecological validity and better candidates were able to access full marks. Weaker candidates' strengths were often a repetition of the conclusion of study.

Where methodological strengths and weaknesses were offered, they really needed to be explicitly related to the studies to be credible. Too many generic points were given which could have been said about any psychological study.

There was the usual case of strengths and weaknesses being written in part (a) by those who had not read the question.

Question 15

Most candidates were able to pick up marks on this question, however there were some initial concerns in terms of ethics, particularly asking people questions about racism and homosexuality. Centres need to keep an eye on this and remind candidates this could have serious consequences. Some weaker candidates offered cognitive rather than social practicals, perhaps through lack of revision of the appropriate one.

In part (a) many candidates were able to recall the hypothesis of their survey, although a minority of them confused the alternative hypothesis with their null hypothesis. Others cited an experimental hypothesis which belonged to a laboratory experiment relating to the cognitive approach. As such these candidates gained no credit. Very few hypotheses were fully operationalised and many were phrased as research questions rather than predictions.

Better candidates did not get aims mixed up with hypotheses and clearly knew the difference between one and two tailed types. In this respect they easily scored at least two marks.

The problems offered in part (b) were disappointing often suggestive of lack of effort and application rather than genuine methodological issues "I didn't have time" and some of the solutions indicated a lack of regard for methodological rigour "I had too many males than females so I removed their results to balance it out" (no mention of randomisation or other sampling issues inherent in this). Other weak problems were to do with the sample "not enough participants as we didn't have enough time" One candidate wrote "One problem was the fact that the results had to be analysed".

Several candidates referred to problems such as being unable to decide how many closed and open questions to do, who to use as their samples etc. These were rarely creditworthy. Others failed to connect their points to their own survey (it may have been an accurate detailed problem) but tended to be a general issue with no explicit links to what they did.

Candidates who did well on this question were clearly outlining actual problems they had encountered such as ambiguous wording which was picked up in a pilot study or in analysis of the results themselves.

Solutions given in part (c) tended to be strongest when the problems in part (b) were real or plausible. These candidates were able to gain good marks here and many used specialist terms and generally appeared quite knowledgeable about methodological issues in research.

Commentary on Q15

Script A

15 As part of the course requirements for the Social Approach you will have conducted a survey (interview/questionnaire).

- (a) Outline the alternative hypothesis of your survey and state whether it is directional (one-tailed) or non-directional (two-tailed).

(3)

Participants will prefer facebook rather than myspace. This is a directional as it is clearly stating that facebook will be the in-group and that it has preference

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

1 – This is a basic hypothesis but is creditworthy and gets an additional mark for the elaboration and correct direction stated. 2

- (b) Outline one problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out the survey (interview/questionnaire).

(2)

~~Some~~ If Participants who took part in the survey hadn't used either social network sites only had seen them.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

2 – Problem given is appropriate but is not elaborated enough to warrant a second mark. 1

(c) Explain how you might have addressed (or did address) this problem when planning and/or carrying out the survey (interview/questionnaire).

(2)

I would of adressed the situation by asking if they had seen the networks or if there friends use either networks to find ~~the~~ out there own views about the network.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – Problem is not addressed in sufficient detail (could have said how they would ask the participants via a questionnaire etc). However solution given is appropriate enough to gain one mark. 1

4 marks

Script B:

15 As part of the course requirements for the Social Approach you will have conducted a survey (interview/questionnaire).

- (a) Outline the alternative hypothesis of your survey and state whether it is directional (one-tailed) or non-directional (two-tailed).

(3)

People will favour their in-group (the football team they support) over people that ~~support~~ are from an out-group (support a rival team). (one-tailed directional hypothesis)


ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – The hypothesis and stated direction both gain one mark each. However neither the IV nor DV are operationalised to warrant the third final mark. Some indication of what is meant by “will favour” is needed. 2

- (b) Outline one problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out the survey (interview/questionnaire).

(2)

That if open questions were used it would be harder to group answer to create a score, (there I used mostly closed questions)


ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – Just enough for a mark, the problem is a generic one which is appropriate. 1

(c) Explain how you might have addressed (or did address) this problem when planning and/or carrying out the survey (interview/questionnaire).

(2)

I decided to create more closed question for example, with yes/no/rating from 1-10. This made it easier when after the pp had taken the questionnaire to create a score of how they react in there In-Group + Out-Groups.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – Problem is addressed in sufficient detail with elaboration (the 1-10 likert example is enough for the first mark) to gain both marks. 2

5 marks

Script C:

15 As part of the course requirements for the Social Approach you will have conducted a survey (Interview/questionnaire).

- (a) Outline the alternative hypothesis of your survey and state whether it is directional (one-tailed) or non-directional (two-tailed).

(3)

Our alternative hypothesis was that "the elderly population were mostly ~~so~~ prejudice to the younger generation". This directional, (one tailed)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – This is a basic hypothesis but is creditworthy and gets an additional mark for the elaboration and correct direction stated. The fact that it uses the past tense ("were") does not penalise the candidate. However no mention of what the candidate means by the elderly or more prejudice means they miss out on a mark. 2

- (b) Outline one problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out the survey (Interview/questionnaire).

(2)

1 problem was that one of our ~~old~~ multiple choice questions was seen to be uncomfortable to answer as it was based around genocide.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – Problem given is appropriate and is elaborated enough to warrant both marks. 2

(c) Explain how you might have addressed (or did address) this problem when planning and/or carrying out the survey (interview/questionnaire).

(2)

After realising this we changed it to an open question
opposed to multi-choice as then the participants ✓
could give their view and didn't feel like
they had to change their views to fit into ✓
categories we had outlined



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – Problem is addressed in sufficient detail with good elaboration showing clear knowledge of the advantages of using open questions. 2

6 marks

Script D

15 As part of the course requirements for the Social Approach you will have conducted a survey (Interview/questionnaire).

- (a) Outline the alternative hypothesis of your survey and state whether it is directional (one-tailed) or non-directional (two-tailed).

(3)

~~Each year will treat it~~
~~different from members of a different~~
~~year in school. It is a non-directional~~
~~hypothesis~~

People will treat members in their school
 year differently from members of a different
 year in school. It is a non-directional

(b) Outline one problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out the hypothesis



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – The hypothesis and stated direction both gain one mark each. However neither the IV nor DV are operationalised to warrant the third final mark. Some indication of what is meant by "will treat year differently" is needed. 2

- (b) Outline one problem you came across when planning and/or carrying out the hypothesis survey (Interview/questionnaire).

(2)

That I used too many open
 questions, which would mean too
 much qualitative data which would
 have been hard to analyse.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – Problem given is appropriate and is elaborated enough to warrant both marks. 2

(c) Explain how you might have addressed (or did address) this problem when planning and/or carrying out the survey (interview/questionnaire).

(2)

I addressed this by changing some open questions and used a likert / scale for some questions and changed some ~~to~~ & to get 'yes' and 'no' answers, which meant that I could analyse / score answers, because there / was more quantitative data.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – Problem is addressed in sufficient detail with good elaboration showing clear knowledge of the likert scale and quantitative data. 2

6 marks

Question 16

Considering that this topic is quite complex it was refreshing to see better candidates appear to recognise the need for qualitative methods in psychology and cite its relevant strengths. These candidates made explicit links with why this type of data might be preferred in psychology, i.e. making reference to the complexity of human behaviour and the difficulty of reducing this to numbers. These candidates were able to score full marks, suggesting that this question was a good differentiator.

Others understood that they had to identify the strengths of qualitative data but then found it difficult to contrast with weaknesses of quantitative data.

There were invariably those who confused both types and got them the wrong way round. Some gave strengths and weaknesses of qualitative data which is not what the question required.

Question 17

Part (a) was as expected generally very well answered and most candidates scored full marks. Many suitable examples were used which tended to be ones involving football teams. Better candidates constantly referred to in group favouritism to maintain self esteem. There were very few examples of the other two processes involved in social identity theory; categorisation and identification.

Some candidates experienced problems with part (b) and responses were generally very weak. The overwhelming tendency was for candidates to simply describe social identity theory in detail focusing on each of the components, with no attempt at evaluation.

Those that evaluated SIT well included evidence from Tajfel, Sherif and other relevant studies such as Lalonde. More importantly they demonstrated how these experiments supported the theory and did not just describe them in isolation, as was the case with weaker candidates. When using illustrative examples such as football hooliganism more able candidates explicitly explained how the concepts of social identity theory explained such behaviour.

Commentary on Q17b

Script A

(b) Evaluate social identity theory as an explanation of prejudice.

(4)
SIT is shown in studies such as Robbers cave, which was controlled so that social identification could take part in the first week, with social comparison + categorisation happening when the two groups met. This caused prejudice which supports SIT.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – Clear statement on how the study supports the theory explicitly linked into the stages of the theory also.

realised - prejudice which supports SIT.
SIT, however, doesn't ~~it~~ not take into account
that some people do not bring themselves
into groups - have little to no
prejudice. Its supported by football violence
in the way that football fans identify
each other by the t-shirts, but still ~~is not~~
~~there~~ is a simple idea of prejudice
which would need more ~~explaining~~ explanation.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

2 – Point is straight off the mark scheme as an application to real life.

2 marks

Script B

(b) Evaluate social identity theory as an explanation of prejudice.

(4)

Prejudice can be explained through the Social Identity Theory, where there is Social Categorisation, and this is when we categorise ourselves into groups: ~~we~~ 'us' and 'them' or ~~the~~ the 'in-group' and 'out-group', then there is Social Identification where we adopt the identity of the group by acting a certain way, saying certain things and wearing certain clothes. Then there's Social comparison where we compare ourselves to the out-group and running ~~down~~ down the out-group and saying bad things which highers our self-esteem.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – The candidate has not answered the question and has described the theory instead of evaluating it. Not creditworthy.

0 marks

Script C

(b) Evaluate social identity theory as an explanation of prejudice.

(4)

Social identity theory is a good explanation of prejudice. Clear evidence from other minimal group studies show that being a member of a group causes prejudice against people who aren't members of that group. Also



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – Candidate needs to say how the minimal group studies support the theory, no credit as the point is too general.

people who aren't members of that group. It explains a wide range in different behaviour such as racism, class conflict and team spirit. But it doesn't explain individual differences in prejudice. And although social identity theory has been useful in understanding relations between and in groups it's not sufficient enough to explain prejudice fully. But it has



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – These last three points are independent of each other and never fully elaborated upon to gain credit.

to explain prejudice fully. It also got support from Tajfel's study about schoolboys between the age of 14-15, where they favoured and gave points to boys that they thought was in their group.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3- This very last sentence gains credit as it just about shows how the study supports the theory using in group favouritism.

1 mark

Script D

(b) Evaluate social identity theory as an explanation of prejudice.

(4)

Social identity theory is supported by research by ~~Tajfel~~ Tajfel, who showed that groups would be prejudice against each other even when they were not comparing. It is also supported



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – Candidate needs to say how the study support the theory, no credit as the point is too general.

each other even when they were not comparing. It is also supported by Reicher and Haslam's 2006 prison study which showed that there was high group identification in the guards and the prisoners. It can also be used to explain real-life situations such as football Hooliganism because supporters



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – This next sentence however does gain credit as the candidate does show how the study supports the theory.

Situations such as football Hooliganism because supporters of one team will be prejudice of the other to make themselves seem better. However it has been criticised for ^{simplifying} ~~complex~~ complex human behaviour and there may be other reasons why groups are prejudice to each other, as it



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – Point is straight off the mark scheme as an application to real life.

reasons why groups are prejudice to each other, as it may depend on culture and history. It may also be criticized because it does not explain individual differences. Such as the soldier that informed the authorities in Abu Graib. This


ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

4 – Although this is quite a general statement it demonstrates enough knowledge of individual differences to gain credit.

differences. Such as the soldier that informed the authorities in Abu Graib. This theory can be used to unite people and overcome prejudice e.g. by creating one big in-group (England team).

(Total for Question 17 = 6 marks)


ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

5 – This final point is a good application to real life and thus is creditworthy.

4 marks

Question 18

There was a great deal of variation in how candidates attempted this question. It is very clear that some candidates do not plan their work as they missed some main points out. The majority were very good at describing cue dependent forgetting but not comparing it with another theory. If included, this tended to be simply an outline of another theory with no comparison which restricted candidates' marks. Most candidates struggled with this element.

Despite this, candidates seemed very able to describe cue-dependency and there were examples of well elaborated explanations of context and state dependency. This certainly highlighted better candidates who were able to give relevant psychological examples of both sets of cues. This was in contrast to those who although knew the difference gave colloquial examples or could not elaborate on the types of cues at all.

Interference, trace decay and repression were the most popular theories of comparison but only better candidates actually compared. So a typical response here would be to highlight how cue dependent does not take biological factors into account for forgetting but trace decay does. This was one of the differentiators determining which band the final mark went into. Others just gave detailed descriptions of theories with a stab at comparison towards the end. Weaker answers just described Multi Store or Levels of processing to no avail.

In terms of evaluating cue dependent theory itself, weaker candidates went into a great deal of detail about the Godden and Baddeley study rather than simply reporting its findings as a supportive piece of evidence for Cue Dependency. They would then completely focus on evaluating the study in isolation with no reference to the theory at all. In essence these candidates were answering a question on describe and evaluate the Godden and Baddeley study.

Only the more able candidates were able to make use of supporting evidence and applications to real life. This coupled with effective comparison pushed them into the top band of marks.

Commentary on Q18

Script A

SCRIPT (A)

*18 Describe and evaluate the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

Your evaluation **should** include:

- comparison with one other theory of forgetting
- strengths and/or weaknesses of the cue dependent theory.

The cue dependent theory of forgetting states that we sometimes forget things as we don't have the right cues to remember it. We can have cues such as the environment or smells which can sometimes help us to remember things stored in our memory. If we



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – No use of correct terms for cues, not saying which is which. Needs to add in both names of the cues with an example to move up a level.

remember things stored in our memory. If we cannot find the right cues then we can not remember, this does not mean the memory is erased as we could find the cues another time. The other theory of forgetting is the interference forgetting theory. This states that



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – Overall a very brief introduction to the theory. Candidate is thus demonstrating brief answers at level one making simple statements.

interference forgetting theory. This states that we can sometimes not remember as our memory has been interfered with. It could of been interfered by another memory trying to store as well. The cue dependent theory is more

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

3- Not enough detail on interference theory, needs mention of the two types of interference and a direct comparison made with cue dependency as required

as well. The cue dependent theory is more higher in ecological validity because people can tell if they have acted on a cue as they can remember smells/sounds. A strength of the cue dependent theory is that it has been tested and supported by Godden and Baddeley 1975. The experiment cue dependant

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

4 – Attempt at comparison is weak and not comprehensible.

recall words. They found that more words were recalled when the participants were in the same environments as they learnt in. This is context dependant as the environment acted as a cue to recall. Therefore supporting the theory. Weakness is that we do not actively look for cues in all memory so it cannot be used for all of our memory. Maybe there can sometimes be no cues. State dependant is where emotion affects memory.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

5 – A good passage saying how the study supports the theory, using correct terms. This section would be worth higher level marks than points 1-4

4 marks

Script B

*18 Describe and evaluate the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

Your evaluation **should** include:

- comparison with one other theory of forgetting
- strengths and/or weaknesses of the cue dependent theory.

Abernathy
DuKa
Baker
J+S.

Munit
Trace Decay
motivated for-
getting.

SCRIPT (B)

The Cue Dependent Theory of Forgetting by Tulving suggests that we don't lose memories or forget them. Just that we do not have the necessary cues needed to retrieve them.

There are two types of cue: State-dependent cues suggest that a person will have better recall if they are in the same state in which they learnt. Bower found that when he hypnotised people into a sad ^{mood} state at recall, so ~~if~~ they were in the same state ^{as} they were at learning, then recall was better.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – A good intro to the essay clearly defining how the theory explains forgetting

The second type of cue is a context-dependent cue. This connotes that unless a person is in the same context for recall as they were for learning, recall will be impaired.

Abernathy found that students sitting an exam~~me~~ could remember more if they were sitting in the same room in which they had learnt.

The Cue Dependent Theory of forgetting is supported by Duka. Duka ~~asked people~~ gave people memory tasks to complete either with alcohol or without it. ^{80 of 101} At recall Duka found

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

2 – Good definitions of both types of cues followed up by relevant research examples which demonstrates clear understanding

that recall was better if those that had alcohol at learning, also had it ~~at~~ recall, and also, those that had the placebo, did better without. (Abernathy found that students did better in exams if they were sitting in the room that they had learnt in.)

The Cue-Dependent Theory has practical applications and standing for

better for students sitting exams, if they imagined the room in which they had learnt. However there are alternative theories to the Cue-Dependent Theory of Forgetting. Motivated forgetting argues that we forget. The Trace Decay Theory by Hebb suggests that we forget information because of the passing of time and the trace fades away, not because we lack the necessary cues to retrieve information. Also, in some experiments it is difficult to decide whether a context cue, e.g. a room, ^{can be} part of the memory but can also act as another alternative theory. Motivated



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – The correct way to use a study to support the theory. No long description of the whole Duka study, candidate has been concise in describing how the findings support the theory.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

4 – Excellent comparison point with another theory, put really well.

11 marks

Script C

One other theory of forgetting is the interference theory which suggests that people forget things because new or old information they have learnt is interfering with the information in which they are trying to process, making them forget the information.

Strengths of



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – This is purely descriptive and needs at least one comparison with cue dependency in terms of how they differ in explaining forgetting

that it can help students revise more efficiently for an exam and also explain why people cannot remember information for a long time but see or smell something the use to and are able to recall a memory.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – The strengths are not elaborated enough to warrant credit. Especially the first point which needs to say how cues can help students revise more efficiently for an exam.

recall a memory.

A weakness of the cue dependency theory is that not everybody can recall information again with cues such as not all people with repression can recall memories and it also cannot be generalised to those with amnesia, as they would be able to remember things otherwise with cues.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

3- A very confused paragraph which makes sweeping statements which are not clear. This makes it difficult to give any credit as it seems the candidate is not sure about what they mean. Lacks clarity and organisation which is indicative of level two.

6 marks

Script D

***18** Describe and evaluate the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

Your evaluation should include:

- comparison with one other theory of forgetting
- strengths and/or weaknesses of the cue dependent theory.

SCRIPT (D)

Cue dependant theory states that there are two types of cues they are context cues, those around you and state cues those inside you.

It shows that if there is a lack of cues you are likely to forget more. The context cues such as environment cause people to forget.

State cues are those that are inside you. for example when learning something you may have coffee but in the recall there is no coffee, you are likely to forget.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 – A correct but fairly simple example of state cues which do add to the weak definition

people to forget.

State cues are those that are inside you. For example when learning something you may have coffee but in the recall there is no coffee, you are likely to forget.

~~A study by Smith and his colleagues~~
Students can benefit from this as of when revising for an exam they can do so in exam conditions for example in silence with no cues.

A weakness of this study is that another theory explains why we forget.

Another theory is interference theory.

86 of 101



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

2 – Again the application to help students revising is correct but could be expressed better to demonstrate effective extended writing for level 3

This explains that we forget because we have interferences.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 – Very brief simple statements shown about another theory which needs expanding on in terms of types of interference to move out of current level 1

These results show that participants that recalled words underwater forget more than those on land.

The weakness of this study is that the task is artificial as ~~divers~~ people like students will forget more words as it is not their natural environment whereas divers go underwater all the time.

Overall, the study can be applied to real life and so can

The ~~ex~~ or is that it explanation of is another theory

because of interferences.

This theory explains that if there is more interferences when recall



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

4 – Correct study is used but never clearly stated how it supports the theory. Candidate just needs to add that words learned and recalled in different environments led to forgetting as the original cue at learning was not present at recall.

7 marks

Grade boundaries

6PS01

Grade	Max.Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	80	64	56	48	40	32
Raw boundary mark	60	43	38	34	30	26

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 US020975 January 2009

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

