



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel
GCE Psychology 8PS0/01
Paper 1: Social and Cognitive Psychology

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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.

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 2024

Publications Code 8PS0_01

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

General Comments

Introduction:

The 8PS0_01 examination requires candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the social psychology and cognitive psychology content from the AS level specification. In addition, they need to apply their knowledge of these topics to novel scenarios and investigations described on the examination paper, including using the prescribed mathematical content. Candidates must also be able to evaluate material as instructed; for example, by explaining their understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of using social and cognitive theories to understand the novel behaviours described on the paper.

Section A is worth 29 marks and examines the social psychology content. There is a mix of short and medium open response questions for students to respond to. At the end of this section there is an essay that is worth 8 marks.

Section B is worth 29 marks and examines the cognitive psychology content. There is a mix of short and medium open response questions for students to respond to. At the end of this section there is an essay that is worth 8 marks.

Section C comprises of a single 12-mark essay question that requires candidates to draw on their knowledge from across social and cognitive psychology.

In this series, examiners saw candidate work across the full range of abilities. Many candidates showed good psychological knowledge and understanding on topics across the paper. A good number of candidates were able to apply their knowledge of realistic conflict theory and reconstructive memory to a novel scenario which was pleasing to see, although fewer were able to achieve as highly when asked to use reconstructive memory in the context of a scenario. Mathematical skills were often very good, with candidates able to correctly calculate the value of U in the Mann-Whitney test.

Comments on Individual Questions and Examiner Tips

Social psychology

Question 1

This question was concerned with Milgram's Ordinary man gives orders (Experiment 13) variation study.

Q01a

This question required candidates to give their knowledge of Milgram's Ordinary man gives orders (experiment 13) variation study. There were two marks available.

Examiners found that some candidates showed good knowledge of the specific aspects of this variation, including who the 'ordinary man' was in relation to the experiment, and how the situation was contrived such that he was left in charge. Answers that included these details could be awarded two marks.

Other candidates had less knowledge of this variation; they typically re-wrote information already given in the question, showing no additional knowledge of who the ordinary man was. Some candidates only gave knowledge of the elements of the procedure that were common to all variations.

The response below was awarded two marks.

(a) Describe the procedure of Milgram's Ordinary man gives orders (Experiment 13) variation study.

(2)

The participant and a confederate were assigned roles of teachers and another confederate the learner by the experimenter. The experimenter outlined the procedure of the experiment but then had to leave the room and the two teachers were left with the shock machine. The confederate, who the participant believed was an ordinary man then gave orders to shock the learner

Examiner Comment:

Candidates are advised to learn the specific details of the methods used in each of Milgram's variations listed in the specification. This will help them to distinguish each variation from Milgram's original study.

Q01b

This question required candidates to give one finding from Milgram's Ordinary man gives orders (Experiment 13) variation study. There was one mark available.

Examiners found that some candidates could give an accurate result, however some lacked precision in their responses. For example, simply saying '20% obeyed orders' was not enough, we wanted candidates to tell us that 20% obeyed orders at 450V. Another common error here was for candidates to give a result from one of the other variations to Milgram's original study.

The response below was awarded two marks.

(b) State **one** result from Milgram's Ordinary man gives orders (Experiment 13) variation study.

(1)

20% obeyed to the final 450 volts.

Examiner Comment:

Candidates are advised to be precise when they give the findings from studies. They must ensure they have given a complete answer since the examiner cannot assume they know something they haven't written. In this example, this meant qualifying their response with something like 'the full 450V'.

Q01c

This question required candidates to explain one weakness of Milgram's Ordinary man gives order (Experiment 13) variation study. There were two marks available.

Examiners found that many candidates were able to identify a weakness of the study however it was less common for them to be able to justify why this was a weakness. More successful responses scored both available marks, for instance by identifying the weakness and justifying this by suggesting the impact on the findings of the study.

The following response was awarded two marks.

(c) Explain **one** weakness of Milgram's Ordinary man gives orders (Experiment 13) variation study.

(2)

The study was unethical, as the ordinary man was in close proximity to the participant and urged them to carry on with the electric shocks. As the ordinary man was in the same room, the participant might have felt more distress and not been protected from psychological harm.

Examiner Comment:

When responding to a two-mark 'explain' question like this, candidates should ensure you have justified the point you have identified as a strength or weakness (as appropriate according to the question). This could be showing your knowledge of the impact of the point you have identified on the findings of the study.

Question 2

This question was concerned with the design and implementation of an investigation that used a questionnaire.

Q02a

This question required candidates to describe how Jasmine could have used a random sampling technique to recruit participants for the questionnaire-based investigation. There were two marks available.

Examiners found that many candidates scored the full two marks for this question, by acquiring the details of the population (parents who did not obey the rule) and then using a random method to select a sample from this group. Some candidates described a different sampling method that was not random sampling (such as opportunity sampling) and so scored no marks. Other candidates identified the population as being 'all' parents at the school; this was not correct since the question stated that she was interested in those parents who did not obey the rule.

The response below was awarded two marks.

(a) Describe how Jasmine could have recruited her participants using a random sampling technique.

Jasmine could have taken a list of all the parents that ⁽²⁾ ignored the rule and ~~put~~ for example write their names down on a paper, which then she would cut ~~out~~, and put in a basket or a hat. She ~~then~~ could pick 20 names from the hat. This way every parent would have an equal chance of being chosen.

Examiner Comment:

Candidates should ensure they properly read all the information given in each scenario. In the scenario for this question, it was stated that the population of interest to Jasmine was parents who did not obey the rule.

Q02b

This question asked candidates to explain a conclusion using the data in the table about how often a group of parents had given their children healthy snacks to take to school in one week. There were two marks available.

Examiners found that many candidates gave a statement about parent behaviour regarding the provision of healthy snacks for their children. They awarded an additional mark when candidates then justified their conclusion using data from the table. In the absence of a conclusion, there was no mark available for the use of data. Candidates who only described results did not receive credit.

The response below was awarded two marks.

Jasmine could conclude that a majority of the children do not bring in healthy snacks, as 7/13 ~~times~~ responses show children not bringing in healthy snacks.

Examiner Comment:

When writing a conclusion, candidates should give a statement about what the data tell us about behaviour. They should support this with appropriate data as justification. They can give the conclusion first or the data first in their writing.

Q02c

This question asked candidates to explain one reason for the collection of quantitative data in the investigation described in the scenario. There were two marks available.

Examiners found they could award marks for a variety of different appropriately contextualised strengths, for example responses about the ease of analysis for quantitative data, and objectivity (thus avoiding the bias associated with subjective interpretation). An initial mark was available for the identification of a strength, and an additional mark was available for the justification of the strength. For example, this could have been a correct statement about the impact on reliability or validity.

The response below was awarded two marks.

(c) Jasmine collected quantitative data.

Explain one reason why Jasmine collected quantitative data for her investigation.

(2)
Quantitative data is quick and easy to analyse. Jasmine could gather the data quickly and produce her findings to see the ~~same~~ difference between ^{the amounts of} healthy snacks brought into school in comparison to unhealthy snacks.

Examiner Comment:

As they work through the various parts of each question like this one, candidates need to make sure that their responses continue to be written in the context of the scenario. In this question, examiners could only award marks if candidates had made it clear that the strength about quantitative data related to the investigation that Jasmine conducted.

Q02d

This question asked candidates to explain one way in which Jasmine could have improved her questionnaire. There were two marks available.

A common acceptable response to the question was the suggestion that Jasmine could have included open questions in her questionnaire. Examiners found responses that identified this improvement often went on to justify the suggestion in an appropriate way, e.g., that this would add validity to Jasmine's investigation as it would help her to understand why the parents behaved as they did.

This response was awarded two marks.

(d) Explain **one** way Jasmine could improve her questionnaire about bringing healthy snacks into school.

(2)

Jasmine could also include some open-ended questions with questions such as "Is your child did not bring healthy snacks to school, what is the reason for this?" in order to gather more information and have a better idea as to why the ~~parents~~ parents did not obey the new rule.

Examiner Comment:

When responding to 'improvement' questions, candidates should avoid suggesting an altogether different research method could be used. For instance, in this question we were looking for how they could have made the questionnaire better rather than using an experiment instead.

Question 3

This question was about understanding the behaviour of staff at two restaurants using realistic conflict theory.

Q03a

This question asked candidates to explain the behaviour of the staff at the two restaurants using their knowledge of realistic conflict theory. There were four marks available.

Examiners awarded up to two marks for clear and accurate knowledge of realistic conflict theory, and up to a further two marks for the application of knowledge about realistic conflict theory applied appropriately to the scenario. Many candidates managed the demands of this question well and it was pleasing to see accurate and detailed responses that fully addressed the demands of the question. Less successful answers often confused different aspects of realistic conflict theory; for example, they confused competition for limited resources with superordinate goals.

The response below was awarded four marks. The response is well structured. Each paragraph gives an accurate point of knowledge about realistic conflict theory and then applies this same point in the context of the scenario described on the paper.

(a) Using realistic conflict theory, explain the behaviour of the staff at the two restaurants.

(4)

Realistic conflict theory states that two or more groups competing for limited resources leads to conflict and prejudice against each other. The Eatery and the Winery are the two restaurants competing for more customers which leads to this conflict.

Realistic conflict theory also states that when two ~~groups~~ groups working together on a mutual goal or reward it leads to much less hostility and less conflict. The staff from both the restaurants had needed to work together on a mutual goal in order to win the competition where they had worked together well with much less hostility.

Examiner Comment:

In four-mark questions such as this, candidates are well-advised to make accurate points from the appropriate theory and then then apply these within the context of the scenario described on the exam paper. Making full use of the scenario within their answer will increase their chances of scoring highly.

Q03b

This question asked candidates to explain one strength and one weakness of realistic conflict theory as an explanation of the staff at the two restaurants. There were four marks available.

Examiners found that this question was very challenging for many candidates. A common mistake made was explaining a strength and a weakness of realistic conflict theory, rather than a strength and a weakness of using it as an explanation for the behaviour in the scenario.

The response below was awarded three marks. A contextualised strength is given that is fully justified for two marks. The weakness was awarded one mark because the candidate has suggested that social identity theory could explain the behaviour instead without fully justifying why this is a weakness for realistic conflict theory.

(b) Explain **one** strength and **one** weakness of realistic conflict theory as an explanation of the behaviour of the staff at the two restaurants.

(4)

Strength

This theory has ~~be~~ supporting evidence of Sherif et al.'s Robber's cave experiment. The boys formed groups and showed inter-group hostility when it came to competing against each other in tournaments. This proves the theory & therefore making it a valid explanation for the staff's behaviour.

Weakness

Social identity theory could be a better way of explaining their behaviour. The existence of ~~the~~ an outgroup gives rise to outgroup bias in order to feel a ~~sense of~~ sense of superiority. The arrival of the new restaurant pushed the existing restaurant to show resentment to feel superior and for self-esteem to remain high.

(Total for Question 3 = 8 marks)

Examiner Comment:

Candidates must try to explain strengths and weaknesses that relate to the context in the scenario in questions like this, rather than explaining generic strengths and weaknesses of theories.

Q04

This essay question was about factors affecting obedience shown by children in a scenario.

Examiners often found good evidence of knowledge and understanding of authoritarian personality that was correctly attributed to Eric. Many candidates made good use of this to explain his differing behaviour with his parents compared to with children at school.

Work on Roxanne and Perdita was sometimes less convincing. In some responses, there was confusion surrounding internal and external loci of control. Other weaker responses were limited to knowledge on agency theory and did not give any convincing reasons for the differences observed among the three children.

Given this was a 'discuss' question, there was no expectation that candidates should use research evidence to support points made.

The response over the page was awarded seven marks, in band 3 of the levels-based mark scheme. This is a good example of a response where the candidate made excellent use of their knowledge on authoritarian personality. This candidate has also written about the concept of having a buddy and how this could cause dissent. They have also suggested that one twin was a 'disobedient model' for the other twin; again, this was considered creditworthy.

Examiner Comment:

If the command word in an essay question is 'discuss', candidates should focus on using their knowledge and understanding of psychology to explain the behaviours described in the scenario. It is not necessary for them to use research evidence in their responses.

Discuss the factors affecting obedience in relation to Eric, Roxanne and Perdita's behaviour.

You must make reference to the context in your answer.

(8)

Eric can be said to have authoritarian personality; This was proposed by Adorno et al which is said that we are socialised at birth to be obedient to our parents, ~~and teachers and so the~~ Eric et al can be suggested that Eric has harsh parents due to the fact that they are ~~being~~ often told off by their parents and so Adorno et al states that children with harsh parents suppress their feelings in childhood as they can obviously not combat their parents' authority; This suppressed anger is lingering in the unconscious mind that holds our aggressive desires and so this usually results in this anger being redirected to ~~these~~ others. In the case of Eric, he has directed this suppressed anger to younger children in school because according to Adorno et al, those who possess these feelings will likely displace their anger onto one minority which in this case is to children who are younger than him. Therefore, authoritarian ~~personality~~ causes Eric to be ^{submitive} obedient to his parents but

rule an impostor to those who are on equal stand-
as him of a student and are also weaker than him in
terms of age.

Regarding Roxanne and Perdita, because they are girls
who often do things together, they are excellent
disobedient models; when it is said when a
person views another dissenting model, it will influence
them to also resist obedience as it gives them the
courage to rebel against authority. In this case,
Perdita wants to do her homework even when their
parents, who are the authority figures, have told
them to end so by being the disobedient model, it
may influence Roxanne to also resist
obedience and not submit to the authority of their
parents as and thus dissent from orders to share
their bags with Eric and do their homework.

In conclusion, Roxanne and Perdita are experiencing
reactance which is the state of mind in which they are
fighting for the freedom to watch television and have their
own bags without having to share this feeling their dissent
against their parents and also serving as disobedient models of

Reuther which causes dissent. Similarly, due to releasing his anger
on the nursery ^{who} ~~which~~ are children ^{and anger by him, it} ~~was~~ **(Total for Question 4 = 8 marks)**
gives him ~~the~~ Eric to be submissive to his parents and teachers ~~and~~
though he feels his unexpressed anger while **TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 29 MARKS**
directing it to other children so he can feel better.

Cognitive psychology

Question 5

This question was about the multistore model of memory.

Q05a

This question asked candidates to describe two features of the 'long term store'. There were two available marks.

Examiners found this question was accessible to most candidates. It was common for them to score both available marks.

The response below was awarded two marks.

(a) Give **two** features of the 'long-term store' as it is used in the multi-store model of memory.

(2)

1. Encoding of the long term store (LTM) is semantic, meaning it encodes by meaning of words.
2. Capacity of LTM is unlimited, so it can hold as many objects.

Q05b

This question asked candidates to explain a strength and a weakness of the multistore model of memory. There were four marks available.

Examiners found a range of responses were given for this question, which attracted marks across the full mark range. Many candidates were able to identify a strength and a weakness, and better response clearly justified their responses.

The following response was awarded three marks. Two marks were awarded for the strength which explains and justifies an appropriate strength of the model. One mark was given for the weakness. The weakness was appropriately identified, however there was some confusion in the evidence used to justify this.

(b) Explain **one** strength and **one** weakness of the multi-store model of memory.

(4)

Strength

It takes in notice that in order for information to be remembered, rehearsal has to occur, which will transfer memories from LTM into STM back and forth. This can be applied to real life where students who retrieve information more often get higher marks on their tests.

Weakness

MSM is seen as an oversimplified model as it does not take in state LTM has two separate stores: procedural and declarative. KF is a brain damaged patient which was only able to ~~hear~~ remember information he wrote himself, and not information others told him verbally, suggesting LTM has two separate stores

(Total for Question 5 = 6 marks)

Examiner Comment:

Questions like this may ask for a strength and a weakness, or two strengths / two weaknesses. It is important that candidates have a range of different points that they can write about for these kinds of questions.

Question 6

This question was concerned with the design and implementation of an experiment on memory.

Q06a

This question asked candidates to calculate the range for Sebastian's data. There was one mark available.

Examiners found this question was accessible to most candidates.

Q06b

This question asked candidates to calculate the Mann Whitney U test for Sebastian's data. There were four marks available.

Examiners found many candidates were able to perform the calculation and so were awarded four marks. Many candidates who were unable to perform the full calculation were able to give the sum of each rank and scored one mark.

Q06c

This question asked candidates to explain one improvement that could be made to the memory experiment. There were two marks available.

Examiners found a range of responses given to this question. Many of them were about separating the participants which was acceptable however not all responses of this kind gave an appropriate justification for this, for example in terms of the impact this would have on the quality of the data that was collected.

The response below was awarded two marks.

(c) Explain **one** improvement Sebastian could make to his experiment.

(2)

Sebastian could use a repeated measures design instead of an independent design when allocating lists of words from condition A or B. In the independent groups design one person may have stronger recall naturally when asked to recall words so this design will reduce individual differences thus increasing the validity of his results.

(Total for Question 6 = 7 marks)

Examiner Comment:

Candidates should ensure they suggest an improvement rather than give a weakness of the way the investigation was done.

Question 7

This question was about using reconstructive memory theory in relation to differences in memory described in the scenario.

Q07a

This question required the same approach as Q03a. Candidates needed to give two accurate pieces of information about reconstructive memory for up to two marks. They also needed to apply their knowledge of reconstructive memory to explain the differences in the memories of Louis and Gus, gaining up to two further marks. There were four marks available.

Examiners found some good responses to this question, with clear evidence of knowledge and understanding of reconstructive memory theory and an ability to apply this in a clear way to Louise and Gus. However, some candidates gave muddled and repetitive knowledge, which was not applied effectively to the scenario.

The response below was awarded four marks. The candidate has given knowledge about the use of schemas in reconstructive memory and has explained why everyone has different schemas. They have then applied this, giving a detailed explanation for the ways in which both Louis and Gus remember the film.

(a) Using your knowledge of reconstructive memory, explain why Louie and Gus described the film differently.

(4)

Reconstructive memory uses schema theory to suggest that we completely reconstruct our memories based on our schemas - little packets of information or a mental representation of knowledge based on our personal experience. In his theory, Bartlett argues that a different set of schemas will change your memory in comparison to someone else. For example, Gus might watch a lot of action films, hence why, when asked to recall the movie at a later date he remembered it as an action film that involved the use of weapons. However, Louie may watch more comedy films (therefore having an entirely different set of schemas to Gus) which caused him to remember the film as a comedy where the two bank robbers kept making mistakes.

Examiner Comment:

Candidates should ensure they make full use of the information given about different people within a scenario; often as was the case here, the scenario is designed to enable candidates to use different aspects of a theory in their responses.

Q07b

This question was similar to Q03b, since it asked candidates to give a strength and a weakness of using reconstructive memory to explain the behaviour of the Louis and Gus. There were four marks available.

Examiners saw some good responses to this question; however it was common for candidates to simply give strengths and weaknesses of reconstructive memory in the generic sense. The question needed candidates to consider how it may / may not be a suitable way to explain the memories described in the scenario.

The response below was awarded three marks. The strength was given one mark for the recognition that the findings from Bartlett's study could help explain the different memories that Louis and Gus had, although the justification for why this is a strength was clear. The weakness was awarded two marks; the candidate has written about the abstract nature of schemas and gone on to justify why this presents a problem for using the theory to understand Louis and Gus.

(b) Explain one strength and one weakness of using Bartlett's (1932) theory of reconstructive memory to explain why Louie and Gus described the film differently.

(4)

Strength

Supporting evidence from Bartlett's 'War of the Ghosts' study which found that people tended to embellish the story to fit in with their schemas such as calling a canoe, a boat. This gives evidence for the idea that schemas influence our memory. This is why Louie and Gus thought that the bank robbers did different things.

Weakness

Testability, it is hard to properly test a person's reconstructive memory as it relies on schemas which are abstract concepts. This means that in studies it is hard to operationalise the variable of reconstructive memory. It is hard to tell what Louie and Gus' schemas of bank robbers are so we don't fully know that they impacted their memory of the film with bank robbers.

(Total for Question 7 = 8 marks)

Examiner Comment:

Candidates should always try to give the reasons why the points they are making are strengths and weaknesses – it is this justification that will enable them to get the second mark for the strength / weakness they have identified.

Q08

This essay question was about the use of laboratory experiments in cognitive psychology. There were eight marks available.

Examiners frequently found good evidence of knowledge about the features of laboratory experiments and the strengths and weaknesses of these. Some candidates were able to write specifically about lab experiments within cognitive psychology whilst other slightly weaker responses were more generic. Among those candidates who did write about experiments within cognitive psychology, most only exemplified their work using Baddeley (1966b); it was relatively unusual for examiners to see other laboratory experiments in cognitive psychology used in responses.

Since the command word for the essay was 'evaluate', examiners were looking for an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of this method of investigation.

The response over the page was awarded six marks, at the top of band three on the levels-based mark scheme. The candidate has shown accurate although not quite thorough knowledge of laboratory experiments. They have given a reasonable balanced range of evaluative points using coherent chains of reasoning with implicit conclusions throughout the response. As was common, this answer is exemplified using Baddeley (1966b) only.

Lab experiments are experiments which are conducted in a highly controlled - normally artificial environment. Baddeley's 1966 study on memory ^{to see if the LTM errors occur naturally} can therefore be considered a lab experiment as it involved participants being taken to an artificial environment. This can be advantageous as the ~~to~~ all variables can be manipulated. In fact the researcher decides to reduce the impact that they might have on a participant, such as noise or other people watching around, eliminating distractions. For Baddeley's study, noise would have allowed him to test memory accurately. Lab experiments also have normally strict standardised procedures, which means that each participant undergoes the exact same treatment/process which increases the reliability of lab experiments significantly and means they can be replicated as well, meaning overall lab experiments can be very advantageous in cognitive psychology. However, lab experiments can also have their disadvantages too. As lab experiments are created in an artificial environment outside of a participant's daily life / normal environment, they are likely to display demand characteristics: Demand characteristics are when the participant alters their behaviour to how they think they should be acting which reduces the validity of their behaviour as it is not being observed, for example during Baddeley's study. Another ~~disadvantage~~ weakness of lab experiments is that they often lack ecological validity which is again

due to the artificial environment and high control over the situation. When a study is lacking in ecological validity it means that the results cannot necessarily be applied to real life / generalised to real life as we cannot make the assumption that a participant will behave the same way in the strict lab experiment and outside of the study - such as the procedure / environment of Baddeley's which is an unusual task and environment for the participants which may have diminished or enhanced their ability to learn the words in order. Suggesting that lab experiments are often lacking in validity.

Overall, Lab experiments can be advantageous at providing reliable results which can be easily replicated, however it is impossible to observe genuine behaviour during a lab experiment due to the artificial environment and the lack of ecological validity which is apparent when comparing the memory of Baddeley looking at Baddeley's study B in 1966.

Examiner Comment:

Whilst candidates are likely to know the most detail about the named contemporary and classic studies from the specification, they could be encouraged to use other research to add breadth to their writing.

Social and cognitive psychology

Q09

The final essay on the paper, as is always the case, required candidates to use their knowledge and understanding from across both social and cognitive approaches to psychology. Candidates were asked to consider the extent to which Sherif (1954/1961) and Baddeley (1966b) could be considered generalisable and ethical. There were twelve marks available.

Examiners saw a variety of responses to the question, across all levels. In general, there was more detail given in the responses seen to Sherif (1954/1961) than to Baddeley (1966b). Indeed, some work on Baddeley was very basic and there were several inaccuracies in descriptions of this study that were less often found in work on Sherif (1954/1961). In a minority of responses, candidates gave general evaluations rather than focusing on generalisability and ethics.

The response over the page was awarded nine marks, in band three of the levels-based mark scheme. It was considered to exhibit accurate knowledge and understanding of the two studies, although the work on Baddeley (1966b) was not considered thorough. There were several different points of evaluation in the response, explained using coherent chains of reasoning and a good balance between those pertaining to generalisability and those pertaining to ethics. It was felt that there was room for improvement in terms of Baddeley (1966b) for ethics, which was a further reason for keeping the response in band three.

9 To what extent can the classic studies by Sherif et al. (1954/1961) and Baddeley (1966b) be considered generalisable and ethical?

(12)

Sherif's Robbers' Cave experiment consisted of 22 11 year old boys at a 'Summer camp' at Robbers Cave state park in Oklahoma, and investigated prejudice between the two groups of 11.

Sherif's study lacks generalisability as it has a niche and small sample. He used 22 11 year old boys, all Protestants from middle class families in Oklahoma, a demographic useful for his matched pairs design but one that ~~the~~ hinders his generalisability as it is not at all representative of the target population of the study. His results found are not applicable to demographics outside of this group, which hinders the validity of his results.

However, in terms of ethics his study is much better. As the boys were under 18 he obtained informed consent from their parents for the study, and none of the boys were ever aware they were being observed or experimented on. This does mean they lacked the right to withdraw as they did not

know they were part of the study two boys were allowed to go home, effectively withdrawing them.

Stevy's ethics do become questionable in regards to the aim of his study, where he caused hostility and prejudice between the boys, which can be seen as unethical, however he worked to correct ~~the~~ this by introducing superordinate goals to reduce the conflict between the Eagles and Rattlers, which he successfully did after 3 superordinate goals had been complete - proven by the increase in out group friendships from 6.4% to 36.6% for the eagles and rattlers.

~~Stevy~~
Buddely (1968) was a memory experiment into acoustically and semantically similar and dissimilar words. His sample size was split into 4 groups of 15, 16, 20, and 21 participants via independent groups design. All his participants were selected from a WILNERS' subject panel, and used both males and females. This is not a representative sample due to the small and non-diverse sample

and it is not aided by the choice of independent groups. Baddelley's study would have been more generalisable if he used repeated measures as he would have had more results for each condition and thus higher generalisability.

However, his study is generally ethical. He used a lab experiment and ~~was~~ acquired informed consent from all his participants, and issued a full debrief after the study to clear up any questions they had. ~~The~~ The right to withdraw was preserved before, during, and after the study to ensure all participants ~~was~~ knew they could exercise it whenever they wanted. Baddelley also did not cause psychological harm to his participants, they were left in the same emotional state they started the study in. He displayed competence as a researcher by ensuring confidentiality and confidential data storage to all participants. No deceit was used in his memory experiments, and he provided informed consent ensured all participants in the study were aware of what was happening. Overall, both Serif and Baddelley's studies can be concluded to lack generalisability but not ethics. (Total for Question 9 = 12 marks)

Examiner Comment:

Candidates should be encouraged to stick to the demands of the question in essays such as this when only certain elements of assessing studies are stipulated. For example, in this question there was no additional credit available for candidates who also wrote about the extent to which the studies were valid.

