

Examiners' Report  
January 2013

GCE Psychology 6PS01 01

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

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

Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

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

## ResultsPlus

### Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education.

Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

January 2013

Publications Code US034799

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

## Introduction

As usual this paper provided a full range of responses from candidates and, in the main, those who read the questions correctly did very well. The questions around How Science Works were answered less well than others and are still an achilles heel for weaker candidates.

Q2, a multiple choice question about which design was used by Godden and Baddeley, differentiated well, with only the most able candidates scoring the highest marks.

Candidates' overall understanding of concepts in all topics is clearly evident. The wide range of marks awarded can be attributed largely to the differing levels of ability to respond to the question with relevant understanding succinctly expressed. It is important that candidates focus on a question and consider how many marks it is worth; they are advised to practise making responses which include sufficient **relevant** information which really does reflect their knowledge.

The essay produced some of the best and highest scoring answers seen in recent exams. Many, however, failed to include procedural details and simply stated that the procedure was the same as the original. A good range of variation studies was evident.

Candidates seem to have scored well on this paper compared to other winter series, and the development in skills plays a major part in this. How Science Works still proves to be the discriminator between strong and weaker responses.

Another area for development could be the engagement with A02 elements. Candidates show good evaluation skills at the level of replicability and validity and aspects of ethics (especially Milgram). However, raising awareness of applicability of psychology beyond the laboratory could not only enable them to articulate this in meaningful evaluation of studies, thus leading to higher scores in examinations, but also help to increase and sustain their intellectual engagement with the subject.

## **Question 11**

### **Q11 (a)**

On the whole this question was answered very well, with candidates demonstrating a sound knowledge of the concept of hypotheses. The majority of candidates avoided the trap of recording an aim instead of a hypothesis. Better candidates successfully recorded a one-tailed (directional) hypothesis and accessed full marks through the mention of 'hours' in the dependant variable (DV). However there were those who failed to provide the necessary detail for 2 marks – and others who gave a null hypothesis instead. A few candidates wrote a non-directional hypothesis. If they scored one mark only it was usually because they hadn't referred to 'hours' spent watching TV, or because they had not really written a prediction.

### **Q11 (b)(i)**

This question produced a range of responses, with many candidates demonstrating a good knowledge of experimental design by answering with independent/matched pairs; there were many who used repeated measures. Those who found this question challenging were those who confused the concept with sampling methods or research methods.

### **Q11 (b)(ii)**

It was relatively rare for candidates to be able to fully justify their choice in an appropriate way, even when they had got b(i) correct – they often scored one mark for recognising that participants could only take part once, since the independent variable (IV) was to do with age. Candidates often found it difficult to explain the appropriateness link to the survey described; many merely gave the advantages of using independent groups without making mention of the survey in question. However the stronger candidates were able to link the design to the study and to give a relevant and concise response. Such answers focused on the need for two groups for a comparison to be made.

Where responses used "correlation" instead of "comparison", no marks could be awarded. Many weaker responses referred to independent groups design in (i), but were rarely able to justify it fully in (ii) with generic reference to order effects and demand characteristics which were not creditworthy for this question / survey.

### **Q11 (c)**

Examiners saw clear understanding of ethical guidelines, correctly identified by all. Many responses accessed solid marks here with two ethical guidelines being correctly named; better answers achieved an additional mark for each one described in the context of the survey. The full 4 marks were awarded to the very best responses which offered elaborated and sophisticated expansions on the basic ideas of each guideline. The common guidelines were: right to withdraw, informed consent and confidentiality. In a number of cases responses simply restated the guideline without further explanation within the description and this restricted the marks that could be awarded.

Weaker answers demonstrated evidence of confusion between briefing and debriefing and, sometimes, informed consent (where this was said to be given by the researcher, rather than obtained). These responses were also related to experimental conditions, rather than to the survey.

### **Q11 (d)**

This question was a real discriminator and many of the candidates found it challenging. Some made 'throw away' comments without explaining them in relation to the survey. Many responses involved a large number of repetitive statements. Almost all responses included justifications referring to 'quick and easy', indicating a lack of understanding of methodological significance. The weaker candidates appeared to focus on these terms

exclusively and failed to gain marks as they did not explain how this allows access to large sample size. The stronger responses explained these in more detail and also explained why this was necessary within this survey.

The main problem was that many candidates didn't account for the fact that both interviews and questionnaires were survey methods. A significant number appeared to think that survey meant 'questionnaire' and often went on to contrast it with interviews, whereas interviews are an element of surveys. Others thought surveys were something different entirely with very few elaborating in sufficient detail to gain marks for points about validity or reliability. There appears to be some lack of understanding of the fact that a survey can be used as a research method within an experiment.

Where responses did gain marks these were most often awarded for what was said about quantitative data being easy to analyse and how. Examiners saw many generic answers which described open/closed questions and qualitative/quantitative data. Reference to the survey was absent in many scripts; in this case no more than 2 marks can be awarded.

(a) Write a directional (one tailed) alternative hypothesis for your survey.

(2)

~~More~~ Teenagers will watch more hours of TV compared to their parents, any change in the dependent variable will be due to chance.

(b) (i) Which participant design would be used in your survey?

(1)

questionnaire.

(ii) Explain why the design you used in (b)(i) is appropriate for your survey.

(2)

There would need to be a questionnaire in the survey as this would be a very effective way of finding out who watches more TV adults or children. We would need the questionnaire as the results will be quantitative.

(c) With reference to your survey into television viewing hours, explain **two** ethical guidelines that you would need to consider.

(4)

1. No <sup>bias</sup> leading questions should be asked. The questions should agree with either parents or children, questions should be balanced.

2. With the survey when being completed the participants should be fully aware of the true purpose of the survey, avoiding deception.

(d) Explain why a survey would be the best research method to use for this particular investigation.

(4)

Surveys are a cost effective, quick and easy way of collecting data. The survey will produce quantitative data on the numbers of hours TV is watched, therefore the quantitative data is a much easier way to collect and use in a chart or graph. Surveys mean that the results are valid as they can be easily replicated.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

(a) 0 marks. The first bit is right but then the last clause is added to make this a null hypothesis - levels descriptions state that 'very unclear prediction' gain 0 marks; the last clause makes it unclear.

(b)(i) 0 marks as questionnaire is a method, not a design.

(b)(ii) 0 marks since (b)(i) identifies a method rather than a design (see mark scheme).

(c) 1 mark - the first 'guideline' is not ethics; the second talks about "deception" at the end and then explains by saying they should be fully aware of the true purpose. This could be deception and informed consent or could be deception explained. It is taken as deception elaborated and gets 1 mark.

(d) 1 mark - cost effective, easy and quick - not enough as it stands but quantitative data, number of hours, charts, graphs are enough to gain 1 mark. 'Valid and replicated' could not gain any further marks.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

With questions like this which have a number of parts to them, it is always worth reading ahead to see what the next part is asking. This will prevent any repetition in answers, which usually means questions may have been misinterpreted.

(a) Write a directional (one tailed) alternative hypothesis for your survey.

(2)

In the survey results will show that teenagers watch more hours of TV than their parents.

(b) (i) Which participant design would be used in your survey?

(1)

Independent groups-

(ii) Explain why the design you used in (b)(i) is appropriate for your survey.

(2)

Because independent groups is where you have two groups who will take part in only one of the two conditions. In this case one condition is the teenagers watching TV and the other is the parents watching TV. This design is used so that we can make a direct ~~cause~~ cause and effect of the DV and IV. And also because there are only two types of participants in the survey so we wouldn't use matched pairs.

(c) With reference to your survey into television viewing hours, explain two ethical guidelines that you would need to consider.

(4)

- ① If we are going to be surveying how much time participants take to watch TV - this means to get accurate data we must ~~write down personal info~~ <sup>get them to</sup> write down personal info. So therefore the ethical guideline of confidentiality must not be breached such as house number, name or what type of program they are watching because this information is private & should be destroyed once the survey is complete.
- ② Also participants must not undergo the ethical guideline of deceit where they never truly know the actual aim of the study/survey until the end. They should be told that the aim of this survey is to observe TV viewing hours of parents & teenagers and this should stay the true aim throughout, instead of e.g. the aim being do parents have authority as to which TV programs go on the TV.



(d) Explain why a survey would be the best research method to use for this particular investigation.

(4)

A survey would be the best research method to follow for the TV investigation because if you are recording the number of hours/minutes a person watches of TV in a given time frame, the information you will be collecting and making a conclusion with will be quantitative data which is ~~numerical~~ numerical data and on a survey people will use tally charts or tick a box for a certain number, so a survey will allow us to gather up the data easily with no hassle. Also in a survey you make up the questions and the answers that people can give, so you interpret what info you are going to find out. Surveys once done are also ~~very~~ very quick & efficient to the experimenter because once you've made the survey & given it to the participant it is up to them to complete it with accurate data and for them to return it back once completed, so it is an easy, timeless and ~~cheap~~ cheap research method as opposed to an observation which would take time.

(Total for Question 11 = 13 marks)



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

(a) 2 marks. The words at the start are bracketed and the end bit is right (IV, DV, operationalised). The early bit does not take anything away from the hypothesis being clear and appropriate and so, using the levels descriptions, this is awarded 2 marks.

(b)(i) 1 mark

(b)(ii) 1 mark. The first bit is about what 'independent groups' means as a design, so *describes* rather than says *why* the design is used, but the answer shows that the candidate does know that the *two* groups is what is important. The point is made that a cause and effect conclusion can be drawn. This is relevant to all designs and a clear rationale for *this* design has not been given. The answer has two groups, two types and there is just enough here for 1 mark.

(c) 4 marks. Confidentiality is well explained with examples and what to do (destroy data and so on). Deceit is well explained (not knowing the aim) and elaboration well linked to this survey.

d) 1 mark. The material on quantitative, numerical, tick a box, gather the data easily (up to 'hassle') gain the mark. The rest of the answer talks about things being easy but without enough clarification for a mark and the comparison is not clear either - observations are not quicker than surveys (without explaining...).



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Part (c) is a very good example of how to access full marks using ethics and make explicit reference to the survey at the same time.

## **Question 12**

On the whole candidates showed a sound understanding of cognitive psychology.

The stronger responses focused on the approach from a broad perspective, looking at assumptions (most commonly computer analogy and information processing) while the weaker responses explained what had been learnt in terms of theories/studies with little reference to the approach as a whole and scored only 1 mark. The very best responses included a full explanation of the computer analogy and comparison to the human brain. Those responses which went on to contrast input process and output with computers were most likely to be awarded full marks. There were a few answers which confused the cognitive and social approaches and these included inappropriate references to prejudice and discrimination.

12 Your younger brother will be starting psychology at college soon and wants to know about the underlying concepts of the Cognitive Approach.

Describe how the Cognitive Approach explains human behaviour.

(4)

The cognitive approach explains how people remember things and forget things. For example, the Multi-store Model shows how information is passed through three stages, the sensory store, short term memory and long term memory. Atkinson and Shiffrin suggest that rehearsal is a key to remembering information. The Cognitive Approach also involves the forgetting of ~~information~~ information with the interference theory and the cue dependent forgetting theory. Interference shows how there is retroactive interference (new information getting in the way of old information) and Pro active Interference (old information interferes with new). Cue dependant suggests how people forget information because they are not in the same context or emotional state as we were ~~when~~ in

(Total for Question 12 = 4 marks)

the place of the memory.  
For example when you're happy, it will trigger happy memories because you are in the same state.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

1 mark - the mark is awarded for how people forget and remember things including the example (not enough without); the description which follows cannot be credited.

12 Your younger brother will be starting psychology at college soon and wants to know about the underlying concepts of the Cognitive Approach.

Describe how the Cognitive Approach explains human behaviour.

(4)

The cognitive approach states that memory is like a computer, the input is the keyboard, the processing is the hardrive and the output is an email.\* It also states that memory is a by-product of intomation processing, we collect intomation everyday, absorbing the environment, ~~and different elements~~ but we only remember the things we pay most attention to, and things we process the deepest & rehearse the most.

\* The capacity of our long term memory is also potentially intinate, whilst the short term remains unilar to a computers, much shorter.

(Total for Question 12 = 4 marks)



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This gets 2 marks. Memory is like a computer input, processing, output - one mark. See fifth and sixth marking points - combination of the two. The rest (excluding the asterisk) is give the one 'pure description' example mark. The asterisk point is not clear and the example mark is given anyway so no more marks.

12 Your younger brother will be starting psychology at college soon and wants to know about the underlying concepts of the Cognitive Approach.

Describe how the Cognitive Approach explains human behaviour.

(4)

There are two concepts to the cognitive approach the first being brains work like computers in which we get an input to our brain from our sensors (eyes, ears, nose, mouth, touch) where as computers get an input from the keyboard. We then process the information into our short or long term memory where as the computer takes the typed out words through the hard drive. Finally we then have an output, our output is far more complicated than a computers as humans could be an action, language, body language where as a computer would be the words appearing on a screen. The second concept is ~~that~~ the linear approach in which everything ~~is~~ piece of information is processed in a line and goes through a sequence such as memory store, the short term memory and then long term memory.

(Total for Question 12 = 4 marks)



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

3 marks - "brains work like computers" (1); "senses and keyboard" (1); short term and long term memory v hard drive (1).

There is a point about humans being more complicated than computers - this is not clearly explained and does not add enough for a mark. Finally the sequence of storage, STM and LTM is included but is not well explained as an example so no mark here.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This is a good example of how to outline concepts in any approach. It focuses on two at the start and gives examples throughout which are always worth doing.

## Question 13

This was well answered by most candidates; answers indicated a clear knowledge of prejudice, but unfortunately description of discrimination was less developed. For example, some responses stated: "discrimination is acting on prejudice" which does not fully explain the concept. There were a good number of candidates who appeared not to have read the requirements of the question properly and consequently did not mention any research evidence. The strongest answers defined prejudice, with illustrative evidence, and then explained the discrimination difference and used evidence to illustrate this. Tajfel and Sheriff were widely cited by these candidates. There were a minority of candidates who did not make any comparison between prejudice/discrimination, and did not define discrimination in their response. Sometimes candidates gave 'real life' illustrations such as football violence, instead of evidence from studies/theories as the question asked, thus limiting their marks.

13 Explain the difference between prejudice and discrimination. You must use evidence from psychological research in your answer.

(3)

Prejudice is an attitude to someone based on little or no knowledge of them e.g. anyone in a hoodie is likely to be a troublemaker. This is because a lot of the people that the news report are seen wearing hoodies. Discrimination however is an action towards someone based on your prejudice. For example you do not employ a job applicant if they are wearing a hoodie based on your previous prejudice that anyone in a hoodie is a troublemaker.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

2 marks. This answer is good on prejudice and on discrimination and gives the difference clearly ('however...').



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Include appropriate evidence from psychological research when it is asked for to take your answer up to Level 3.

13 Explain the difference between prejudice and discrimination. You must use evidence from psychological research in your answer.

(3)

Prejudice is a pre-judgement of somebody we know nothing about, and this is usually negative. Whereas ~~the~~ Discrimination is the act we take on a group of people and how we behave towards them because of our prejudice views. Prejudice leads to ~~the~~ discrimination.

Tajfel and Turner described and proved (in their minimal groups study) that prejudice can be caused by the simple act of grouping in which a person feels negatively towards someone who is in their outgroup. This led to social comparison, in which we consider ourselves better than members from the outgroup, and ~~we~~ feel inferior. This comparison leads to ~~the~~

(Total for Question 13 = 3 marks)

two discriminate and ~~between~~ between different and negatively towards the outgroup. This theory is known as the Social Identity Theory and helps explain racism and national chauvinism.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

3 marks. Both prejudice and discrimination are correctly defined and a clear difference is given (first two sentences). The research by Tajfel and Turner is described appropriately and therefore the answer can be awarded the full 3 marks.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

An excellent example of how to refer to research in your answer without going into too much depth and detail about the research itself. The focus on Tajfel and Turner is enough to gain credit.



13 Explain the difference between prejudice and discrimination. You must use evidence from psychological research in your answer.

(3)

Prejudice is holding stereotypical views of a certain group. Discrimination is treating a certain group differently due to beliefs held about them. Social Identity theory looks at prejudice and Tajfel's study showed in-group favouritism and due to social identity -action there was prejudice, discrimination occurs in conscious



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

1 mark. There is a basic explanation of the difference but the evidence needs to look at "out group hostility" rather than "in group favouritism" which is not really 'appropriate' and cannot be rewarded.

## **Question 14**

This question was answered rather well with many candidates achieving full marks; they gave a good description of context dependency plus an example and then state dependency plus an example. The majority of responses showed a good knowledge of cue-dependent theory. The construction/expression of responses was often what brought them down. Many candidates wrote clearly about the encoding specificity principle. Candidates who might have otherwise have scored full marks sometimes spoke about context and cue dependency as the 'same' feature, and the second feature which they then identified was weaker.

Better answers would talk about cues, including state/context in feature one and then focus on context in feature two.

Illustrative examples were correctly used, although the degree of detail varied, impacting on the final mark.

A few candidates wrote about entirely different theories of forgetting.

Rarely did candidates stray to LOP or MSM. Many used Godden and Baddeley's study as a feature which could not gain marks on its own.

14 Your friend is helping you revise and wants to see if you can pick out the most important points from theories you have studied.

Your friend has asked you to explain two features from the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

Outline **two** features of the cue dependent theory of forgetting that you think are important.

(4)

First feature

I would tell my friend the first feature of this theory is it states that cues have to be available in order to be able to remember a certain memory of event. This theory is based on the long-term memory and not the short term store. It believes that ~~the cues~~ if the cues are absent you are unable to retrieve the memory that has been forgotten.

Second feature

A second feature of the theory is it involves two types of cues to remember information. The context dependent cues are the setting in which the event or memory took place. The state dependent cue is the state you ~~were~~ were in when the event or memory took place.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

2 marks. The first feature is about cues being there to aid recall (being available) - 1 mark. The second feature is that there are two types of cue, but without elaboration only 1 mark can be given. Context is reasonably well explained but 'state' is not and there is no ID mark for 'two types of cue'.

14 Your friend is helping you revise and wants to see if you can pick out the most important points from theories you have studied.

Your friend has asked you to explain two features from the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

Outline **two** features of the cue dependent theory of forgetting that you think are important.

(4)

First feature

There are two cues - State and Context.  
Context can be things like location and State can be things like objects, smells, feelings.

Second feature

It can be very useful in eye witness testimony as someone can return to a crime scene and then specifically recall memories in good detail.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

0 marks. State is poorly outlined (objects, smells) and 'context being location' needs further development to gain a mark. The second feature shows usefulness, which is not as such a feature of the theory, so no marks here either.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

When the question asks for two features always decide which features you will use before writing. This way its easy to separate them out (and for the examiner to mark) and you won't get into a muddle by repeating yourself.

- 14 Your friend is helping you revise and wants to see if you can pick out the most important points from theories you have studied.

Your friend has asked you to explain two features from the cue dependent theory of forgetting.

Outline **two** features of the cue dependent theory of forgetting that you think are important.

(4)

First feature

Context -dependent, which is about the environment.

Cue-dependent theory stated that if ~~the~~ the environment when encoding and retrieval are the same, our accuracy of recalling tend to be better. For example, we should ~~at~~ revise for an exam in a quiet environment because in the exam hall, it will be quiet and we tend to recall better as of what cue-dependent theory stated.

Second feature

State - dependent, which is mostly about our state of mind. Cue-dependent theory stated that we tend to have a better recall if our state of mind when encoding and retrieval are the same. ~~For~~ For example, we should study for our exam in an alert mode, as when ~~we~~ we are in the exam hall, our state of mind will usually be alert, which is better.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

4 marks. The two features are clear: state and context. The first feature is well explained with an example to help the outline so two marks. The second feature explains 'state' well. It is the example that gets the second mark and 'alert mode' is given as a 'state' so two marks here too.

## **Question 15**

In this question candidates who did well were able to link the theoretical to the scenario, and were able to explain why the hostility occurred. Weaker responses simply spoke about the theoretical without paying attention to the scenario or points were linked to the stimulus, but the points were poorly made. A number of candidates wrote rather mundane answers about prejudice and discrimination with no identifiable psychology in them.

Broad responses incorporated both obedience and prejudice, nevertheless a good number gained maximum marks by merely giving full explanation of prejudice and the scenario. It was pleasing to see that there were many fewer cases of candidates who appeared unfamiliar with dealing with scenario (application) questions.

Sometimes candidates wrote about SIT but often they addressed 'social identification' very well compared with what they said about 'in' and 'out' groups and about discrimination to raise self-esteem. Many candidates tried to talk about the principal being a part of the 'in group' but this almost always seemed contrived and implausible. Obedience was referred to frequently with teacher/class described as being in agentic state but little expansion of why and of the impact of this on hostility. There were some muddled ideas expressed about agentic shifting and moral strain which varied widely in their accuracy and relevance. There were some flights of fancy concerning what else might have happened in the college.

15 Some tension has arisen at a college because the Principal has allowed Mr Page's class to go on a special trip but Mr Wood's class has not been allowed to go. The Principal's decision has caused lots of resentment amongst staff and students alike. Mr Page and his class are looking forward to the trip but are getting lots of hostility from the other class.

Use your understanding of prejudice and/or obedience to explain this situation.

(6)

Using the 3 main concepts of Social Identity theory: Categorisation, Identification and Comparison, Mr Wood's class has come to identify Mr Page's class as the outgroup and has therefore become more prejudiced towards them. Social Comparison causes one to identify his/her group as the better group in order to boost self esteem so this has even caused more anger within Mr Wood's class because Mr Page's class has been favoured over theirs and therefore has been presented as the more superior group, which Mr Wood's class dislikes. Anyone who joins Mr Wood's class or anyone who is already in it, through social identification they will also adopt the beliefs and norms of the group which means they will also likely be hostile to the out-group (Mr Page's class) even though they have no personal issues with that class simply because they belong to Mr Wood's class and they are deindividuated which means their personal responsibilities or morals no longer come first but that of the group and they are not likely to feel responsible for their actions.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

4 marks awarded as follows: Identify as the outgroup and become prejudiced towards them - 1 mark; point made and explained about raising self esteem - the answer says why they dislike the more superior group (presented as more superior) - 1 mark. Adopting beliefs and norms, hostile to outgroup, even though not personal - 1 mark. Deindividuation elaborated upon - losing individual status because of being part of the group so they don't feel responsible for the actions - 1 mark

15 Some tension has arisen at a college because the Principal has allowed Mr Page's class to go on a special trip but Mr Wood's class has not been allowed to go. The Principal's decision has caused lots of resentment amongst staff and students alike. Mr Page and his class are looking forward to the trip but are getting lots of hostility from the other class.

Use your understanding of prejudice and/or obedience to explain this situation.

(6)

The Principal have shown some in-group favouritism by choosing Mr. Page's class to go to a field trip but not Mr Wood's class to due personal reasons. He is also being discriminative towards Mr Woods class as by not letting them go for a field trip. Social Identity states that when groups are formed, prejudice and discrimination will occur. Since there are two groups in this situation, prejudice and discrimination has started occurring. Realistic conflict theory states that when competition is introduced, prejudice and discrimination will occur, having the field trip as the competition of which class should go, so hostility has occurred between the two groups.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

2 marks. The first sentence about 'in group' favouritism needs to be explained to gain a mark. The second point about being discriminative also needs to be explained so no mark. There is a point about SIT referring to the formation of groups, the ensuing prejudice and discrimination and linking to the scenario - 1 mark. The point about realistic conflict theory is nicely made - 1mark



15 Some tension has arisen at a college because the Principal has allowed Mr Page's class to go on a special trip but Mr Wood's class has not been allowed to go. The Principal's decision has caused lots of resentment amongst staff and students alike. Mr Page and his class are looking forward to the trip but are getting lots of hostility from the other class.

obedience

Use your understanding of prejudice and/or obedience to explain this situation.

(6)

Social identity theory can help explain this issue. The separate classes already have grouping caused between them and according to Tajfel and Turner the simple act of grouping can cause prejudice between groups of people. Therefore these two classes may already feel prejudice towards each other. This ~~is because~~ may have caused prejudice behaviours and tension between the staff due to in-group and out-group. Mr Page was bringing to a group of people (his staff) and they all share the same trait of going on the trip together, whereas Mr Wood's class are not an group and do not share these traits so they are not allowed to go on the trip. Therefore Mr Wood is in the out-group, and they consider Mr Page the in-group and so may feel negatively towards them. They use social comparison to compare themselves against each other, and each staff member will be showing group membership towards their group/class. This is often caused as bringing to a group increases self-esteem and makes people feel better about themselves so the prejudice will continue. This will have caused tension and may lead to discrimination between the two groups. Tajfel's minimal groups study supports this issue as he showed how prejudice could be caused between 48 small groups just by the act of grouping alone. This is a similar example to the situation and shows how this situation may have been caused.

Realistic conflict theory says that competition ~~may~~ should be present for any prejudice to be caused and although in this situation there is not any direct competition nor is the added element of the special trip which is a benefit

and in the best interests of the class. This may have increased Tension and caused more prejudice.

The Mr Woods may have felt it too be wrong and unfair to let one class go and not the other, however as the principle is an authority figure to Mr Woods, he may have been in the age of the state and allowed words to go on the basis that he give upon his own free will and put the responsibility in the hands of the principle, which is why the principle feel resentment.

This can be explained by the obedience theory proposed by Milgram in which we give up our own free will to follow orders from above in authority.

We have a tendency to follow orders to maintain a stable society, when in a

Abundant school type situation where staff and students would have complied with rules to maintain this stable world as it may have caused more problems going against the principals decision. This can also be explained by Milgram's obedience theory.

(Total for Question 15 = 6 marks)



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This answer is awarded the full 6 marks and was typical of an answer to achieve this.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Make sure you try and use both theories of prejudice and obedience in a question like this as it will enable you to access more marks. Limiting yourself to just one theory makes it difficult to get all the 6 marks.

## Question 16

In this question, similarly to the previous one, candidates who scored well were those able to relate the theory to the scenario. Many candidates simply focused on what could be done to improve Haider's recall as opposed to explain the factors which lead to him finding it difficult to recall the details. The weaker responses simply spoke about theories of forgetting as opposed to how they explain this situation. The stronger answers gave broad responses looking at the scenario from different angles, and explaining each successfully. The downside here is that there were those which were too broad and did not give each factor a full enough explanation, it may have been better to be more focused and to respond in greater depth. However, in terms of knowledge of memories theories, candidates displayed a good knowledge across the board.

A wide range of concepts used here too and pleasingly many more appeared to be able to link it to Haider better than in Q15. Trace Decay, Cue Dependency, Interference, Lop, MSM, Repression and Reconstructive Memory all featured in answers and in the main were used well. The only real times when candidates limited themselves was when only using one or two concepts. Those that scored more highly usually did so by sheer number of theories that they wove into their answers. Relatively few candidates confusing pro- and retroactive interference, which was refreshing!

Paradoxically, candidates who obviously understood the theories very well, often scored fewer marks as they concentrated on giving a detailed explanation of the theory, relating it to the stimulus in the last sentence. Candidates who were succinct in outlining theories were able to refer clearly and concisely to the stimulus, managing to include more explanations and scoring much higher (4-5 marks). Apart from the odd few, all candidates did make reference to the stimulus.

### SECTION C

Answer ALL questions. You are advised to spend approximately 25 minutes on Section C.

- 16 Haider watches a film at the cinema but when telling his friends about it the next day he cannot remember everything about it.

Using theories of forgetting and/or memory, explain why Haider has forgotten details about the film.

(6)

The trace decay theory of forgetting explains why Haider has forgotten details about the film. It states that if there is not an engrain (energy trace) present, then the memory will not be able to be successfully retrieved. For example Bartlett's theory of forgetting states that memory is not like a tape recorder and it involves perception interpretation and retrieval Haider may have interpreted the film in a way which is difficult to recall. The cue dependency theory of forgetting

states that for memory to be successful, state cues and context cues have to be present. If Haider had similar surroundings of being in the cinema with the same people and smells and sounds, remembering the film will be easier. The levels of processing theory of memory by Craik & Lockhart states that memory is based on how we process information. For example, structurally, phonetically and semantically. If Haider only paid attention to the pictures and not the story or dialogue, recall would not be successful as much as semantically processing the film for example relating the story to his lifestyle.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

3 marks

There is a mark given for trace decay and explaining why Haider might have forgotten - no engram.

The point about Bartlett and interpreting differently is not well explained - 'difficult to recall' needs explaining (how does the interpretation affect the recall...), no mark could be awarded here. Haider, similar surroundings, has cues is clearly explained and does link to memory, not forgetting details of the film - 1 mark. The LOP point is well explained relating to Haider and how he processed the film - 1 mark.

He cannot remember everything about it.

Using theories of forgetting and/or memory, explain why Haider has forgotten details about the film.

(6)

Haider may have forgotten details about the film maybe because he ~~was~~ is not in that context, e.g. the cinema to remember how he experienced the film and what he saw. If Haider ~~of~~ went back to the cinema and then told his friends about the film he may know more as he is in the place where recalled; according to cue dependent theory.

Another theory that can support this is the multi-store model of memory by Atkinson and Shiffrin. They argue that ~~memory~~ <sup>there</sup> are three separate memory stores, sensory, STM and LTM. For Haider to remember more of the film this theory would suggest he watches it again till he would remember. The multi-store model says that for information to stay in your short term memory it should be rehearsed.

However, another thing that can support why Haider cannot remember much of the movie is primacy and recency. This ~~egg~~ believes that we tend to remember things at the beginning and at the end more than the middle. This can explain why Haider may not have remembered much. For example if we had to read out a list and recall the words after we tend to remember the first and the last more.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

2 marks. Both marks are gained in the first paragraph: 1 mark at 'what he saw' as this explains how cue dependency links to Haider's situation; the second mark is at the end of the paragraph and is awarded for suggesting going back to the cinema to get cues to trigger recall. No marks can be gained in the middle paragraph since the link to theory is inadequate.

The third paragraph talks about primacy and recency and might explain why Haider did not recall much of the middle but the answer does not make this explicit.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Remember that just by using terms such as 'cinema' 'Haider' 'the film' 'his friends' etc you are making links to the scenario and therefore answering the question correctly.

### SECTION C

Answer ALL questions. You are advised to spend approximately 25 minutes on Section C.

- 16 Haider watches a film at the cinema but when telling his friends about it the next day he cannot remember everything about it.

Using theories of forgetting and/or memory, explain why Haider has forgotten details about the film.

(6)

A reason why Haider may have forgotten the film is due to interference. He may have experienced pro-active interference, where ~~an~~ old which is where old information interfered with the recall of new. He could be getting confused with a film he has seen before therefore can not recall <sup>the film</sup> as old info has interfered with new. It could be explained by retroactive interference. If Haider had gone home ~~as~~ and perhaps watched another film, he may not be able to recall the one he watched at the cinema, as the new ~~the~~ information from the other film would have affected the old information from the one he saw at the cinema. It could also be explained by cue-dependent forgetting. If Haider was feeling happy at the time he watched the film but sad when asked to recall he may not be able to recall all the details as he isn't in the same state. Also Levelt's multi-store model would suggest that if Haider hadn't rehearsed what happened in the film enough times before retelling it, it

may not be in his long term memory so details could be forgotten.

Also levels of processing suggests if he hasn't processed details of the film semantically, by adding meaning to it, ~~ever~~ parts of memory may be forgotten as he may have only listened to it, which is auditory, and so phonemically processed therefore not deeply processed or ~~to~~ has lasting durability with memory.

Finally reconstructive memory ~~for~~ would suggest that it doesn't fit into his existing schema therefore he can't remember details of the film because they are

(Total for Question 16 = 6 marks)  
too far away from anything they have seen.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

6 marks. Proactive interference is well explained and an example is included - an old film interferes with the new one - 1 mark. Retroactive interference is also well explained including an example - 1 mark. The example of not being in the same state (clearly linked with an example to Haider) - 1 mark. The point about not rehearsing is not that well made but is nevertheless clear and related - 1 mark.

The essay talks about LOP and having to add meaning, with the example of *not* being able to add meaning (though not sure why it would be auditory - perhaps not watching for a while?) - 1 mark. The 'not fitting into existing schema' and 'not matching previous experiences' is also rewarded - 1 mark

## Question 17

This question produced one of the best sets of essays seen in recent years. Some candidates could describe a variation with clarity, by being able to highlight what the variation was and how the actual study was run (e.g. going through the main concepts of the original). Many could also evaluate well, with ethics and validity being the most popular points made.

### Common Variations:

Run down office block (Bridgeport)

Physically forcing hand onto plate

Disobedient/Obedient Stooges

On the whole the candidates had a good understanding of the studies carried out by Milgram; there was much evidence of centre-specific effect. By this I mean that it appears that some centres had focused on delivering a variation study in its entirety whilst others deliver differently, giving less weight to the entirety of the study, though making reference to the variation. This was particularly evident with the evaluation; as an example, those who used the run down office block variation mentioned that it lacked ecological validity because it was carried out in a lab. In a similar fashion candidates who did not properly undertake a variation study simply used the same conclusion as Milgram drew from his original study. There were many responses in which the evaluation was generic, with only the stronger candidates focusing specifically on the variation. Weaker responses tended to not fully describe the study, rather they would mention what the variation was and the results which had been found and then move into the evaluation. On the other hand there were those who simply restated Milgram's original study and then at the end would say what the variation did differently. There is no doubt that most of the candidates have a comprehensive knowledge of the Milgram research, and they were able to identify suitable variations. As a result, I suspect that one of the challenges for candidates was to *select* what to write and, in a handful of instances, more selective writing in a concise manner would have improved the response.

Levels/marks awarded were usually differentiated on the basis of description rather than evaluation. Evaluation points very rarely related to the variation but described basics of generalisability, deception, protection from harm and so on with most answers doing this reasonably well.

There is little evidence of understanding of the wider applicability of Milgram's work (most responses simply citing how this helps to understand the holocaust). Level 4 responses were rare, with most candidates achieving Level 2 due either to their writing a very brief description, citing inaccurate or incomplete results (e.g. the obedience rate was not as high) or limited evaluation. Level 3 responses were comprehensive in their detail and discussion, falling short of Level 4 in the absence of applicability of the study. The few Level 4 responses seen by examiners were impressive in their ability to demonstrate insight, maturity and eloquence, especially in such time-pressured conditions.

Common mistakes included only covering the original or using Hofling. A small number of candidates wrote about Hofling, Meeus & Raaijmakers. A similar number simply gave Milgram's original study.



\*17 Milgram carried out a number of variations of his original (1963) study of obedience. These variations attracted similar criticism to that of his original (1963) study.

Describe and evaluate **one** of Milgram's variation studies.

(12)

One of Milgram's variation is when he used female participants instead of male participants. The aim of the study was still to investigate power of legitimate authority. The task the female participants had to do was be the teacher and shock the learner (confederate) every time he got an answer wrong. The shock generator went from 15 volts all the way up to 450 volts. When Milgram originally conducted the study all the male participants went up to 300 volts. ~~16~~ ~~participants~~ participants stopped between 300 and 375 volts and ~~remains~~ ~~remained~~ 26 participants went up to 450 volts. However in the variation when Milgram used female participants, 4 participants stopped at 150 volts and 65% of the participants went to all the way to the highest level. The conclusion Milgram originally concluded was that social setting is a powerful determination of behaviour. We ~~are~~ are socialised to recognise authority and act as we are told. After doing the variation study with female participants Milgram said this study ~~showed~~ show that level of obedience applies to both gender more or less equally. Milgram's variation study also had high population validity as it used female participants from ~~the~~ various backgrounds.

This ~~and~~ therefore ~~the~~ study has high replication validity for America. However this may not be generalised to women from other cultures. Experimental validity was also high as participants believed they were shocking Mr Wallace. Further more Ecological validity was also high as other researchers such as Milgrams original study and his more up to date study show similar results. Milgrams study was reliable as it followed specific ~~pro~~ procedure and was standardised and therefore can be repeated. The study had good ethics however the participants were asked to continue with the study when they wanted to stop. However the participants were aware that they had the right to withdraw and some participants did withdraw.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

6 marks

The *description* is Level 2 because the variation is not emphasised that much e.g. the aim and so on; the answer needs more on the procedure(e.g. advertised...).

*Evaluation* is Level 2 as well - there is some confusion (high ecological validity not clear, for example) - but a number of points are made, though not well explained. Though there is some confusion in the essay, both description and evaluation are covered with good points made. Description is better than evaluation and the response reaches the top of the level.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Always try to make clear to the examiner which variation you are writing about, this will benefit you. Always use Aim, Procedure, Results and Conclusion when describing studies. Try and strike a balance between both description and evaluation as this is what the question is asking.

\*17 Milgram carried out a number of variations of his original (1963) study of obedience. These variations attracted similar criticism to that of his original (1963) study.

Describe and evaluate **one** of Milgram's variation studies.

(12)

In 1963, Milgram conducted an experiment on obedience. Two years later in 1965, he made some alterations to further prove his theory. One could be of the obedient and rebellious stage. In 1963, there was a stage 'Mr. Wallace' who would offer participants 'verbal prods' such as 'It is essential that you continue' or 'you must go on'. However, ~~in~~ in 1965, the stages were obedient and rebellious. In his original study, 65% of participants administered the full 450V of electricity. However, when the stage was obedient, the figure went up to 72.5%. This tells us that while under the agentic state, you are much more likely to conform <sup>obey</sup>. In addition, the 1965 study showed that the rebellious stage also had a strong impact on the participant's decision. While the rebellious stage was present, we see that only 15% of participants went the full 450V. This also implies that we are obedient while in the agentic state.

'1965 - Milgram's obedient and rebellious stages'

FOR

As we can see, the stages' decision also had an effect on the participant's decision. This tells us that while under the agentic state (as opposed to the autonomous state), we are more likely to obey, therefore backing up his own theory.

When in the 'autonomous state', people usually follow their moral compass. As we know, participants were under the 'agentic state' meaning they were taking orders from someone of a higher authority. Results imply that ~~Milgram's Agency Theory~~ <sup>the experiment</sup> did show significant ~~research~~ data to further back up Milgram's Agency Theory.

Despite the alterations, Milgram's experiments all yielded the results he expected with his Agency Theory. This suggests that his experiments were mostly all reliable and usually always valid as well.

'1965 - Milgram's obedient and rebellious stooge'

AGAINST:

Despite the fact that participants obeyed, the experiment was still set in a lab condition. Because of this, the ecological validity is low and so the participants may not take it as seriously as if it was conducted in a natural setting.

As well as this, the experiment was unethical. Firstly, the participant would have most likely been under 'moral strain'. This is where a person is going against their moral compass i.e. what they know is right. This would've most probably traumatised the participant. In addition, the participant wasn't given the right to withdraw from the experiment but instead given verbal prods.

The obedience was also unethical as it was 'destructive'. This is where an individual will hurt or inflict pain on another as he is following instructions from an authoritative figure 'agentic state'.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

4 marks. This answer does not really explain the obedient and rebellious stooge conditions though results are included and are accurate. The material about agentic and autonomous state is not presented as evaluation; there is no credit for the 'for' points - these are mostly conclusions. The idea of ecological validity lacking is fine, as are the two ethical points, so there is *basic* evaluation. However, much of the evaluation is weak e.g. the point that they did not have the right to withdraw, and much is general. As the evaluation is limited and the description only slightly better, 4 marks are given, acknowledging that the description takes the essay just above Level 1

\*17 Milgram carried out a number of variations of his original (1963) study of obedience. These variations attracted similar criticism to that of his original (1963) study. Describe and evaluate **one** of Milgram's variation studies. (12)

- means and way - generalisability - generaliser - ecological - reliable - validity  
 - task supported by agency  
 - ethics - informed consent  
 - deception  
 - attribution  
 30% physically place learners hand on metal plate

The aim of Milgram's variation study was to see whether the use of an authority figure lead to increased levels of obedience. To also see whether a change to the original experiment lead to an increase or decrease in the levels of obedience.

Milgram gained 40 men aged 20-30 years old by volunteer sampling in a newspaper by offering \$4 to take part in a study on 'human learning'. The participants would arrive at the laboratory and would meet another participant who was actually a stooge. The participant would then become either the learner or the teacher. The participant always became the teacher.

They were they told to hold the hands of the learner down onto metal plates which would give the learner an electrical shock if he got a question wrong. For each wrong answer the voltage would go up by 15V. The learner at 150V would say that the shocks were becoming painful and at 300V stop answering the questions. Verbal prods such as "Please continue" were used if a participant wanted to leave. The participant was debriefed after the experiment.

Only 30% of the participants did want to 450V's compared to 65% in the original study.

Therefore we can conclude that the presence of a authority figure lead to people administering a potential lethal shocks. It also shows that when the participant had to physically hold down the persons hands

to administer the shock obedience levels decreased.

The study lacks generalisability, the study only used male participants who were aged 20-30 years old. This is not representative of the target population as females were not included.

It lacks ecological validity as it took place in a laboratory which is an artificial environment for the participants. It is not a natural environment for the participants.

It lacks task validity, physically holding a persons hands down on metal plate to administer an electrical shock is not a normal task for the participant to take part in.

However it is reliable as it had high controls such as same verbal prods, same environment, same levels of voltages. This means the experiment can be replicated to compare results.

It is supported by Agency Theory, Agency theory suggests that obedience ~~are~~ increases when a legitimate authority figure is present as they take responsibility and the consequences which supports this variation.

However it is unethical, ~~imposed~~ deception occurred as participants were told it was a test on human learning when actually it was on obedience. They were also <sup>not</sup> told that the learner was another participant when actually he was a stooge.

Meeus and Raaijmakers also found high levels in obedience when an authority figure was present. They found 92% of participants obeyed which supports Milgram's variation.

It also has cause and effect as due to the

laboratory setting there is an independent and dependent variables...



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

10 marks. The aims are general not specific to the variation, but there is quite a bit of early detail about the main part of the study. Then the variation is clearly given and explained accurately. Aim, procedure, results, conclusion are all included. There are minor omissions/inaccuracies e.g. the participants only hold the hand down when Mr Wallace starts refusing, a lot dropped out early on, they did not hold the hand down all the time. However, there is a lot of detail and this is enough for Level 4.

The evaluation is very good, offering breadth and depth with a good range of points made.

Description is just Level 4 and 10 marks are given.



## Paper Summary

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

Ensure that you *do* put two crosses in multiple choice questions which ask for two

Always refer to the stimulus material in your answers (particularly for key issue questions)

With key issue questions make sure that **each** point made links back to the stimulus

Never talk about ethical guidelines in isolation; always make sure that they link to the study in the question

If a question asks abouts research then you must include references to research in your answer

Make sure that your hypothesis is not written as an aim and that it includes both the independent and dependent variable.

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US034799 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

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

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

