

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE Psychology 6PS01 01

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

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

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

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

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.
To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028571

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

This paper provided the usual mixture of surprises in candidate's responses and in the main those who could read the questions correctly did very well. The paper did prove to be harder than previous series and this has been reflected in the lower mean score.

There were some real discriminators on the paper such as question 13 where a surprising number of candidates were unable to give a thorough response, to what in fairness is a common question. Evaluation of theories has always proved an obstacle for some but the number that found it difficult to pick up marks when even describing a theory of forgetting was concerning.

The now common stimulus response question about natural experiments (Q15) was done very well by most candidates which again demonstrates good application of skills to these types of questions. Similarly question 16 also asked for application of research to the stimulus and it was extremely pleasing to see how many responses scored the full 6 marks here.

All this made it more surprising then that candidates should struggle with the essay on Level of Processing considering how straightforward it was. So many decided to mix up levels of processing with multi store and others simply could not provide any sort of evaluation which was creditworthy.

Question 12

Q12 (a)

This question was not answered well by candidates. Many simply described the procedure of Hofling et al and so it was difficult to award points. Usually such description would gain one or two marks providing candidates said, e.g. the nurses were in their natural environment; did not know they were being studied; were alone on the ward so could not confer. Furthermore, the quality of the candidates' answers showed that many learn by rote and are not always able to apply what they know.

A large number of candidates misinterpreted the question and instead wrote about the regulations that the nurses broke, rather than discussing the ways that Hofling *et al.* contrived the situation to make it likely that the nurses would obey. Numerous candidates had an excellent knowledge of the aims and procedures of the experiment but this alone was not creditworthy. Most candidates did refer to the voice of a 'doctor' on the phone and so got credit for this. A small number of candidates did however describe two or three ways in which the procedure encouraged obedient behaviour very well. A small number of candidates wrote good answers about the nurses feeling subordinate to the (male) 'doctor' on the basis of gender which was not on the mark scheme but was credited. This question really differentiated between candidates who simply knew about the study and those that could apply their knowledge to the particular slant of the question.

Candidates who engaged with the question gave some excellent answers scoring full marks. Some candidates managed to pick up a mark or two by doing this, mainly for mentioning the authority of the doctor. Some candidates referred to the results and conclusion in this section, having not looked at the second part of the question in advance.

On the whole most candidates responded to this question fairly well, in their responses candidates were able to mention that the study took place in the natural environments making nurses less likely to suspect that anything was going on, nurses were left alone on the wards making them more inclined to take orders from a 'doctor'. Also candidates picked up on the fact that the doctor was running late and would sign necessary paper work on arrival. Many candidates answering this question were able to score three or four marks for their responses.

However many candidates were able to highlight that the orders were taken from a doctor over the phone therefore nurses assumed he was legitimate and in authority thus being awarded marks for such points.

Q12 (b)

Most candidates scored two marks on this question and there were only a handful that scored zero marks. Many candidates had a thorough knowledge of the numbers involved in the experimental part of the study and could accurately give numbers of those obeying and not and could give the number of nurses that had noticed the dose discrepancy. Many also gave the numbers of graduate and student nurses who said they would/wouldn't have followed the orders in the questionnaire part of the study. A small number incorrectly thought that the same nurses were involved in the experimental and questionnaire-based parts of the study. Poorer responses referred to the 'majority' of nurses obeying in the experimental part of the study. The better answers made two clear and specific points about the results/conclusion of the study. Some answers had incorrect figures e.g. 20/21 nurses obeyed and so did not score.

12 (a) Describe how Hofling et al (1966) set up their study on obedience so that nurses were likely to break hospital regulations.

(4)

Hofling et al was a study on obedience in a field experiment, meaning that it has high ecological validity due to it being in a natural setting. Hofling set up the study so that the nurses were likely to break hospital regulations by not informing the nurses from the beginning so in actual fact, the nurses were unaware of the experiment they were taking part in. The aim of the study to see the relationship of the nurses and doctors and see whether they are agents of people in a natural environment. Hofling's study was likely to break hospital regulations due to the nurses being informed by a confederate (someone in higher authority than a nurse) to persuade the nurses to admit the drug 'Astraten' to the patients, thinking that the doctor knew best the nurses didn't check the dosage or believe it was the best interest of the patient to follow orders.

(b) Outline the findings (results and/or conclusions) of Hofling et al's (1966) study on obedience.

(2)

21 out of 22 nurses said that they wouldn't administer the drug when interviewed in actual fact 21 out of 22 nurses did administer the drug. ^{obeying -} All nurses said they didn't see the drug and 10 said they did, but thought the doctor knew best. The conclusion shows that people are obedient in a natural setting.

(Total for Question 12 = 6 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Part a gets 3 marks. The nurses were not aware it was an experiment gets one mark. Someone in higher authority... gets one mark. One mark for the nurses did it...thinking the doctor knew best. Part b gets 2 marks 21 out of 22 said they would not scored one mark. One mark attributed for 21 out of 22 did.

Question 13

Q13 (a)

Not many candidates scored four marks on this question, some answers were very repetitive and some described research into the theory rather than the theory itself. Some candidates muddled theories together whilst others described models of memory (e.g. MSM, LOP) rather than theories of forgetting. Despite the question saying not to, candidates were still describing cue dependent forgetting. A considerable number spoke about context/state dependency which the question instructed them not to. A small number also wrote answers about EWT which were not relevant. This question was also left blank a lot more often than others on the paper.

Better candidates gave clear explanations of the theory with examples. The majority of candidates described either 'Interference' or 'Trace decay'. Those opting for Interference often scored full marks as they were able to talk about both pro- and retroactive Interference and give examples. However, there was much confusion here. Many just got them the wrong way around and others gave examples which contradicted their definitions. Few went beyond this by discussing similar material being more likely to be confused.

Answers on trace decay were also often good scoring high marks – many candidates were able to talk about accessibility/availability in the context of their answers and were able to obtain three to four marks for their responses. Many of them being able to talk about learning causing a physical change thus creating an engram, the problems of availability and the need for rehearsal in order to strengthen the memory trace. Very few discussed differences between trace decay for STM and LTM.

Repression and Displacement made up the majority of other chosen theories. Common responses depicted by candidates included unpleasant thoughts are pushed to the back of the mind and many examples were then used to illustrate this point. However some student responses did not mention unconscious thoughts being very active in the mind. Only a couple of candidates discussed the continued existence of the memories and their potential impact on those who have repressed them. Displacement answers were limited to STM capacity, information being pushed out and use of examples.

Q13 (b)

This was answered rather poorly overall. There seemed to be a lack of ability to use findings from research in giving strengths/weaknesses, even for candidates who could describe the theory well in part a. Those that did try to use research often chose the wrong studies or did not use the findings particularly effectively. A few successfully referred to the advantages of other explanations for forgetting for their weakness.

A large number of candidates left it blank and those who did attempt it gave superficial, generic answers that could be talking about any theory of memory. Some candidates gave good and bad points about memory itself e.g. it can be very time consuming to rehearse material to remember it, rather than actually evaluating how accurate the theory of forgetting is. The few candidates who did answer this effectively gave some excellent answers referring to supporting research and contradictory theories, giving clear explanation which engaged with the theory being evaluated.

Many candidates applied trace decay to learning/revision techniques and Alzheimer's patients. Some used the correct study for Peterson and Peterson, only a couple mentioned biological evidence. Many discussed the difference between recall of memories using learning to ride a bike as an example of a memory that is not rehearsed, but is retained. Few compared this with interference, but some used cues as a comparison point.

With Interference some mentioned Dallenbach, fewer mentioned McGeogh. Some candidates mentioned the importance of not revising similar subjects in close succession,

but hardly any candidates fully understood the issue of interference being concerned with what happens between learning and recall.

For Displacement some candidates tried to explain the serial position curve, but it was a little clumsy. No candidates were able to fully explain Peterson and Peterson's interference task and its impact on recall. Candidates struggled to go much beyond a discussion of ecological validity.

There was some explanation of how people actually do forget traumatic events for repression, but few could explain evidence of poorer recall of stressful words. Some managed to explain how taboo words were recalled well than neutral, but few candidates were able to answer this section well. Many candidates tried to use flashbulb memories in the evaluation.

13 (a) Describe **one** theory of forgetting you have studied within cognitive psychology **other than** the cue dependent theory.

(4)

Name of theory Trace decay.

When we encode a new memory it forms a path in our neural network called a trace. This trace must be reinforced through rehearsal and repetition in order to strengthen the memory and be able to retrieve it. This is because trace decay is described as being ~~is~~^a problem of availability, the memory is there but the trace to retrieve it is weakened. It can be best described by the Tip of the tongue phenomenon. If the trace isn't strengthened then it will decay and information will be lost - forgetting occurs.

(b) Outline **one** strength and **one** weakness of the theory you described in (a).

(4)

Strength

has applications in learning and revision that repetition and rehearsal will make retrieval easier.

Weakness

doesn't account for how deeply something is processed or encoded.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Part a gets 3 marks. One mark for neural network, path and trace. Rehearsed and reinforced scored one mark. Another mark for trace being weakened. Part b scores one mark. Applies to revision and learning scored one mark although nothing was awarded for the weakness.

Question 14 (a)

This question was answered well by most candidates with quite a lot scoring three or four marks. This often depended on which issues they had chosen to outline. With regards to deception, candidates were able to highlight that participants were not told the true aims of the experiment and that the electric shocks that participants thought were real were in fact artificial. Very often though, candidates did not extend their answers, only giving one point for deception, i.e. deceived as to the aim of the study, when they could have easily added, e.g. and they were deceived into thinking they were giving real shocks to the learner, and so on. Some candidates did not gain a mark on 'deception' by not clearly stating the difference between what the participants thought the study was on and what was actually being studied. Few explained why deception was needed.

Right to withdraw was popular, but most only discussed the lack of it. Few managed to explain that the right remained despite the prods. Better candidates usually knew that this was offered but effectively taken away with the verbal prods so scored both marks.

Informed consent was not so popular, but was answered quite well. Candidates appreciated that consent was for a different study, but some did not express this well enough to access both marks. Some were able to link deception with consent.

Most candidates who chose distress/protection of participants explained how giving shocks was traumatic and some could expand with details of participants behaviour (such as sweating etc). Only a few managed to link this with the debrief. Some were confused regarding the participants actually being distressed because they received a test shock. The majority of answers based on distress tended to be quite vague and lacked any real examples from the study.

14 (a) Outline **two** ethical issues with Milgram's original study.

(4)

1 Participants were deceived, they believed they were originally volunteering for a test. In memory, they were also lead to believe that the electric shocks they were administering were real, ~~the~~ and therefore ~~of~~ believed they were genuinely harming the other participant i.e. confederate.

2 Participants ~~were~~ lacked protection, many were under a lot of stress during the experiment that ~~lead~~ ^{lead} to nervous laughter, nail biting and on one occasion ~~of~~ convulsions that meant the experiment had to be terminated for that particular participant.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gets four marks altogether. One mark for memory and shocks both not real is okay without the other part as there are two things said. Elaboration about the confederate scored another mark. One mark for nail biting etc.

Elaboration about terminating the experiment as one person reacted so badly scored a further one mark.

Question 14 (b)

Most candidates were able to pick up both marks here and could easily have got more had they been available. The most popular application was explaining the events in WWII but only better answers would mention the agentic and autonomous states/moral strain of soldiers and authority figures. Weaker answers tended to give conclusions of Milgram's study or in some cases evaluation points around ethics. Some focused on teacher pupil relationships but never mentioned the authority figure or that agentic shift is happening.

(b) Outline how the findings from Milgram's original study of obedience might be applied to real life.

(2)

The study lacks ecological validity, however as the participants were unaware that the experiment was an obedience shows that this is how they would react in such a situation, which means if they were being told to do something by a figure of higher authority, they would most likely obey

(Total for Question 14 = 6 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response gets 0 marks because it is evaluation and not about findings being applied.

Question 15 (a)

Candidates either knew the definition of a natural experiment well or were hedging their bets. Nearly all answers involved something about natural environment but then only better candidates could correctly talk about a naturally occurring IV which is not manipulated by the researcher. Others repeated what they knew about field experiments and some tried to bring in comparisons with laboratory experiments without actually making any salient points.

15 Mrs Smith took over Mrs Jones's Psychology class in January because Mrs Jones went on maternity leave. Mr Brown's class was not affected by staff change. Researchers decided to use this as a natural experiment to discover whether the students' level of attendance is affected by staff change part way through the year.

Figure 1: Table of Results to show class attendance throughout the year

	Mrs Smith's & Mrs Jones's class	Mr Brown's class
Class attendance (%) before January	80%	95%
Class attendance (%) from January onwards	92%	93%

(a) Define what is meant by natural experiment.

(2)

A natural experiment is one where the task and environment are not artificial and the independent variable occurs naturally and is not manipulated by the researcher.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This gets two marks. The point about not manipulated and naturally occurring IV gets one mark. As natural environment is added to this scored one mark.

Question 15 (b)

Again most candidates were able to have a go at this as it is a common question but invariably some got the IV and DV the wrong way around. Others gave one word answers such as staff or attendance which have never been creditworthy. Better answers were ones which had an element of change in class or measurement in attendance.

(b) Identify both the independent variable (IV) and the dependent variable (DV) in this experiment. (2)

Independent variable (IV)
the controlled variable. in an experiment.

Dependent variable (DV)
the manipulated variable. in an experiment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This gets 0 marks. It is about defining the two terms (but not right in any case).

Question 15 (c)

Another commonly asked methods question which was done well by the majority. Candidates that scored zero simply missed out on making it a null hypotheses rather than an experimental one. Answers that included both correct IV and DV with some form of negation were able to score full marks.

(c) Write a suitable **null** hypothesis for this experiment. (2)

There will be no effect on attendance when ~~more~~ Mrs Jones becomes the teacher except that which occurs by chance.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

IV/DV clearly identified. Gives the negative (no effect)...two marks awarded.

Question 15 (d)

This question proved to be a real differentiator between able and less able candidates. Those that could use the table and describe findings did so by simply comparing the figures box to box up/down and left/right. Importantly though they did this by looking at a percentage increase/decrease rather than just lifting figures already stated. Weaker answers either hardly ever mentioned figures from the table or repeated what was in them.

(d) Using the table in Figure 1, describe the results of this experiment.

(3)

The results show that the attendance of Mrs Smiths + Mrs Jones class had increased ~~after~~ after Mrs Jones left by 12% whereas there was a slight decrease in attendance by 2% in Mr Browns class but the attendance in Mr Browns class is always higher than Mrs Smiths and Mrs Jones class.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate response gets three marks
12% increase for one mark. 2% increase (Mr Brown) gets one mark. Attendance higher for Mr Brown (always) gained a further mark.

Question 15 (e)

This question was generally well answered; the majority of candidates were able to supply correct situational or participant variables *and* said how it would affect the DV without resorting to teacher's personality. Popular responses included student illness and the time of year being exam period. However weaker candidates remained confused about the participant/situational variables and responded to the question with examples of the independent variables i.e. strictness of the teacher or personality.

Some candidates who did give the correct answers often did not score the full two marks, as they did not explain how the situational variable would impact on attendance e.g. failing to say when an increase/decrease in attendance occurred accordingly.

(e) Identify **one** participant or situational (extraneous) variable in this experiment and suggest how it may have affected the results.

(2)

Weather is a situational variable that may have affected attendance as the experiment took place around January which suggests that snow could affect pupils' ability to get to school and therefore attendance will be lower than usual

(Total for Question 15 = 11 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer is awarded two marks.
Weather bad in January is the identification
and then the effect is given/elaboration.

Question 16

This question was answered extremely well and many candidates were awarded maximum marks. Had the question been worth more marks a good percentage would have been able to access these. This demonstrated how candidates can excel in the application of their knowledge, making very thoughtful points, to these types of stimulus response questions.

Nearly all candidates were able to explain theories concerning prejudice and obedience. Often candidates explained the theory, and then went on to apply it to the scenario. Sadly some candidates had an excellent understanding of the theory, but did not gain any marks as they did not answer the question.

A lot of candidates wrote extensively about cognitive, affective and behavioural elements of prejudice but failed to be very 'psychological' and so this was of minimal benefit to them. Most candidates did write about SIT and this was usually effectively done, common errors were confusing the different stages and failing to relate the points they were making to the conflict between Ranza and Gofani. Most referred to agency theory and gained two or three marks in doing so. Some candidates wrote extensively about Mai Lai/other examples they had studied more than they needed to do so.

Weaker candidates failed to engage with the scenario, despite clearly understanding the relevant theories. Many candidates gave irrelevant definitions of prejudice and obedience and some answers were very repetitive, rather than getting straight to the point. Some candidates were able to gain marks by using research as examples, some tried to do this – but struggled to really say how/why the research was relevant.

Stronger candidates responses included SIT, Milgram's agency theory and moral strain; each response given were applied accurately to the scenario and the use of real life examples helped to illustrate their points.

16 There has been a long running conflict between the two neighbouring countries of Ranzea and Gofani. The president of Ranzea has ordered the invasion of Gofani to take control of the country. There have been reports of soldiers from Ranzea carrying out atrocities in Gofani villages.

Use your understanding of prejudice and/or obedience to explain these events.

(6)

These events are occurring because of prejudices between the two groups. Tajfel's social identity theory the simple act of grouping can lead to prejudice (there are 2 groups here Ranzea and Gofani). The first stage is social categorisation, this is already predetermined here as to which country you were born/live in. Then there is social identification both countries identify with other people in that country, they may wear particular cloths to emphasise this. Then there is social comparison. Both groups try to boost their self esteem, they do this by making their own country (their ingroup) look good, and their outgroup (the other country look bad, this is in group favoritism and out group denigration and explains the long running conflict. Tajfel's minimal groups study shows it clearly that even boys (who are friends), that are separated into 2 groups will be prejudice against the other group to make themselves feel better. The president of Ranzea then ordered the invasion of

Gofoni, he would demand obedience from his troops to do this. Because the troops are 'categorised' and already feel ~~prejudice~~ prejudice towards the other country they are more likely to respond with obedience even if they think what they're doing is wrong. Also because it was the president giving the order he has recognised authority over the country and as shown in Milgram's study people recognise authority and comply with obedience. One beginning on this process people find it harder and harder to say no. Also the reports of atrocities being committed could also be a way by the soldiers to improve their social standing. They want to make Gofoni look bad and themselves look good.

(Total for Question 16 = 6 marks)

and because there is a prevailing culture of violence the soldiers comply and the prejudices they hold lead to discrimination between people in both groups. Yet we cannot just say these acts are committed just to improve your social standing. These groups may have historical conflicts due to things like scarce resources in the past.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This gets 6 marks. Tajfel - two groups lead to prejudice - and links to the two groups in the source (and this takes in the point about social categorisation because of the country the person is in. This last bit is not worth a second mark - the simple act of grouping...is enough for the mark)

Social identification - wearing particular clothes (in that country) got one mark. One mark for boosting self esteem (both groups) - making them look good and the others look bad. The study about two groups prejudiced even if friends (Tajfel) scored one mark. President giving an order (and some of the earlier material) scored a further one mark. One mark for mentioning scarce resources. All points relate to the source in some way.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always explain research with reference to the question being asked. It is not enough to state the name of the researcher without explaining its relevance or conclusion. However, there is little need to describe the whole study in detail as this wastes time and answer space.

Question 17

There was some variation in ability here. A number of responses did not describe the model and launched straight into a sometimes lengthy description of Craik & Tulving's aims, procedure and findings etc, limiting their marks to band 2. Quite a number of responses talked about something more like the multi-store model – these were often very muddled and lacking in structure, seeming to contain everything that the candidate knew about cognitive psychology, so could gain little if any credit.

Most candidates were able to describe the model and proved relevant evidence with evaluation and examples. Only a few could describe and discuss this at a high level. Some candidates offered only the different types of rehearsal and others offered the levels, not many provided both. In evaluation, many applied this to revision and were able to offer a few studies to support and contradict the model. Often there was disparity between the quality of description and evaluation. Most of the answers were written rather like a list of separate evaluation points rather than a coherent discussion of the model.

Overall, the quality of the description of the Levels of Processing model was poorer than the evaluation. Most commonly, descriptive content referred only to the structural/phonetic/semantic aspect of the model. It was not uncommon to need to award marks in band 2 on the basis of a very brief or muddled description.

Evaluation often referred only to the Craik & Tulving experiment and the application of LOP in teaching and learning in schools. Better responses referred to a wider range of research evidence that might be used to support/challenge the model (Ramponi, Nyberg, Reber etc), and criticised the model itself in terms of its simplicity/circularity – where these things were attempted, they were almost invariably done very well. Those candidates who gave less evaluation points, but were more relevant and well expanded scored higher.

Weaker candidates had a tendency to start off with the MSM and somehow incorporate LOP into this. These then tended to evaluate the supporting research, again these were basic points which could be applicable to any laboratory experiment, rather than specific to Craik and Tulving and generally were not linked back to the theory.

The stronger candidates were able to hit the level 4 band through clearly defined explanations of the LOP model of memory. Candidates were able to pick up on both maintenance and elaborative rehearsal with accurate explanations of both. In terms of the evaluation candidates were able to give a detailed response and were able to include examples of supporting or confounding evidence, any methodological issues relating to such studies, real life applications of the theory as well as being able to highlight alternative models of memory.

*17 Describe and evaluate the Levels of Processing model of memory.

(12)

The levels of processing model of memory was proposed by Craik and Lockhart in 1972. They suggested and proposed in their theory that there are two types of rehearsal: maintenance rehearsal and elaborative rehearsal. They stated that maintenance rehearsal is when you do not give the words much meaning and you try and preserve the information for a short period of time. They suggest that this is information stored in shallow levels of processing. However, on the other hand, they suggest that elaborative rehearsal is

when you rehearse information and process it at a deeper level because you are giving it more meaning to preserve it for a longer period of time.

Craik and Lockhart also suggest how there is three ways how we process information. Firstly, we process information either on its look, sound or meaning. If we process information on its look we call this structural processing. If we process information on its sound we call this phonetic processing and finally if we process information on its meaning we call this semantic processing. Craik and Lockhart suggest that structural processing is the ~~processing which develops the~~ shallowest level of process. However, on the other hand semantic is the deepest level of processing because we are giving the information meaning.

Evidence from the Craik and Tulving (1975) levels of processing experiment proved that Craik and Lockhart study that we process words in different ways due to its ~~size~~ look, sound or meaning. They also proved that we process ~~store~~ structural information at the shallowest level compared to processing semantic information at the deepest level. They conducted an experiment with 24 participants and they ~~used~~ showed all participants 60 two-three syllable words and then asked questions about these words. These questions allowed the words to be processed either orthographically by asking questions such as 'is this word in lower case', phonetically by asking 'does this word rhyme with - - - - -' or semantically 'is this a type of food'. They then jumbled these words with another 120 two-three syllable words to see whether participants would

remember the original 60 words. They supported Craik and Lockhart's theory as they found that only 17% of words were remembered ~~structurally~~ by asking structural questions; 36% of words remembered by asking phonetic questions; finally 65% of words remembered by asking semantic questions. This suggests and supports Craik and Tulving's theory of levels of processing that if we process information by giving it meaning, we process it deeper meaning that we can remember the information for longer periods of time. However, if we process information giving it little meaning structurally it is processed at the shallowest levels leading to it being retained for a shorter period of time and not as well

recalled.

This theory can be applied to real life situations as teachers can encourage students to give meaning to revision notes in order for them to be successful in exams.

One drawback with this theory is it only suggests that the central processor processes information but doesn't explain why some information is processed ~~as~~ structurally compared to other information being structured semantically.

An alternative theory going with the multi-store model of memory conducted by ~~Shiffrin~~ ~~can be~~ Atkinson and Shiffrin can explain why a word in the middle of a long list can be remembered even though it is not in the recency or primary stage on the serial position curve. It explains how a word such as 'windows' has meaning and it seen as being funny and this means that this ~~information~~ word is recalled as it is transferred straight into the long-term memory.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gets 7 marks altogether. Description is Level 3. Maintenance rehearsal and elaborative rehearsal are well described. Then the three levels are covered and good use of the terms (quality of written communication). There is some repetition towards the end of the description - but at Level 3 there can be some lapses in organisation. Evaluation is Level 3. There is the study (the whole of the second page) of which only the findings are relevant. The rest of the description of the study is not needed (not evaluating LOP) but the findings are useful as evaluation. Then the practical application, also fine as an elaboration point but not very detailed. So 'more than one' evaluation point but not a lot of depth.

As the evaluation is at the bottom of Level 3, there are lapses in organisation, although description is Level 3, this is given the mark at the bottom of the level.

As both are just Level 3, but there is material that is not useful and material that is not well explained/outlined, so the bottom of the level.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

As with all essays each element of the question should be systematically explored in the candidates answer.

As essay questions typically have multiple elements, it would be useful to rehearse less straightforward essays with students.

Paper Summary

In order to improve their performance candidates should:

Always read the requirements in the question and not just focus on the odd word

Always look for words in bold as they are key to answering the question

Always make reference to the stimulus in your answers

Do not describe if the question asks for evaluation

Always see how many marks the question is worth and be guided by that NOT by the number of lines given on the page

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

Order Code US028571 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

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



Rewarding Learning