Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2023

Pearson Edexcel
GCE Psychology (8PS0)
Paper 1: Social and Cognitive Psychology

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.

- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.

- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.

- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.

- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.

- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.

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

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

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(a)	**AO1 (1 mark)** One mark for a definition of superordinate goals. For example: • Superordinate goals are goals that can only be achieved by competing groups acting cooperatively (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(1)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	**AO1 (2 marks), AO3 (2 marks)** One mark for identification of each strength (AO1). One mark for justification of each strength (AO3). For example: • The theory can be used to help reduce prejudice in the real world by introducing cooperation between rival groups (1) by forcing the two rival groups who are competing over a scarce resource to work together on a task to minimise conflict between them (1). • The study by Sherif et al. (1954/1961) supports the theory as the hostility between the boys increased when they competed (1) which was shown as the out-group friends was 7% after competing at games such as tug of war and baseball so the theory has credibility (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(4)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(a)	**AO2 (2 marks)** Up to two marks for description of one way personality could account for the scenario. For example: • The girl in Natasha's class may have an authoritarian personality as she discriminates against her by calling her names because of her accent (1) this can also be seen in her prejudicial attitude as she believes Natasha is inferior to her and that she should not be allowed in her class (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.** **Generic answers score 0 marks.** **Answers must relate to the scenario.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(b)	**AO2 (2 marks)** Up to two marks for description of one way the situation could account for the scenario. For example: • Natasha's classmates may see her as different from themselves because of her accent and deem her to be part of the 'outgroup' (1) so they discriminate against her by calling her names and laughing at her to boost their group status (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.** **Generic answers score 0 marks.** **Answers must relate to the scenario.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3	**AO1 (2 marks), AO3 (2 marks)** One mark for identification of the strength/weakness (AO1). One mark for justification of the strength/weakness (AO3). For example: Strength • Milgram's variation experiment 7 showed that when immediacy is reduced the obedience level of the individual decreases so the theory has credibility (1) because the participants who went to the 450V shock decreased from 65% when the experimenter was in the room to 22.5% when they gave the instructions over the telephone (1). Weakness • Alternative theories can equally explain obedience of individuals such as French and Raven (1959) so the theory is not a complete explanation of obedience (1) because reward power could explain why someone would follow a command from an authority figure to receive incentives and perhaps not due to status, immediacy or number of social sources (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(4)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(a)	**AO2 (1 mark)** One mark for correct calculation of the median score. • 8.5 **Reject all other answers.**	**(1)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(b)	**AO2 (1 mark)** One mark for correct calculation of the mean score. • 11 **Reject all other answers.**	**(1)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(c)	**AO2 (3 marks)** One mark for correct calculation of sum of squared values = **70** One mark for dividing the sum of squared values by 7 (n-1) = **10** One mark for calculating the square root = **3.16** to two decimal places **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(3)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	**AO2 (3 marks)** Up to three marks for description of how Milgram's research could account for the scenario. For example: - Milgram's research showed authority figures wearing a uniform would increase obedience so could explain why Elijah and his friends stopped swearing (1). Milgram's variation 13 where an ordinary man gave the order led to lower levels of obedience could account for them ignoring the manager on the bus where he would have no authority (1). The informal setting on the bus may explain them ignoring the manager, as shown in the rundown office block variation where obedience was reduced compared to at Yale University (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.** **Generic answers score 0 marks.** **Answers must relate to the scenario.**	**(3)**

Question Number	Indicative Content	Mark
6	**AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks)**	**(8)**
	Burger (2009)	
	AO1	
	• Burger's (2009) used 29 males and 41 females who were from a variety of educational and ethnic backgrounds.	
	• Burger (2009) used the same four verbal prods, such as 'please continue' throughout his partial replication of Milgram's (1963) study.	
	• The participants were placed in a room at Santa Clara University Campus with equipment such as an electric shock generator and intercom.	
	• The participants believed they were administering electric shocks up to a voltage of 150 volts each time the learner incorrectly remembered a word pair.	
	AO3	
	• The use of males and females and those who had different levels of education and a mix of ethnicities means the findings are more representative than Milgram (1963) who only used males.	
	• As Burger (2009) used the same verbal prods, this enabled him to accurately replicate the procedure each time so the data can be tested for reliability.	
	• The laboratory conditions at the University were artificial and unnatural to the participants which means that the study has low ecological validity.	
	• Believing that they were electrocuting learners when they failed to remember word pairs is an artificial task not true of everyday life for the participants so lacks task validity.	

Reicher and Haslam (2006)

AO1
- A standardised briefing about the rules and behaviours that they would be expected to follow were used in the simulated prison setting.
- The prisoners and guards were aware that their behaviour was being observed and recorded.
- From an original 332 volunteers who had responded to an advert, a sample of 15 males and 0 females was selected.
- The roles of 'guard' and 'prisoner' were randomly allocated to participants without experimenter intervention.

AO3
- The controls put in place for the prisoner and guard roles means the simulation could be replicated to test for reliability.
- The prisoners and guards could have behaved in ways they thought the experimenters wanted as they knew they were being watched so the study may lack validity.
- The sample was androcentric so may not represent role compliance in females so the study lacks population validity.
- The random role allocation increases validity as it reduces experimenter bias in that it prevented active selection of the personalities most likely to conform to 'prisoner' or 'guard'.

Cohrs et al. (2012)

AO1
- Standardised scales were used to assess the Big Five personality dimensions, Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA), and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) and all participants received the same questionnaires.
- The only data used for analysis was for participants that indicated they were of German nationality, did not have a disability and were of heterosexual orientation.
- Participants completed self-report questionnaires that consisted of Likert style closed questions designed to measure RWA.
- Each participant was asked to give a second questionnaire to an acquaintance or friend who also reported on them.

AO3
- The standardised questionnaires can be retested to test for the reliability of the instruments used to assess attitudes and prejudice.
- Using only data from specific nationalities, disabilities and sexual orientations means that the findings lack population validity.
- The use of closed questions to measure personality dimensions in the questionnaire does not allow participants to expand on their reasons for prejudice so lack validity.
- Cohrs et al. (2012) used peer-reports and self-reports in the data collection so they could compare the results to determine the effectiveness of the methods when testing for links between openness to experience and agreeableness and prejudice.

Look for other reasonable marking points.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks) **Candidates must demonstrate an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding vs evaluation/conclusion in their answer.**
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-2 Marks	Demonstrates isolated elements of knowledge and understanding. (AO1) A conclusion may be presented but will be generic and the supporting evidence will be limited. Limited attempt to address the question. (AO3)
Level 2	3-4 Marks	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material, leading to a superficial conclusion being made. (AO3)
Level 3	5-6 Marks	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Arguments developed using mostly coherent chains of reasoning leading to a conclusion being presented. Candidates will demonstrate a grasp of competing arguments but evaluation may be imbalanced. (AO3)
Level 4	7-8 Marks	Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Displays a well-developed and logical evaluation, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments, presenting a balanced conclusion. (AO3)

Cognitive Psychology

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(a)	**AO1 (2 marks)** Up to two marks for description of the phonological loop. For example: • The phonological loop is assumed to be responsible for maintaining speech-based information (1) and consists of two sub-systems, including the inner ear (storage) and the inner voice (rehearsal) (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(b)	**AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)** One mark for identification of a weakness (AO1). One mark for justification of the weakness (AO3). For example: • The 1974 model has been added to over time, so it may have been incomplete and inaccurate (1) because the addition of an episodic buffer in 2000 showed that the original version of the theory could not fully explain memory, and still may do so (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8	**AO1 (2 marks), AO3 (2 marks)** One mark for identification of each weakness (AO1). One mark for justification of each weakness (AO3). For example: • Case studies of brain-damaged patients are unique so the memory impairment may be specific to that individual (1) so the findings about the way that memory functions have limited representativeness to the general population (1). • It is difficult to obtain informed consent from brain-damaged patients (1) as in the case study of HM who had severe amnesia and was not able to consent himself, therefore it may not be ethical to carry out the study (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(4)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(a)	**AO2 (1 mark)** One mark for correct calculation. • 75% **Reject all other answers.**	**(1)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(b)	**AO2 (1 mark)** One mark for correct calculation. • ¾. **Reject all other answers.**	**(1)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(c)	**AO2 (4 marks)**	**(4)**

	Group 1: Students who wrote summary notes		Group 2: Students who did not write summary notes	
	Test performance (out of 32)	Rank 1	Test performance (out of 32)	Rank 2
	Total	**76.5**	Total	**59.5**

- One mark for correct totals (both group 1 and group 2 must be correct for mark).

- One mark for $8 \times 8 + \frac{8 \times 9}{2}$

- One mark for correct figure for U_a (i.e. minus the total of the ranks).
$U_a = 8 \times 8 + \frac{8 \times 9}{2} - 76.5 = 23.5$

- One mark for correct figure for U_b (i. e. minus the total of the ranks).
$U_b = 8 \times 8 + \frac{8 \times 9}{2} - 59.5 = 40.5$

Note: U = the smaller value, i.e. = **23.5**.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(d)	**AO2 (1 mark)** One mark for accurate definition of a Type I error. For example: • A Type I error is when the researcher incorrectly rejects the null hypothesis when they should have accepted the null hypothesis (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(1)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9(e)	**AO2 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)** One mark for identification of an improvement to the study (AO2). One mark for justification of the improvement (AO3). For example: • Stefan could have used students for other subjects, such as Geography, rather than just using psychology students (1) so that his results into the influence of writing summary notes could be more representative of students as a population in general than just for a single subject (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.** **Generic answers score 0 marks.** **Answers must relate to the scenario.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10(a)	**AO1 (2 marks)** Up to two marks for description of the sensory register. For example: • The sensory register acquires information from the world around the individual via the senses (1). The information is encoded depending on format in which the information is received (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10(b)	**AO1 (1 mark), AO3 (1 mark)** One mark for identification of a strength (AO1). One mark for justification of the strength (AO3). For example: • Glanzer and Cunitz (1966) provide supporting evidence that short-term memory and long-term memory stores are separate stores (1) as in their serial position effect experiment, participants recalled more words from the beginning and end of the word list suggesting two distinct memory stores (1). **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(2)**

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11	**AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks)** **e.g. How reliable is eyewitness testimony?** **AO1** • Eyewitness testimony has been identified as the leading factor in misidentifications which have led to innocent people being wrongfully convicted of crime (Innocence Project, 2015). • Wrongful conviction of innocent individuals through eyewitness testimony can lead to them being in prison for years so they cannot work and contribute to society. • If someone innocent goes to prison for a crime they did not commit due to eyewitness misidentification, the guilty go free and can continue to commit crimes in society and harm members of the public. • Ronald Cotton was convicted of the rape of Jennifer Thompson-Cannino who wrongfully identified him and he spent more than 10 years in prison, which could have been avoided with reliable eyewitness procedures. **AO3** • Bartlett's (1932) war of the ghosts shows the reconstructive nature of memory when participants changed details in the story over reproductions, so could explain why eyewitness testimony is unreliable. • Peterson and Peterson (1959) showed that when rehearsal was prevented participants forgot the majority of trigrams within 18 seconds, and eyewitnesses to a violent crime may not want to rehearse the incident so can explain the unreliability of their testimony. • Loftus (1974) found evidence to suggest that leading questions can influence the testimony of a witness, so misinformation like this could account for why an eyewitness might misidentify a suspect, leading to the innocent individual going to jail. • Studies testing eyewitness testimony, such as Loftus (1974), occur in laboratory settings with artificial tasks so may not represent real life eyewitness testimony, and studies should therefore use real eyewitnesses with real interviewing procedures. **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(8)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		**AO1 (4 marks), AO3 (4 marks)** **Candidates must demonstrate an equal emphasis between Knowledge and understanding vs assessment/conclusion in their answer.**
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–2 Marks	Demonstrates isolated elements of knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Generic assertions may be presented. Limited attempt to address the question. (AO3)
Level 2	3–4 Marks	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material, leading to a generic or superficial assessment being presented. (AO3)
Level 3	5–6 Marks	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Arguments developed using mostly coherent chains of reasoning leading to an assessment being presented which considers a range of factors. Candidates will demonstrate understanding of competing arguments/factors but unlikely to grasp their significance. The assessment leads to a judgement but this may be imbalanced. (AO3)
Level 4	7–8 Marks	Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding. (AO1) Displays a well-developed and logical assessment, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of the significance of competing arguments/factors leading to a balanced judgement being presented. (AO3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12	**AO1 (6 marks), AO3 (6 marks)** **AO1** • Interviews can be structured where there is a pre-determined list of questions to be asked about obedience. • Unstructured interviews into prejudice will explore participant attitudes to prejudice and discrimination and the researcher is able to be flexible with the questions asked. • Interviews into obedience and prejudice can be conducted face-to-face, particularly with vulnerable participants or when about sensitive topics. • Field experiments investigating memory would be carried out in the natural setting for the participants. • The IV is manipulated and the DV is measured in a field experiment into the memory process. • Field experiments will usually collect quantitative data related to the memory performance of the participants. **AO3** • The standardised nature of a structured interview means that all participants get the same obedience questions, so the responses about their attitudes to obedience can be compared and tested for reliability. • The qualitative data from unstructured interviews into prejudice may be analysed in a biased way by the social psychologist, so the results about attitudes to prejudice may be considered subjective. • An interviewer could influence the responses concerning obedience and prejudice if conducted face-to-face through researcher effects, so the results may not be valid. • Being in a natural setting, the participants' memory performance would be more likely to be their usual response, so the research would be higher in ecological validity. • By precisely manipulating the IV and carefully measuring the DV, field experiments can infer some level of cause and effect between a factor affecting memory and the memory performance. • Measuring the memory performance of participants using numerical data can mean that underlying reasons why the memory performance may have been worse or better under a certain condition cannot be fully explored. **Look for other reasonable marking points.**	**(12)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1 (6 marks), AO3 (6 marks)
		Candidates must demonstrate an equal emphasis between knowledge and understanding vs evaluation/conclusion in their answer.
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3 Marks	Demonstrates isolated elements of knowledge and understanding. (AO1)
		A conclusion may be presented, but will be generic and the supporting evidence will be limited. Limited attempt to address the question. (AO3)
Level 2	4-6 Marks	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1)
		Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material, leading to a superficial conclusion being made. (AO3)
Level 3	7-9 Marks	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding. (AO1)
		Arguments developed using mostly coherent chains of reasoning leading to a conclusion being presented. Candidates will demonstrate a grasp of competing arguments but evaluation may be imbalanced. (AO3)
Level 4	10-12 Marks	Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding. (AO1)
		Displays a well-developed and logical evaluation, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments, presenting a balanced conclusion. (AO3)