Write your name here

Surname: StemUp Model Solution | Other names:

Pearson Edexcel
International Advanced Level

Centre Number | Candidate Number

Psychology

International Advanced Subsidiary
Paper 1: Social and Cognitive Psychology

Thursday 12 October 2017 – Afternoon
Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Paper Reference
WPS01/01

You do not need any other materials.

Total Marks

Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ALL** questions.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided – *there may be more space than you need.*

Information

- The total mark for this paper is 64.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets – *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*
- The list of formulae and statistical tables are printed at the start of this paper.
- Candidates may use a calculator.

Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ▶

P50813A

©2017 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1

P 5 0 8 1 3 A 0 1 2 4

Pearson

FORMULAE AND STATISTICAL TABLES

Standard deviation (sample estimate)

$$\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum(x-\bar{x})^2}{n-1}\right)}$$

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

$$1-\frac{6\sum d^2}{n(n^2-1)}$$

Critical values for Spearman's rank

	Level of significance for a one-tailed test				
	0.05	**0.025**	**0.01**	**0.005**	**0.0025**
	Level of significance for a two-tailed test				
N	**0.10**	**0.05**	**0.025**	**0.01**	**0.005**
5	0.900	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
6	0.829	0.886	0.943	1.000	1.000
7	0.714	0.786	0.893	0.929	0.964
8	0.643	0.738	0.833	0.881	0.905
9	0.600	0.700	0.783	0.833	0.867
10	0.564	0.648	0.745	0.794	0.830
11	0.536	0.618	0.709	0.755	0.800
12	0.503	0.587	0.678	0.727	0.769
13	0.484	0.560	0.648	0.703	0.747
14	0.464	0.538	0.626	0.679	0.723
15	0.446	0.521	0.604	0.654	0.700
16	0.429	0.503	0.582	0.635	0.679
17	0.414	0.485	0.566	0.615	0.662
18	0.401	0.472	0.550	0.600	0.643
19	0.391	0.460	0.535	0.584	0.628
20	0.380	0.447	0.520	0.570	0.612
21	0.370	0.435	0.508	0.556	0.599
22	0.361	0.425	0.496	0.544	0.586
23	0.353	0.415	0.486	0.532	0.573
24	0.344	0.406	0.476	0.521	0.562
25	0.337	0.398	0.466	0.511	0.551
26	0.331	0.390	0.457	0.501	0.541
27	0.324	0.382	0.448	0.491	0.531
28	0.317	0.375	0.440	0.483	0.522
29	0.312	0.368	0.433	0.475	0.513
30	0.306	0.362	0.425	0.467	0.504

The calculated value must be equal to or exceed the critical value in this table for significance to be shown.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Chi-squared distribution formula

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E} \qquad df = (r-1)(c-1)$$

Critical values for chi-squared distribution

	Level of significance for a one-tailed test					
	0.10	**0.05**	**0.025**	**0.01**	**0.005**	**0.0005**
	Level of significance for a two-tailed test					
df	**0.20**	**0.10**	**0.05**	**0.025**	**0.01**	**0.001**
1	1.64	2.71	3.84	5.02	6.64	10.83
2	3.22	4.61	5.99	7.38	9.21	13.82
3	4.64	6.25	7.82	9.35	11.35	16.27
4	5.99	7.78	9.49	11.14	13.28	18.47
5	7.29	9.24	11.07	12.83	15.09	20.52
6	8.56	10.65	12.59	14.45	16.81	22.46
7	9.80	12.02	14.07	16.01	18.48	24.32
8	11.03	13.36	15.51	17.54	20.09	26.12
9	12.24	14.68	16.92	19.02	21.67	27.88
10	13.44	15.99	18.31	20.48	23.21	29.59
11	14.63	17.28	19.68	21.92	24.73	31.26
12	15.81	18.55	21.03	23.34	26.22	32.91
13	16.99	19.81	22.36	24.74	27.69	34.53
14	18.15	21.06	23.69	26.12	29.14	36.12
15	19.31	22.31	25.00	27.49	30.58	37.70
16	20.47	23.54	26.30	28.85	32.00	39.25
17	21.62	24.77	27.59	30.19	33.41	40.79
18	22.76	25.99	28.87	31.53	34.81	42.31
19	23.90	27.20	30.14	32.85	36.19	43.82
20	25.04	28.41	31.41	34.17	37.57	45.32
21	26.17	29.62	32.67	35.48	38.93	46.80
22	27.30	30.81	33.92	36.78	40.29	48.27
23	28.43	32.01	35.17	38.08	41.64	49.73
24	29.55	33.20	36.42	39.36	42.98	51.18
25	30.68	34.38	37.65	40.65	44.31	52.62
26	31.80	35.56	38.89	41.92	45.64	54.05
27	32.91	36.74	40.11	43.20	46.96	55.48
28	34.03	37.92	41.34	44.46	48.28	56.89
29	35.14	39.09	42.56	45.72	49.59	58.30
30	36.25	40.26	43.77	46.98	50.89	59.70
40	47.27	51.81	55.76	59.34	63.69	73.40
50	58.16	63.17	67.51	71.42	76.15	86.66
60	68.97	74.40	79.08	83.30	88.38	99.61
70	79.72	85.53	90.53	95.02	100.43	112.32

The calculated value must be equal to or exceed the critical value in this table for significance to be shown.

stemup.co.uk

Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test process

- Calculate the difference between two scores by taking one from the other
- Rank the differences giving the smallest difference Rank 1

  Note: do not rank any differences of 0 and when adding the number of scores, do not count those with a difference of 0, and ignore the signs when calculating the difference
- Add up the ranks for positive differences
- Add up the ranks for negative differences
- T is the figure that is the smallest when the ranks are totalled (may be positive or negative)
- N is the number of scores left, ignore those with 0 difference

Critical values for the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test

	Level of significance for a one-tailed test		
	0.05	0.025	0.01
	Level of significance for a two-tailed test		
n	0.1	0.05	0.02
N=5	0	-	-
6	2	0	-
7	3	2	0
8	5	3	1
9	8	5	3
10	11	8	5
11	13	10	7
12	17	13	9

The calculated value must be equal to or less than the critical value in this table for significance to be shown.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Answer ALL questions in this section. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

1 Milgram completed a number of experiments into obedience.

(a) State **one** aim of Milgram's telephonic instructions (Experiment 7) study.

(1)

To see whether reducing the physical proximity of the experimenter, by giving orders over the telephone instead of in person, would affect the level of obedience.

(b) Give **one** conclusion Milgram made from his telephonic instructions (Experiment 7) study.

(1)

Milgram concluded that when the authority figure is physically distant, obedience is reduced, as only 20.5% went to 450 volts compared with 65% when the experimenter was in the room.

(c) Explain **one** weakness of Milgram's telephonic instructions (Experiment 7) study in terms of validity.

(2)

The study took place in an artificial laboratory at Yale using a fake shock generator and a learning task of word pairs, which participants would never meet in everyday life. This means it lacks ecological validity, so the findings may not reflect how people really obey an authority figure who gives instructions by telephone, for example a manager phoning an employee at work.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

(d) Explain **one** individual difference that could affect whether someone is obedient.

(2)

Personality: Adorno et al. (1950) claimed that people with an authoritarian personality are more likely to obey. Elms and Milgram (1966) found that obedient participants scored higher on authoritarianism, because such people like rules, respect authority and are submissive to those of higher status, which leads to higher levels of obedience.

(Total for Question 1 = 6 marks)

2 Rendi wanted to test how obedient the other students in her psychology class were to authority figures. She designed a questionnaire to gather quantitative data.

(a) State **one** closed question that Rendi could use in her questionnaire about obedience.

(1)

Would you obey your teacher if they told you to stay behind after class? Yes / No

(b) Explain **one** weakness of Rendi using quantitative data about obedience.

(2)

Quantitative data, such as yes/no answers or ratings, would only show how many of the students in Rendi's class say they obey, but not why they obey authority figures such as teachers or parents. Because it gives numerical data with little depth or detail, it lacks validity, as the students cannot explain their reasons or the circumstances in which they would or would not obey.

Rendi also decided to conduct interviews about obedience.

(c) State **one** open question that Rendi could ask in her interviews about obedience.

(1)

Explain why you would or would not obey your teacher if they asked you to do something you thought was unfair?

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

(d) Describe how Rendi could analyse the data gathered from the open questions in her interviews.

(2)

Rendi could use thematic analysis. She could read through the transcripts of the interview answers several times and look for common themes or patterns in why the students said they would obey, such as "fear of punishment" or "respect for the teacher's role". She could then code the answers into these themes and count how often each reason for obeying different people appears.

(e) Explain how Rendi could use secondary data to improve the reliability of her research into obedience.

(2)

Rendi could compare her own findings with secondary data from previous studies on obedience, such as Milgram's (1963) findings or published surveys of obedience in students. If her results are similar to these previous findings, this shows consistency across studies of obedience, which confirms that her research is reliable.

(Total for Question 2 = 8 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

3 In social psychology, you will have learned about one classic study in detail.

- Moscovici et al. (1969) Influence of a Consistent Minority on the Responses of a Majority in a Colour Perception Task.

(a) State **two** results of Moscovici et al.'s (1969) study.

(2)

1 *8.42% of the responses in the consistent minority condition were "green" (32% of participants said green at least once).*

2 *Only 1.25% of the responses in the inconsistent minority condition were "green".*

(b) Suggest **one** improvement that could be made to Moscovici et al.'s (1969) study.

(2)

Moscovici et al. (1969) only used 172 female participants, so the sample was not representative of the target population. The study could be improved by using a more representative sample, including males as well as females, and people from different age groups and cultures. This would increase the population validity, so the findings about minority influence could be generalised more widely.

(Total for Question 3 = 4 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

P 5 0 8 1 3 A 0 8 2 4 stemup.co.uk

4 Research has been conducted to investigate conformity, including Asch (1951) and his variation studies (1952, 1956).

Evaluate research into conformity.

(8)

Asch (1951) investigated conformity using a laboratory experiment with 123 male American students. Each naive participant was placed in a room with seven confederates and had to say aloud which of three comparison lines matched a standard line. On 12 of the 18 trials (critical trials) the confederates gave the same wrong answer. Asch found that participants conformed on 36.8% of critical trials, 75% conformed at least once and 25% never conformed. Asch then replicated the study in variations (1952, 1956), for example when one confederate gave the correct answer (a dissenter), conformity fell to 5.5%, and with only one confederate conformity was very low (about 3%), rising sharply up to three confederates.

A strength of Asch's research is that it was a laboratory experiment with standardised controls, for example the same lines, the same confederates and the same order of trials were used, so the independent variable (group pressure) could be shown to cause conformity, establishing cause and effect. Because of these controls, the procedure can be repeated, and Asch re-tested his findings in his variation studies, which increases reliability and makes the research scientifically credible.

The variation studies are also useful because they identify situational factors affecting conformity, such as group size and unanimity, which can be applied to real life, for example a single person speaking out in a group may reduce conformity.

However, conformity research often uses artificial tasks. Sherif's (1936) autokinetic effect study asked participants to estimate how far a stationary point of light moved, and Asch's line judgement task is unlike everyday decisions. This means the research lacks task validity and

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

ecological validity, so judgements about conformity may not apply to real life, where decisions often have real consequences.

The samples are also limited. Asch used only American male students in the 1950s, a period of strong social conformity in the USA. Perrin and Spencer (1980) repeated the study with British students and found much lower conformity, suggesting the findings are a "child of its time" and lack temporal validity. There are also ethical issues, as participants were deceived and may have felt stress and embarrassment.

In conclusion, conformity research such as Asch (1951) is well controlled and reliable, and shows clearly that group pressure can cause people to conform. However, the artificial tasks, biased samples and changes over time mean the findings should be generalised to real-world conformity with caution.

(Total for Question 4 = 8 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 26 MARKS

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

SECTION B

COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

Answer ALL questions in this section. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

5 Explain **two** strengths of the working memory model.

1 *The working memory model is a more detailed explanation of short-term memory than the multi-store model. It divides STM into separate components, the central executive, phonological loop, visuo-spatial sketchpad and episodic buffer, which better reflect the complexity of everyday memory, such as being able to do a verbal and a visual task at the same time.*

2 *There is supporting evidence for its separate components. Baddeley and Hitch (1976) found that verbal reasoning tasks used the central executive while digit span tasks used the phonological loop, so two tasks using different components can be done together. The case of KF also supports this, as his verbal STM was damaged but his visual STM was not.*

(Total for Question 5 = 4 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

6 Mrs Wang wanted to find out if weekly spelling tests were effective in helping children to learn to spell words correctly. She split her class into two groups of 10 children.

- Group 1 had a weekly spelling test for eight weeks and then a final test.
- Group 2 had **no** weekly spelling test for eight weeks and then a final test.

The results of the class are recorded in **Table 1**.

Group 1 (score out of 20)	Group 2 (score out of 20)
16	15
17	12
15	11
18	13
19	9
18	12
17	13
15	10
16	11
15	9
Mean Score = 16.6	Mean Score = 11.5

Table 1

(a) Calculate the **median** score for Group 1 using the data in **Table 1**.

Space for calculations

(1)

15, 15, 15, 16, 16, 17, 17, 18, 18, 19

Median = (16 + 17) ÷ 2 = 16.5

Median score for Group 1 ..... 16.5 .....

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

(b) Calculate the standard deviation for Group 1 by completing **Table 2**.

The formulae and statistical tables can be found at the front of the paper.

You **must** give your answer to two decimal places.

(4)

Participant	Score	$x - \bar{x}$	$(x - \bar{x})^2$
A	16	−0.6	0.36
B	17	0.4	0.16
C	15	−1.6	2.56
D	18	1.4	1.96
E	19	2.4	5.76
F	18	1.4	1.96
G	17	0.4	0.16
H	15	−1.6	2.56
I	16	−0.6	0.36
J	15	−1.6	2.56
Mean score	16.6	**Sum of differences²**	18.4
Standard deviation for Group 1 = 1.43			

Table 2

Space for calculations

$\Sigma(x - \text{mean})^2 = 18.4$

Variance $= 18.4 \div (n - 1) = 18.4 \div 9 = 2.044...$

Standard deviation $= \sqrt{2.044...} = 1.4298... = 1.43$ (2 d.p.)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

(c) Justify, using the multi-store model of memory, **one** conclusion that Mrs Wang could make from her study.

(2)

Group 1, who had weekly spelling tests, had a higher mean score (16.6) than Group 2 (11.5), so Mrs Wang could conclude that weekly testing improves spelling accuracy. According to the multi-store model, the weekly tests act as rehearsal of the spellings in short-term memory, which transfers them into long-term memory, so they are recalled better in the final test.

(d) Mrs Wang used an independent groups design.

Explain **one** strength and **one** weakness of using an independent groups design.

(4)

Strength

Each child only takes part in one condition, so there are no order effects such as practice, fatigue or boredom. For example, children in Group 2 cannot improve simply from having done Group 1's weekly tests, which increases the validity of the results.

Weakness

There is limited control over participant variables, as different children are in each group. Group 1 may simply have contained children who were already better spellers or had more help at home, which may affect the results, so the difference may not be due to the weekly tests.

(Total for Question 6 = 11 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

7 In cognitive psychology, you will have learned about one of the following contemporary studies in detail:

- Darling et al. (2007)
- Sacchi et al. (2007)

(a) State **one** aim from your contemporary study.

(1)

Sacchi et al. (2007): to find out if doctored photographs of past public events (Tiananmen Square 1989 and the Rome anti-war protest 2003) affect memory for those events and attitudes towards them.

(b) Explain **one** weakness of your contemporary study.

(2)

Sacchi et al. (2007) used a sample of 31 males and 156 females, all students from an Italian university. This is not representative of the target population, as it is gender biased and only includes young, educated people from one culture, so population validity is reduced and the findings about doctored photographs may not be generalised to other groups.

(Total for Question 7 = 3 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

8 Papel has anterograde amnesia which means he cannot create new memories. His short-term memory lasts between 7 and 30 seconds. He also has some retrograde amnesia which means he has lost some long-term memories. Papel has two children and he can remember who they are, but he cannot remember events or special occasions from the past.

Cognitive psychologists have completed a case study about Papel to investigate amnesia and transference processes between short and long-term memory.

Discuss the use of case studies in cognitive psychology as a method to research memory.

You must make reference to the context in your answer.

(8)

A case study is an in-depth study of one individual or a small group, often someone unique, such as Papel with his anterograde and retrograde amnesia. Researchers gather detailed, mainly qualitative data using different methods, such as interviews with Papel and his family, observations, memory tests and brain scans, and the person can be studied longitudinally to see how memory processes change over time. Famous examples include HM (Scoville and Milner, 1957) and Clive Wearing.

A strength is that case studies allow psychologists to study unique cases that could never be created ethically in an experiment. Researchers could not deliberately damage someone's brain, but Papel's amnesia allows them to investigate the transfer between short-term and long-term memory. For example, his STM lasts between 7 and 30 seconds, which is roughly normal, but he cannot make new long-term memories, suggesting that STM and LTM are separate stores and that it is the transfer process that is damaged. This supports the multi-store model, in the same way that HM's case did.

Case studies also give rich, detailed data. Papel can remember who his two children are but not events or special occasions from the past, which can be documented in case notes and observations. This suggests that semantic memory (facts) and episodic memory (events) are separate parts of LTM, a distinction that would not be seen from a simple lab experiment.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

Using several methods also allows triangulation, which increases the validity of the conclusions.

Papel could also be studied longitudinally, with his anterograde amnesia monitored over time to see if he improves at making new memories, for example of his children growing up. This gives insight into how memory changes and recovers.

However, case studies of unique individuals cannot be generalised to the wider population. Papel's brain damage, his memory before the amnesia and his personal background are unique, so findings about transference in his memory may not apply to people with normal memory. It is also difficult to know what Papel's memory was like before his amnesia, so it is hard to tell which deficits are caused by the damage.

Case studies are also hard to replicate, so their reliability is low, and the qualitative data may involve researcher interpretation, as psychologists working closely with Papel over a long time may become biased. There are also ethical issues, as Papel may not fully understand or remember giving consent, so consent may need to be regained regularly.

In conclusion, case studies like Papel's give unique and detailed evidence about memory, such as the separation of STM and LTM, but they lack generalisability and reliability, so they are most useful when their findings are checked with controlled experiments on larger samples.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

(Total for Question 8 = 8 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 26 MARKS

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

SECTION C

Answer the question in this section. Write your answer in the space provided.

9 Antonio and Enrique were watching a football match between their two favourite teams. Antonio supports one team and Enrique supports the other. During the match, a player from Enrique's team was sent off the pitch by the referee for a serious foul against a player from Antonio's team.

Antonio thought it was a fair decision by the referee, however, Enrique disagreed and thought the player had not committed a foul. When Enrique and Antonio were discussing what happened, they had different accounts about the actions of the football player who was sent off.

Evaluate whether reconstructive memory can account for the difference in Antonio's and Enrique's recall.

You must make reference to the context in your answer.

(12)

Bartlett (1932) argued that memory is reconstructive rather than an exact copy of what happened, like a recording. Memories are stored as traces, and not all information is encoded at the time of an event. When we recall, we fill in the gaps using our schemas, which are mental frameworks of prior knowledge, expectations and experiences. Bartlett called this "effort after meaning", as people try to make sense of what they remember. As a result recall becomes distorted: details that do not fit our schemas are left out (levelling), details that fit are exaggerated (sharpening), and information is changed to make it more familiar and logical (rationalisation).

Reconstructive memory can account for the difference in recall. Antonio and Enrique saw the same foul but each support a different team, so they have different schemas. Enrique has a favourable schema of his team and their players, so when he reconstructs the event he may level out details that suggest a foul, such as a high tackle, and sharpen details that suggest the player was innocent, such as touching the ball. Antonio's schema of the opposing team may include the expectation that their players foul, especially if this player has done this before, so he may reconstruct the action as more serious.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

The incident happened quickly during a live match, so neither may have had a clear view of all of the player's actions. Their memory traces would be incomplete, and each would fill in the gaps from previous football knowledge in a way that fits their own team loyalty. The referee's decision itself may also have been used as information: Antonio may rationalise that a sending off means there must have been a foul, while Enrique rationalises it as a referee mistake. Discussing the event afterwards may also distort their memories further, as each reconstructs it again when retelling it.

There is supporting evidence. Bartlett (1932) found that when English participants recalled "The War of the Ghosts", their stories became shorter and were distorted to fit their own culture, for example "canoes" became "boats". This supports the idea that existing schemas change recall, as with the two fans. Brewer and Treyens (1981) found that participants who waited in an office falsely recalled objects that fit an office schema, such as books, which were not there, showing schemas fill gaps in memory. Hastorf and Cantril (1954) found that Princeton and Dartmouth students who watched the same rough American football game reported very different numbers of fouls by each team, depending on which team they supported, which is very similar to Antonio and Enrique.

However, Bartlett's research lacked scientific rigour. He did not give standardised instructions and the time intervals between reproductions were not controlled, so the evidence underpinning the theory is low in reliability. In addition, the War of the Ghosts story was unfamiliar and confusing, so distortion might be less likely with a familiar event like a football match. Yuille and Cutshall (1986) found that real eyewitnesses to a shooting gave accurate recall months later, suggesting memory for important, emotional events is not always reconstructed.

Reconstructive memory also only describes that memory is reconstructed rather than explaining

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

how schemas are formed or exactly how reconstruction takes place, so it is hard to test scientifically. There are also other explanations for the difference in Antonio's and Enrique's accounts. They may have had different viewpoints of the pitch, or paid attention to different players, so the difference could be due to encoding rather than reconstruction at recall. They may also remember the event in the same way but deliberately give a biased account to defend their own team, which is a response bias rather than a true memory distortion.

In conclusion, reconstructive memory can largely account for the difference in Antonio's and Enrique's recall, as their team loyalties give them different schemas that fill the gaps in incomplete memory traces, and this is supported by studies such as Bartlett (1932), Brewer and Treyens (1981) and Hastorf and Cantril (1954). However, as the theory is descriptive and other factors such as viewpoint, attention and response bias may also be involved, it is unlikely to be the only explanation.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

(Total for Question 9 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 12 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 64 MARKS

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk