

## Memory

A student showed participants a film of a car accident. After watching the film, each participant was asked to write down what they had seen. The student was surprised to see that the descriptions of the accident were quite different.

The student's psychology teacher suggested that the participants' recall might be improved by using cognitive interview techniques.

Suggest **two** cognitive interview techniques that could be used to improve participants' recall of the film.

**[4 marks]**

### Mark Scheme:

**Marks for this question: AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Suggestion of how two cognitive interview techniques might improve recall is clear, accurate and coherent. There is appropriate use of terminology.
1	1–2	Suggestion of how two cognitive interview techniques might improve recall is limited. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate. OR one technique at Level 1/2
	0	No relevant content.

#### **Possible content:**

- the participants could have been asked to report every detail; elaboration might refer to e.g. the colour of the cars, even if seemingly irrelevant, or how this technique might trigger additional information
- the participants could have been asked to recall the events in a different order; elaboration might refer to starting e.g. from the point of impact to the start of the film, or how this technique might have disrupted the influence of schema/expectations
- the participants could have been asked to recall the event from the perspective of others; elaboration might refer to eg the driver of one of the cars, or how this technique might disrupt the influence of schema/expectations
- the participants could have been encouraged to mentally reinstate the context; elaboration might refer to eg being reminded of the weather and the general environment, or how this technique might trigger recall. Credit reference to the encoding specificity principle.

Credit other relevant suggestions e.g. strategies from the enhanced cognitive interview.

Simply naming two techniques, maximum **one** mark. Naming one technique is not creditworthy.

Danielle was walking down the high street when she witnessed a crime. A young man attacked an elderly woman. After a struggle, the man ran away with the woman's handbag. Danielle and another couple of witnesses stayed with the woman until the police arrived.

Explain how the police could use the cognitive interview to help Danielle's recall of the event.

**[6 marks]**

**Mark Scheme:**

**Marks for this question: AO2 = 6**

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	Application of knowledge to Danielle's experience is mostly clear and effective. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3–4	There is some application of knowledge to Danielle's experience. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1–2	There is limited application of knowledge to Danielle's experience. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- Danielle is encouraged to mentally reinstate the context, reminded of, eg why she was walking down the high street, the weather etc as this may trigger further information (reinstate the context)
- Danielle should be asked to report every detail even if it seems irrelevant, eg what the attacker was wearing, the style of the handbag etc (report everything)
- Danielle should be asked to recall the event in a different order, eg beginning from when she comforted the elderly woman and working backwards (changing order)
- Danielle should recall the event from the perspective of others, eg the couple of other witnesses who were present at the time (changing perspective)
- credit features of enhanced cognitive interview to facilitate recall if applied to Danielle's experience.

Credit other valid applications.

Answers may cover fewer points in more depth or more points in less depth.

**Examiner Comment:**

Question 09 (6 marks)

Most students demonstrated clear understanding of the principles behind the cognitive interview, but failed to apply it appropriately 'to help Danielle's recall of the event'; this required reference to details of the situation provided in the stem.

Outline and evaluate research (theories and/or studies) into the effects of misleading information on eyewitness testimony.

**[16 marks]**

**Mark Scheme:**

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	Knowledge of research is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9–12	Knowledge of research is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5–8	Limited knowledge of research is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1–4	Knowledge of research is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content

**AO1 content**

Knowledge of research (theories and/or studies) into the effects of misleading information on EWT.  
Leading questions:

- Loftus and Palmer (1974) – estimates of speed based on changing verb in the critical question
- Loftus and Zanni (1975) – ‘Did you see the/a broken headlight?’
- Loftus (1975) – ‘How fast was the car going when it passed the white barn?’
- response-bias explanation – leading questions do not affect memory, just choice of answer
- substitution bias/explanation – question wording actually distorts memory.

Post-event discussion:

- Gabbert et al (2003) – paired discussions influence recall of crime
- memory contamination – co-witnesses mix (mis)information
- memory conformity – witnesses go along with others for social approval.

Accept other relevant theories/studies.

### **AO3 content**

Evaluation/discussion of research into misleading information:

- real-life application – links to cognitive interview
- use of artificial materials in studies, eg films – less anxiety-inducing than in real-life
- demand characteristics in lab studies reduce validity
- lack of consequences in lab studies compared to real-life – Foster et al (1994)
- memory for important events/details is less susceptible to distortion
- credit other methodological issues in studies, eg sample bias
- credit ethical issues if made relevant to discussion
- use of evidence to support/challenge effects of misleading information.

Accept other valid evaluation points.

### **Examiner Comment:**

#### **Question 10**

There were some excellent answers to this question that focused on the effects of misleading information, succinct outlines of relevant studies (mostly the various Loftus studies, but also studies on post-event discussion), and effective evaluation. This could be methodological (artificial materials, lack of consequences in lab studies, demand characteristics, etc), or in terms of applications, for example development of the cognitive interview. Weaker answers tended to provide inaccurate descriptions of relevant studies and rote learned evaluation not clearly linked to the specific question of misleading information and eye witness testimony. Stronger answers demonstrated effective use of material, for example using evidence for the effects of age and anxiety on eye witness testimony, as evaluative material (a failure in some key studies to control for confounding variables). Weaker responses simply wandered away from the question and discussed studies on age and anxiety (in particular the weapons effect) as though they were automatically relevant.

