

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2009

GCE

## GCE Psychology 6PS01 / 6PS02

**ResultsPlus**  
Helping you to raise attainment  
[www.resultsplus.edexcel.com](http://www.resultsplus.edexcel.com)

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](http://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/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated Science telephone line: 0844 576 0037



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2009

Publications Code US021630

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

## Contents

### *Psychology 6PS01 / 6PS02*

#### Psychology 6PS01

Questions 1-10 Multiple Choice	3
Question 11	4
Question 12	5
Question 13	10
Question 14	10
Question 15	10
Question 16	15

#### Psychology 6PS02

Questions 1-10 Multiple Choice.	23
Question 11	24
Question 12	25
Question 13	29
Question 14	33
Question 15	33
Question 16	33
Question 17	37
Question 18	41
Statistics	45

## Unit Test 6PS01/01 (UT1)

### General Comments

This was the second exam assessing the new 2008 specification. It meant a number of candidates were sitting the exam for the first time as they had not been entered in January or that candidates were re sitting after their initial first attempt.

The paper was accessible for all and discriminated between candidates. The main distinction between more and less able candidates was and always has been the ability to elaborate. Higher scoring answers can back up a point with general and specific examples of research. Others find it difficult to provide relevant psychological research and instead rely on anecdotal information which is not creditworthy. There are continuing signs of a gradual improvement in this area but it still remains the main differentiator amongst all candidates.

It was again pleasing to note the very rare number of unanswered questions and blank pages. Most candidates had a good attempt at all questions.

The single biggest problem however came with the essay where a significant number of candidates described and evaluated Hofling which received no credit. Candidates and centres need to be aware this is an American study and the question required one from a different country. What made this error more surprising was that a question on Hofling had already been asked earlier in the paper.

Candidates need to be reminded to read the short stimulus material given for certain questions. A firm understanding of the stimulus will make questions more accessible. There seem to be too many examples of unnecessary errors on the part of the candidate from simply glossing over the stimulus material and not reading it properly. The stimulus is designed to help candidates, not hinder them.

In Q11, for example, most of the answers to this research methods question could be found in the actual stimulus at the start. This was typical of the type of question which used to appear on the old specification Unit 5 and is also seen on the 6PS02 paper this year. Candidates might benefit from attempting past papers from unit 6765 to practice using what is in the stimulus in their answers.

Some candidates still have problems with questions asking for specific requirements. Q11 (e) is a typical question on ethical guidelines and explicitly asked for these with reference to the study in the stimulus. Again many candidates simply chose to ignore this and gave generic answers about ethics which meant they lost out on some relatively easy marks.

What is a real discriminator? Q12 (b) on describing Social Identity Theory has been a common one over the years but still only better candidates seem to access the top marks. Q12 (c) was probably the most poorly answered question on the paper and it involved a visual stimulus to help cue candidates. It might be the nature of the theory, as was demonstrated by the previous question, but many candidates just did not use Social Identity Theory to answer the question. Instead they reverted to 'story telling' about gang culture.

Q15 enabled better candidates to express themselves fully and demonstrate their abundant knowledge of the cognitive approach to explain the stimulus material.

### **Questions 1-10 Multiple Choice**

The standard of responses in this section already showed an improvement from January 2009. The majority of candidates did well on these multiple choice questions with some scoring the full 11 marks. There were fewer instances compared to the January paper where candidates changed their minds and put a line through the box only to go back and cross it later.

Questions 1-4 were based on studies and theories which as in January were answered better than questions 5-10 around methodology. It can be surprising that candidates have a level of knowledge to recognise detail of studies in these short multiple choice questions but not in longer questions later on in the paper. A candidate may get the first question correct about social comparison but then not be able to describe this component of Social Identity Theory for question 12 (b).

The remaining A03 questions on methods included another one on mean, mode etc which was the opening question in the January paper. Again this was answered well and in turn, much better than question 11 (c) which was on the same topic.

Questions 6 and 10 were both on designs and were answered rather inconsistently in that some candidates did better on one than the other. However most candidates got question 11 (a) correct which was also on designs.

Q8 was the first time a question on sampling had been asked and surprisingly a few candidates struggled with this. Perhaps the reason for this was it was on volunteer rather than opportunity or random. Centres are reminded candidates need to know all the types of sampling techniques given in the specification, not just those used the most in research or student practical work.

However it was questions 7 and 9 that were most poorly answered in this section and only the better candidates consistently got both correct. It is clear some candidates are unfamiliar with types of interviews judging by the varied responses given to this question on structured interviews. It is even clearer that the term operationalisation is still poorly understood, as it was on the old specification unit 5.

### Question 11

Part (a) was answered very well by most candidates who could easily identify independent groups as the correct design. Weaker candidates would either put the wrong design, repeated measures and matched pairs were very common, or would end up guessing and throwing in random psychological terms. Methods such as cross sectional studies were not uncommon as were samples or independent variables.

Better candidates gave full reasons for the choice of design in part (b) with elaboration and typically looked at why repeated measures design would not be appropriate for this study. These answers demonstrated a depth of comparison between independent and repeated measures and showed a good knowledge of order effects.

A surprising number of candidates were not familiar with the term 'central tendency' in part (c) and were unable to answer this question correctly. They made random guesses such as "the ice rink" or gave the name of a design or method. A fair number of candidates simply wrote "the average" which indicated some knowledge but even though the term was actually written in the table, these candidates unfortunately never mentioned it.

Part (d) seemed to confuse many who mixed validity with reliability. Others kept on writing about how the study measured what it was supposed to or put forward definitions of validity which had been rote learned. Too many candidates just simply did not elaborate beyond this. Those that did score one mark tended to repeat the first point on the mark scheme about it being a natural setting but no more.

Only the better candidates could put forward arguments for this study having both high and low validity. The wordlist being an artificial task was the most common explanation for the latter.

Unfortunately even the most able candidates lost marks in part (e) by not referring to the study. They could easily outline two appropriate ethical guidelines, right to withdraw and informed consent being the most popular, and provide excellent descriptions of these, accessing one mark for each. They would however not refer to the actual study so didn't access the second elaboration mark, limiting themselves to half marks. Far too many candidates (probably just as many as those who did Hofling for Q16) simply ignored the "with reference to this study" part of the question. Better answers would always make this reference and in most cases in quite a simple and obvious way e.g. "the ice hockey player's names should remain confidential throughout and not be made public without their direct permission".

In part (f) some candidates tended to give a strength of field experiments "high in ecological validity" or gave more than one weakness. Most answers however focused on lack of full control over extraneous / confounding variables and better candidates elaborated on this to get the second mark. Most typically, they compared it to control in a laboratory experiment or actually gave an example of variables not under control and their possible effects.

### Question 12

**Part (a)** did act as a clear differentiator and weaker candidates typically scored 0 or in a few cases 1 mark for getting two or three statements correct. There were very few instances of boxes having more than one answer written in them.

**Part (b)** was typical of a question asked on the previous specification and the responses within this new specification were still just as varied. Only the better candidates were able to describe the theory about prejudice and the 3 component parts accurately. Suitable examples were not used as the description was thorough enough to warrant full marks. Weaker answers would usually be full of colloquial references to what causes prejudice with little or no psychology in them. Others correctly gave an opening point about in group favouritism and then mixed up the three component parts of the theory.

Probably the most disappointing responses came from part (c). Weaker candidates found this very difficult and just wrote about gang culture or stereotypes from the media rather than S.I.T. Many candidates talked about stereotyping and those who did try to link the stimulus to S.I.T spoke mainly just of the formation of the in-group and out-group. Very few mentioned each of the three steps, including the better candidates. Those that were able to answer the question typically picked up at least 2 marks. They could discuss the role of the teenager as either part of the in group or out group and made explicit reference to S.I.T.

Script A

(c) Young people are getting a 'bad press' coverage for hanging around towns in groups and wearing 'hoodies'.



© Matt Cardy/Getty Images

Using social identity theory explain why teenagers might be getting negative media coverage. (3)

- Firstly the media <sup>categories</sup> ~~identifies~~ <sup>categories</sup> the boys who wear these clothes as a group, known as hoodies, this becomes the out-group.
- Further coverage from the media identifies this group of individuals as a threat to society, as they do not act according to social standards, this puts further emphasis on their out-group status.
- Lastly, social <sup>comparison</sup> ~~comparison~~ occurs, whereby prejudice in the form of other groups, such as students (Total for Question 12 = 9 marks) negatively compare themselves with the hoodies, which is broadcasted by the media. This comparison therefore occurs on a much wider scale.

**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Good clear points made which all refer explicitly to the three component parts of S.I.T. The first point about out groups is straight off the mark scheme and followed up by good descriptions of social identification and comparison. Full marks are therefore given here.

## Script B

(c) Young people are getting a 'bad press' coverage for hanging around towns in groups and wearing 'hoodies'.



© Matt Cardy/Getty Images

Using social identity theory explain why teenagers might be getting negative media coverage.

(3)

Through prejudice - when a group of young people who wear hoodies + tracksuits get into trouble, people assume all teenagers are like this when they aren't. This is social categorisation - putting people into groups.

The teenagers dress the same (hoodies) to emphasise their group membership with their in-group.

This is called social identification, resulting in people being prejudice towards the teenagers. (Total for Question 12 = 9 marks)

1.

2.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

1 - The first mark is given at the end of the opening paragraph for social categorisation. It enhances what is said previously and relates it to the theory directly. Without this last sentence no credit could be given.

2 - A second mark is given for social identification and the correct example of dress code required to identify themselves as part of that in-group. Nothing further is said about social comparison so this answer gets 2/3.

## Script C

(c) Young people are getting a 'bad press' coverage for hanging around towns in groups and wearing 'hoodies'.



© Matt Cardy/Getty Images

Using social identity theory explain why teenagers might be getting negative media coverage.

(3)

Because the media is allowing for audiences to believe they are trouble, making people believe it. People believe what they hear on the TV, and form opinions and begin to judge people. Social identification happens when people identify with the people that aren't teenagers, which leads to prejudice feelings. ~~from the~~ <sup>Then the</sup> media are putting teenagers down, comparing everyone with them, demonstrating social comparison. (Total for Question 12 = 9 marks)



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This just gets a mark right at the end of the answer for social comparison. Everything previous is a little too general and confused.

Script D:

(c) Young people are getting a 'bad press' coverage for hanging around towns in groups and wearing 'hoodies'.



© Matt Cardy/Getty Images

Using social identity theory explain why teenagers might be getting negative media coverage.

(3)

If on the news some ~~the~~ hoodies are seen to be doing something wrong, the media makes it out to look as though every teenager wearing a hoodie is definitely bad and the same as those they see on the news. If ~~the~~ hoodies were seen through the media doing ~~something~~ good for example helping an elderly person cross a road, then people will think all hoodies were good and the same as what they see through the media.

(Total for Question 12 = 9 marks)

1.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

1 - This is very colloquial and has no psychology in it at all, and no reference to S.I.T which means it gets 0 marks.

### Question 13

Hofling proved to be the most popular study chosen for part (a) and (b), followed by Sherif with a few candidates opting for Tajfel and fewer still for Reicher and Haslam.

Better aims in part (a) were those that were always elaborated upon and clear, straight from the mark scheme. Weaker aims tended to just talk about nurses obeying doctors or to see if Milgram's findings could be replicated.

For part (b) too many responses over-relied on terminology without explanation. 'It was high in ecological validity because it was a field experiment' etc. There was lots of usage of mnemonics such as GRAVE to help candidates evaluate and in the main these tended to work well. Ethical and methodological points picked up the most marks, although better candidates did go beyond just these and could demonstrate an array of practical applications in detail.

### Question 14

Part (a) as expected was generally done well with Multi Store and Levels of Processing being the most popular theories identified. Some weaker candidates identified cue dependent or trace decay incorrectly. Others identified one theory and went on to describe a different one in part (b)

Part (b) was generally well answered but some candidates had a tendency to skip through the Multi Store Models stages without describing them in any detail. Some elaboration on capacity and duration would have been enough. The same can be said of Levels of Processing for which a few just listed the three types of processing with no explanations of the difference between each. Weaker answers also ended up repeating Bartlett's War of The Ghosts study rather than describing the reconstructive theory. It was rare to see any other models mentioned apart from the odd one about working memory.

Better candidates found this question much more straightforward and nearly always scored full marks. Any diagrams for the Multi Store were accurate and labelled and in most cases these answers could have got more than the four marks available. Better answers frequently gave examples of each level of processing without necessarily referring to the study by Craik and Tulving. These could also describe the process of reconstruction and the role of schemas in Bartlett's theory.

### Question 15

Candidates had a lot to say but often didn't relate it to the stimulus material and in some cases even the question set. Too many candidates gave rehearsed 'reliability of EWT' responses and would rigidly stick to this. Weaker answers tended to drift off into a key issue on EWT or even use concepts from the biological approach that were not relevant to the question.

Better answers made reference to a variety of concepts from the cognitive approach, cues and models of memory in particular. They tended to make explicit reference to the stimulus material throughout their answers. These used research findings from studies such as Loftus and Palmer without having to describe the whole study which was common amongst weaker candidates.

## Commentary on Q15

### Script A

15 You are sitting in a lesson and suddenly hear a loud explosion outside. You run to the window with all your classmates and see a large cloud of smoke and people running around. You are questioned the next day by the police about what happened.

Using concepts, theories and/or research from the Cognitive Approach explain why your recall of the event might differ from others who saw the same incident.

(5)

Recall might be different because at the time of the explosion you may not have had time to rehearse the information you were taking in so it would not have had time to move into the long term memory. This idea is supported by the multi store model of memory.

From the time of the event to the next day interference may have occurred and new information may have interfered and got in the way of previously stored information. For example you may have seen something on TV or talked to other people who may have interfered or contaminated what you actually saw. You may have also reconstructed your memory differently to someone else using schemas and past experiences you have stored in your memory. Confabulation may have taken place and rationalisation to try to make sense of what happened. This is supported by Bartlett's theory of reconstructive memory. The absence of cues may also affect recall of different people. You wouldn't be in the same emotional and contextual state at the police station. Research suggests that if the cognitive environment is not reinstated when recall takes place then forgetting occurs due to absence of context-dependent cues and state dependent cues. This is supported by Godden and Baddeley's study on divers. Recall is better when in same emotional state as event.

(Total for Question 15 = 5 marks)

1

2

3

4

5



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

- 1 – Good start directly answering the question and bringing in lack of rehearsal from the MSM.
- 2- Interference is used well as an explanation and elaborated upon with a solid example. The fact that the type of interference is not mentioned does not detract from the mark given.
- 3- A third mark is given here for reconstruction and confabulation which is put well and makes good reference to schemas and past experience influencing recall.
- 4-5 – The final two marks are given for the explanation of lack of cues which is well expressed and elaborated upon (both types of cue are mentioned).

Script B

15 You are sitting in a lesson and suddenly hear a loud explosion outside. You run to the window with all your classmates and see a large cloud of smoke and people running around. You are questioned the next day by the police about what happened.

Using concepts, theories and/or research from the Cognitive Approach explain why your recall of the event might differ from others who saw the same incident.

(5)

firstly, ~~delay~~ bias you didn't actually see the explosion going off, ~~and~~ so this would effect your reliability of information you give to the police. You may have a reconstructive memory of the event so you could stereotype what you thought had happened. You may be in a different psychological state from the state you were in when seeing the incident. ~~This~~ You may have not gone back to the scene when questioned by the police, supported by Cue dependent theory, how cues from the environment <sup>supported by Accident Baddeley</sup> trigger your memory. You are interviewed and questioned the next day by police, so delay may effect your memory as well as interference, how other information happened after the incident has intergered with the memories from the scene. Also, the multi-store model supports the differ of recall, as information entering your short term memory is limited to 7 items + or - 2, ~~so~~ <sup>and</sup> processing may not have been done to ensure this information would have moved into the long term memory, resulting in it being lost. Police may have asked leading questions, supported by the study by Loftus and Palmer.

1.

2.

3.

4.

(Total for Question 15 = 5 marks)



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

- 1 – No credit for the opening three explanations about reliability, reconstruction and psychological state as these are each too brief and need a little more expansion.
- 2- This is more creditworthy as it demonstrates how lack of cues may be an issue in recall.
- 3- This is also worth a mark as interference is commented upon and linked to being interviewed by the police at a later date which may affect recall.
- 4 – Although term rehearsal is missing the answer has enough in it to infer this and there is some level of detail about the capacity of STM to warrant a mark. The final sentence on leading questions is much like the first three opening ones and as such gains no credit so overall 3/5.

## Script C

15 You are sitting in a lesson and suddenly hear a loud explosion outside. You run to the window with all your classmates and see a large cloud of smoke and people running around. You are questioned the next day by the police about what happened.

Using concepts, theories and/or research from the Cognitive Approach explain why your recall of the event might differ from others who saw the same incident.

(5)

My account of the incident may differ from what other people saw as depending on how the questions from the Police are phrased. For example "So you heard a bang, you went to the window and saw some people running and some smoke." This doesn't sound too bad therefore it doesn't seem so bad but the question may be phrased differently "so you heard a loud explosion, you ran to the window, there were hundreds of people running around screaming and there was thick black smoke". This seems more dramatic therefore Person 2 is going to see the event as worse than Person 1. This is similar to the eyewitness testimony research done by Elizabeth Loftis.

1.

2.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

1 – This takes a while to get to the point about leading questions but the example is good and so gets a mark after the second quote.

2- This elaboration on the example is very good and clearly explains why the leading question may impact on the recall from the witness. Overall this answer gets 2/5.

## Script D

15 You are sitting in a lesson and suddenly hear a loud explosion outside. You run to the window with all your classmates and see a large cloud of smoke and people running around. You are questioned the next day by the police about what happened.

Using concepts, theories and/or research from the Cognitive Approach explain why your recall of the event might differ from others who saw the same incident.

(5)

~~Eyewitness testimony may differ from the event the~~

The recall of the event may differ from others who saw what happened as they may have seen what happened before the explosion as well. But recall will differ from others as if they have been interviewed before ~~that~~ ~~them~~ you then leading questions may be used. Other students may also think that they saw other things as to make it more exciting. Also under stress people believe that they see other stuff such as some one running away from the incident with it being a day after the event students will have talked after school and their stories of what happened may get affected.

1.

2.

①



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1-2

This gets one mark for the brief description about stress and interference both of which are not explained in enough detail. The whole answer itself has little explicit psychology in it.

### **Question 16**

The essay asked for an obedience study outside the USA and unfortunately far too many candidates opted for Hofling here and scored zero marks. Teachers need to ensure that students know that this was done in USA.

There were still many candidates who scored highly on this question and in turn there was a spread of all possible correct studies from the mark scheme. Better candidates could describe and evaluate (Meuss and Raaijmakers commonly) very well indeed. In fact they would typically write more than was required, would demonstrate accuracy of findings to the correct percentage and would strike a balance of both methodological and ethical issues in evaluation.

## Script A

\*16 Describe and evaluate one study of obedience from a country other than Milgram's (USA).

Name of study Muuss + Raajmaker 1966

15-65

(12)

Muuss + Raajmaker (1966) study took place in Holland on a university campus. The 39 <sup>(PPTs)</sup> participants were selected <sup>as they volunteered</sup> via a newspaper ~~article~~ <sup>the equivalent to</sup> article (same as Milgram), and were told they would be paid the sum of \$13 dollars.

Unlike Milgram, Muuss & Raajmaker split the 39 PPTs into a control and experimental groups. In the experimental there were 22 PPTs and in the control there were 15.

Both groups were told they were to interview an applicant <sup>who was</sup> (stage) for a job & if they <sup>multiple choice</sup> got the applicant got the answers to the questions correct they would receive the job.

The were also told to administer 15 stressful comments <sup>to the applicant</sup> as the PPT was told that the applicant would have to be able to deal with stressful conditions in order to get the job. The control group did not have an experimenter in the room and were told to give the stressful remarks as when they wanted. Whereas in the experimental group they were told to give the stressful remarks when told to on the television screen or by the experimenter who was present at the time.

The questions were divided into 4 parts, the first part giving no stressful comments to give a baseline measure of stress from the electrodes on the applicants head and then in the other 3 sections they gave 15 of the

stressful ~~comers~~ comers scoring from 15 (weak) to 65 (high stress). If the ppt was thought to be retracting from the study they were given a lot of set pros to administer to the ppts by the experimenter who was present.

They found that in the experimental condition 92% of the ppts gave all 15 comers, unlike Milgram who had 65%. As Muesel & Rajmoter thought in modern society psychological harm will be more common and be able to be administered easier as the effects of psychological harm are not immediate as they are with physical harm.

In the control condition all the ppts did not give all 15 comers. And Muesel & Rajmoter concluded that obedience to still as high as ever even in a liberal culture society like Holland in the 1960's.

In the study the ppts were deceived as the appraiser for the job was in fact a stooge of obs even though the ppts were aware of being in a study, they did not know the true aim.

Also the study does not have high ecological validity as the study took place on a university <sup>52 of 56</sup> campus & thus

3.

4.

was not a natural setting for the ppts.

The demand characteristics ~~at~~ were then also heightened as some of the ppts did not believe that the interview was real.

The study has some generalisability as the sample was large & it was of both males and females & so was representative & also as Milgram's study was in America it gives a result of high obedience in another country other than Holland.

In the study the ppts were not protected from harm as ~~the~~ some may have been psychologically harmed from giving stress remarks to the applicants.

Also the ppts did not have a right to withdraw as they were given 'prods' by an authoritative figure (experimenter) and so were urged to carry on with the study & so this made it harder for the ppts to withdraw.

5.

6.

7.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

- 1 – Good start directly answering the question and showing a very good level of detail - referring to how sample was found and experimental and control groups.
- 2- Good level of detail here too in the first part of the procedure highlighting differences between conditions.
- 3- Procedure is further elaborated in detail with explicit reference to questions and stressful comments.
- 4 – A concise set of findings and conclusion are given here which again with the rest of the essay so far shows a good level of detail. The description has everything apart from a clear aim
- 5- Evaluation starts off well with ethical and methodological criticisms from the mark scheme.
- 6- Both these points are well made, concise and demonstrate the candidate knows what terminology used actually means
- 7- More relevant ethical points are made and are directly related to the study not just described in a vacuum. Overall the essay fits into the middle of the top band as both injunctions have been done very well and the whole answer is detailed and balanced.

Script B

\*16 Describe and evaluate one study of obedience from a country other than Milgram's (USA).

Name of study Slater et al - UK.

(12)

This study's aim was to investigate the finding of Milgram's Obedience study, and to see if Milgram's results were still valid today.

Slater et al was a laboratory study, one which used volunteer sampling. It used similar ways to Milgram's study, in terms of getting its participants. Participants were ~~volunteers~~ volunteering

for a memory test, however, this was ~~an~~ incorrect, as it was an obedience test. Once participants turned up for the experiment, they were met by ~~Mr Smith~~ Slater

who explained to them that this was, in fact, an obedience test. There were 34 participants in total, all fully aware of the female virtual human, who was connected to electric shocks. 23 participants were

able to see the virtual human, displayed on a screen in front of them. 11 participants communicated through text, and could not see or hear the human

aviator. All participants were the teachers, having to ask the female virtual human questions, and if answered incorrectly an electric shock would be given by the teachers. This was

ordered by the learner, ~~Mr Smith~~ Slater. Participants were also told that the electric shocks were increasing in voltage, up to 350 volts. They were also told that

the more the volts increased, the more distressing the

1.

2.

virtual human became, which was visible to some participants.

The results showed that all the participants who were communicating with the <sup>virtual</sup> human gave all electric shocks. The participants who were ~~able~~ able to see the virtual human ~~were~~ were more restricted to give all shocks, and only 17 out of 23 did so. The conclusion to this study is that it does support Milgram's study and the level of obedience is still similar today.

3.

The study was a laboratory study, which was artificial, this means it has low ecological validity. The ~~control~~ variables were controlled too. There was a huge similarity between the results for Milgram's study and Slater's study, showing that Milgram's study was not just reliable of his time, and it does count for today.

4.

Because the virtual human was female, this may have affected the results, and a different outcome may have been the case if the virtual human were male.

The sample size was reasonably small, making the results hard to generalise to the population.

The location it was held in was London, which was prestigious, allowing generalisation to be difficult. Participants behaved in a <sup>46 of 56</sup> psychological subjective

state, even though the ~~was~~ virtual human was fake, showing the study has practical applications.

5.

Even though the participants were debriefed at the end of the experiment and <sup>we</sup> told that the study was for obedience, no informed consent was given before the experiment, or participants were told they were volunteering for a memory test, going against ethical guidelines.

6.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

- 1 – A good introduction with a clear aim given and demonstrates a comparison point with Milgram as a way of showing knowledge of both studies.
- 2- A nice concise procedure which has a good level of detail so it's clear what happened in the study. Good clarity and organisation shown.
- 3- The results and conclusion are reasonable but could have been elaborated upon i.e. some mention of physiological changes and level of stress encountered.
- 4 – The opening evaluative comments are correct but need some elaboration about laboratory experiments i.e. which variables could have been controlled?
- 5- Evaluation here is better but still needs points 'finishing off' i.e. practical applications applied where?
- 6- Again correct ethical points are stated but not elaborated enough. Overall though the description is better than the evaluation the latter is still done well enough for the answer to warrant marks in the level 3 band.

## Script D

Meelus and Raaijmakers Dutch study.

\*16 Describe and evaluate **one** study of obedience from a country other than Milgram's (USA).

Name of study Meelus and Raaijmakers.

(12)

1. In this study there were 24 participants, who were told to be interviewers. They were told to make the interviewee person being interviewed feel under pressure by making remarks. The person the participants were told to continue making unbecomingly negative remarks throughout the interview to make the person being interviewed feel stressed.

2. The study has a very small sample size so it will be hard to generalise. It has low ecological validity ~~has~~ as this is not a realistic situation. The study however can be repeated as it has controls. It relates to Milgram's study as the participants did what they were told even though it went against their moral code. The study was set out in a different country so it is ethnocentric. The study may have harmed the participant as they were told to harm another person. The participants were debriefed so they understood why the experiment took place.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

- 1 – Very limited description with brief statements given about the procedure only.
- 2 – Six separate evaluation points are made in this whole paragraph (which are all relevant criticisms) not one of which is in enough detail or elaborated. This puts this answer into the top of the first band.

## Unit Test 6PSO2/01

### General Comments.

This was the first exam for unit 2 in the new specification. The new paper, which is longer in terms of both time and marks, included multiple-choice questions and 2 essays in the final section.

Time did not seem to be an issue with most candidates attempting all of the questions including both essays in section c, which was pleasing to see, and few answers towards the end of the paper seemed to be rushed.

Candidates did seem to find the AO3 questions more difficult than some of the other questions. In some cases, this was through clear lack of knowledge, whilst for other questions marks tended to be lost through lack of detail. Evaluation is still a weaker area than description, with the majority of candidates feeling that some description was necessary when the question just asked for evaluation, the difference being the weaker candidates tended to write a lot of description with very little evaluation, whilst the stronger candidates offered a small amount of description as a means of introducing the topic. If the question is a straightforward evaluation question, then there is no need to write any description. With regard to the stimulus question, it was good to see that most candidates referred to the stimulus at least once. It is important to note that when a stimulus is given and the question asks the candidates to refer to the example, not doing so will limit the marks they can gain from that question.

### *Questions 1-10 Multiple Choice.*

This was a new feature of the exam, though most candidates will have also done multiple-choice on 6PSO1. It was not necessarily as easy as the candidates may have thought, though good candidates were able to gain high marks on this section.

Questions 1-5 were non-methodological questions and tended to be answered well, apart from question 3 on negative reinforcement, where a lot of candidates confused it with punishment and so crossed the wrong answer. Questions 5-10 were on research methods, which did not tend to be as well answered, though the good candidates could get most of these marks as well. Weaker candidates thought the description of a random sample was actually opportunity sample, possibly because this is the type of sample they have used throughout their practicals during the course. For question 10, a lot of candidates could get at least one mark. The one they had most difficulty with was the type of data needed for a Mann Whitney U Test.

Some candidates indicated 2 boxes for their answer when the instructions clearly stated 1 box for those questions, and so did not get a mark as they did not clearly state what their answer was. Some candidates failed to put a cross in any box for some questions, or only 1 box when the answer had 2 correct answers. This may have been a case of not reading the instructions above the questions clearly, or not being sure of the answer.

### Question 11

Most candidates were able to give a non-directional hypothesis, though a minority did give a null. There were very few directional hypotheses. However a lot of candidates only gained 1 of the 2 marks due to lack of detail. Most were able to say the left or right foot but few operationalised the DV in the hypothesis, just stating they gained an advantage without referring to speed or time.

Part (b) was generally well answered with most candidates being able to identify that it was a repeated measures design, though a few did state independent measures. It might help candidates if they underlined the main points in stimulus questions referring to research methods as they were reading them.

In part (c) the vast majority of the candidates were able to identify correctly what the IV was.

**11** A study was carried out to investigate whether kicking off from the starting block with the right foot or left foot gave sprinters an advantage. 20 participants were asked to take part in two sprints; in one trial they kicked off with their left foot and in another with their right. It was found that, on average, kicking off with their right foot gave them an advantage of 80 ms (milliseconds).

(a) Give a non-directional (two-tailed) experimental hypothesis for the study.

2 Q11a  
(2)

There will be a significant difference in the amount of time taken (ms) to run a sprint if the runner <sup>kicks off</sup> starts on either their right or left foot.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This clearly identifies the DV as the amount of time taken to run the sprint and the kicking off with their left or right foot and so can gain both marks.

**11** A study was carried out to investigate whether kicking off from the starting block with the right foot or left foot gave sprinters an advantage. 20 participants were asked to take part in two sprints; in one trial they kicked off with their left foot and in another with their right. It was found that, on average, kicking off with their right foot gave them an advantage of 80 ms (milliseconds).

(a) Give a non-directional (two-tailed) experimental hypothesis for the study.

1 Q11a  
(2)

The will be a significant difference when participants kick off with their right foot than with their left.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Whilst the IV is clearly operationalised as the right or left foot, the DV is not operationalised at all. They just say there will be a difference so this can only gain 1 mark.

### Question 12

Question 12 was not very well answered, with some candidates clearly not understanding levels of significance, and either leaving it blank or answering incorrectly. In part (a), some candidates just said it was the level of significance without saying what the term meant. Others gained a mark for knowing what  $p$  meant but failed to convert the 0.05 to 5% or 1/20. Others failed to include the term less than. A lot of candidates just said that  $p$  was equal to or less than 0.05 so not showing any understanding of the term and so gaining no marks. Others thought the term meant the probability the results were significant was 5% rather than chance. Whether candidates attempted to answer this correctly or not seemed to be centre specific.

Most candidates could correctly state that the null hypothesis could be rejected in part (b)(i), though there were some blank spaces. Again it is worth the candidate attempting this question even if they aren't sure of the answer.

Part (b)(ii) was again poorly answered, though most of those who attempted it could use the table and say the observed value was bigger than the critical value and so gain a mark. However some then went on to talk about 0.05 or 0.025 as the critical value rather than 0.380 or 0.447. Those that got part (b)(i) incorrect tended to get this wrong as well.

12 Researchers carried out a correlational study to see if there was a relationship between eating breakfast and students' scores on a maths test. They carried out a Spearman's rho test on the data and found that the observed value of rho was +0.519,  $N = 20$ .

Table to show the critical values for Spearman's test.

	$p \leq 0.05$	$p \leq 0.025$
$N = 20$	0.380	0.447

(The observed/calculated value of rho must be equal to or greater than the critical/table value to be significant.)

(a) What is meant by the term  $p \leq 0.05$ ?

(2) 1 Q12a

$p \leq 0.05$  is the significance level in psychology. It means we are 95% confident that the results are because of and not chance so we have to allow 5% for chance

(b) (i) State whether the researchers would reject their null hypothesis.

(1) 1 Q12bi

The researchers would reject their null hypothesis

(ii) Explain your answer to (b)(i).

(2) 2 Q12bii

The observed value was 0.519 and the critical value at significance level  $p \leq 0.05$  was 0.380 therefore it is significant because the observed value is greater than the critical value so the researchers would reject the null hypothesis and accept the hypothesis



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Part (a). The candidate knows that the probability the results are down to chance is 5%. However they fail to include less than so only gain 1 mark.

Part (b)(i) gains a mark for correctly saying we can reject the null hypothesis.

Part (b)(ii) is a good answer clearly giving the correct figures for the observed value and the critical value and then saying why the null can be rejected by comparing the figures and stating the observed value is bigger than the critical value.

12 Researchers carried out a correlational study to see if there was a relationship between eating breakfast and students' scores on a maths test. They carried out a Spearman's rho test on the data and found that the observed value of rho was +0.519,  $N = 20$ .

**Table to show the critical values for Spearman's test.**

	$p \leq 0.05$	$p \leq 0.025$
$N = 20$	0.380	0.447

(The observed/calculated value of rho must be equal to or greater than the critical/table value to be significant.)

(a) What is meant by the term  $p \leq 0.05$ ?

(2) 2 Q12a

this means there is a less than or equal to chance of 5% that the results occurred by chance rather than the relationship between the IV and the DV.

(b) (i) State whether the researchers would reject their null hypothesis.

(1) 1 Q12bi

yes they can reject ~~the~~ null hypothesis

(ii) Explain your answer to (b)(i).

(2) 2 Q12bii

because the observed value<sup>0.519</sup> is greater than the critical value of 0.380 when  $N = 20$  at  $\leq 0.05$ .



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Part (a). This candidate gets both marks as they have correctly converted 0.05 into 5% and told us there is a less than or equal chance of the results being by chance.

Part (b)(i). This gets the mark for saying yes. The rest of the answer shows understanding but was not needed as the mark was already given.

Part (b)(ii). This is another good answer where the candidate clearly understands that the observed value has to be bigger than the critical value and uses the correct figures from the table.

12 Researchers carried out a correlational study to see if there was a relationship between eating breakfast and students' scores on a maths test. They carried out a Spearman's rho test on the data and found that the observed value of rho was +0.519, N = 20.

**Table to show the critical values for Spearman's test.**

	$p \leq 0.05$	$p \leq 0.025$
N = 20	0.380	0.447

(The observed/calculated value of rho must be equal to or greater than the critical/table value to be significant.)

(a) What is meant by the term  $p \leq 0.05$ ? (2) 0 Q12a

*p ≤ 0.05 is the significance level which means if the end value is significant then there will be a 5% chance that it will happen.*

(b) (i) State whether the researchers would reject their null hypothesis. (1) 0 Q12bi

*No they would not reject their null hypothesis.*

(ii) Explain your answer to (b)(i). (2) 0 Q12bii

*because to reject the null hypothesis the value must be more than 0.40 at  $p \leq 0.05$  whereas in this case the value is 0.380 which is less than 0.40.*



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Part (a). This did not get any marks, and shows how candidates confused the fact that the term meant the results would be significant to 5% rather than significant to 95% or more.

Part (b)(i) is also incorrect.

Part (b)(ii) shows the impact a correct answer to part (b)(i) has on this answer. Again it is not worth any marks as the candidate has clearly confused what is meant by the term observed value, thinking the critical value of 0.447 is the observed value.

### Question 13

Part (a) was answered very well, with most students being able to gain good marks for describing the Oedipus complex. Candidates were able to refer to the complex in terms of rivalry, castration fear and identification with the father. Some candidates developed their answers well including reference to defence mechanisms, the superego, morality and gender. Whilst most candidates could say at what stage it occurred or the correct age, very few gave the two together, or tended to get the age of the phallic stage incorrect. Many forgot to say that the complex occurs unconsciously, leading to inappropriate comments about the son and the mother. A minority just described the psychosexual stages instead of focusing on the Oedipus complex. Some lost marks because they tended to repeat the same points in different words throughout their answers.

Candidates found part (b) harder, with the weaker students offering lengthy descriptions of the 5 stages with very little evaluation. Most candidates used Little Hans as supporting evidence, but failed to include the results of the study, instead concentrating on a description of the procedure which was not credit worthy. Some evaluated the theory in terms of the methods used focusing on subjectivity, generalisability and reliability. Too often candidates based their evaluation in terms of it explains what it explains e.g. it explains that if we get stuck in the oral stage we suck our thumbs, which is descriptive rather than evaluative. A lot of the evaluation was opinion without any justification, so the candidates said it was not generalisable without explaining why, and so not gaining marks. Good candidates managed to compare the theory to other theories such as the biological theory.

13 Oedipus was a man who had been raised by foster parents and did not know his real parents. He killed his father during a battle, and, as the victor, married his mother.

(a) Describe Freud's theory of how boys develop through the Oedipus Complex.

(4) 3 Q13a

The Oedipus complex occurs in the phallic stage at around 5 years old, the boy realises that he has a penis and that his mother does not and then becomes interested in his mother as the obvious female. The boy views his father as a rival for his mother's affection and fears that he father will castrate him if he knows about his desire for his mother, this is called castration anxiety. <sup>the boy also wishes to kill his father so he can have his mother</sup>

as the boy goes through the Oedipus complex he decides the way in which to gain his mother is through identification with his father to 'become' him. When the boy identifies and 'becomes' his father he no longer wants to kill him and has passed through the Oedipus complex and gained a male gender identity.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer gained full marks. The first sentence is not relevant to the answer but it then goes on to compare it to the social learning approach and the biological approach so gaining two marks. It then gains a mark for saying that he collected qualitative data that is high in validity, a good example of explaining the point. Again the points on generalisability and reliability explain why these are a problem instead of just stating that they are. The last sentence on subjectivity also gains a mark.

(b) Evaluate Freud's theory of psychosexual development.

You may find it helpful to include:

- application to real life
- comparison with other explanations
- methodology
- research evidence.

(5) 3 Q13b

Freud's theory of development has been criticized by alternative theory such as the social learning approach. Bandura states that children develop their gender identity by imitating a relevant same-sex role model. This is one aspect which Freud fails to consider. ~~Back~~<sup>Supporting</sup> evidence ~~comes~~<sup>for the</sup> psychosexual development theory from Freud's Little Hans study which was an in-depth case study which found a little boy experiencing the oedipus complex. The Hans study concluded by Hans identifying with his father just as the theory states.

Freud's theory can be applied to modern day society to explain when some people are fixated in the phallic stage of development and "stuck" in the oedipus complex it may cause problems in adult life. For example failure to pass through the oedipus complex means lots of energy is wasted and could explain problems in adult relationships as the individual may be proud or incapable of loving another person.

Evidence for Freud's development theory came in the form of case studies which have many flaws, for example Little Hans' study got its information from a secondary source as it was from Hans' father. Freud only met Hans once which meant supporting evidence for this theory could be low in validity and not true to life.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer gained 3 marks. The first sentence is a nice comparison using social learning theory, and the second sentence clearly states that Little Hans identified with his father so supporting the theory rather than just saying Little Hans supports the theory. The second paragraph does not gain any marks. This is an example of saying the theory says what it says with no application. If there had been comments on how therapy could be used to help adults with problems, then it could have gained the mark. The final mark was given for the third paragraph as it explains why there was a flaw with the Little Hans study, but the last sentence shows some confusion over the term validity. Though there were flaws with how the data was collected in the experiment it does not mean that the theory is not true to life.

(b) Evaluate Freud's theory of psychosexual development.

You may find it helpful to include:

- application to real life
- comparison with other explanations
- methodology
- research evidence.

*reference mechanisms scientifically measured*

(5) 2 Q13b

Freud's theory of psychosexual development is useful in that it can be used as an application to society as in everyday life boys and girls do <sup>sometimes</sup> experience problems at those stages resulting in them becoming fixated. Freud's theory can be used to explain such behaviour. However there are other explanations for ~~a~~ particular behaviours as according to the biological approach which suggests that genes and the ~~the~~ environment is hugely responsible for the ~~the~~ ~~being~~ and the development of the personality of certain individuals. Again more negatively researchers cannot scientifically test and measure Freud's theory of psychosexual development as it can't be seen but instead is Freud's interpretation, this subsequently affects the reliability of his ~~theories~~ making it difficult to be <sup>applied and</sup> replicated as a case study.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The first part of the answer is just description saying the theory explains what it explains. There is a comparison to the biological theory, which gained a mark after bracketing out the bit about the environment. The bit about it can't be tested scientifically did not get a mark as it can be tested scientifically, it is just hard to. Indeed there are now studies that have tested the theory using scanning techniques. The final mark comes for explaining why it is hard to replicate his case studies.

### **Question 14**

Most candidates were able to gain 1 or 2 marks for both parts of (a), but very few gained the third mark available, mainly because candidates failed to extend their answers. Most gave a definition of each term and could then relate it to Manpreet in the stimulus material, which was pleasing to see. Some candidates did get the two terms mixed up and so didn't gain any marks.

Part (b) was very well answered with the vast majority of candidates gaining all 3 marks. The small minority that did not get full marks tended to mix up the terms neurotransmitter and receptor.

### **Question 15**

Part (a)(i) was very well answered with the majority of candidates being able to give enough detail about the aims and procedure to gain good marks. Very few went on to give the results or conclusion, showing they are reading the question carefully. Those candidates who remembered the two aims found it easier to gain full marks. The sample was generally given in enough detail to gain a mark, as the three conditions of the study. Several candidates stated that the children were frustrated before they saw the model, which was incorrect. Some candidates confused the Bandura studies, referring to whether the model was punished or rewarded or saying they viewed the model on the TV.

Most candidates answered part (b) very well. The most common mistake was thinking that it was not true that about a third of the children who saw the aggressive model imitated the behaviour.

Part (c) was also answered well. The most common mistake was thinking that being in a nursery made the study controlled. In these sort of questions the candidates do need to read the whole sentence once they have finished their answer to make sure what they have written fits.

### **Question 16**

This was an evaluation question but a lot of candidates tended to describe the therapy rather than evaluate it, especially the weaker candidates. The most common therapy used was aversion therapy and these answers tended to focus on the ethical issues involved. The use of the therapy with homosexuals was often used but they often lacked clarity when referring to the ethics of this. There were also a lot of answers about systematic desensitisation and token economy. The token economy answers tended to be weaker, possibly through lack of evidence to support that it works. A lot of answers needed to be explained further, e.g. a candidate may say evidence shows it works without giving the results of that evidence. A minority of candidates evaluated classical or operant conditioning rather than a therapy.

16 Classical and/or operant conditioning can be applied to the treatment of psychological disorders. Examples include aversion therapy, flooding, systematic desensitisation and token economy.

Evaluate **one** treatment/therapy from **either** classical **or** operant conditioning.

Name of treatment/therapy aversion therapy

(4) 2 Q16

Aversion therapy involves classical conditioning. This could be said to be unethical as it causes sickness on the patient, which means they experience short term physical harm. Also, once conditioned, the conditioned response of being sick may become extinct and therefore the treatment will be unsuccessful.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Gains 2 marks 1 for each sentence as the candidate explains the problems with the therapy rather than just state the problems.

~~Primary~~ Aversion therapy can cure people of alcoholism, which in the long term can make them healthier and greatly benefit them. Also, spontaneous recovery could occur, which would mean if they began to drink again later on in life after the therapy, the stimulus may cause the conditioned response - sickness - and stop the patient from becoming an alcoholic again. This therapy does not work on everyone therefore cannot be generalised.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The first sentence is just saying what it does.

16 Classical and/or operant conditioning can be applied to the treatment of psychological disorders. Examples include aversion therapy, flooding, systematic desensitisation and token economy.

Evaluate **one** treatment/therapy from **either** classical **or** operant conditioning.

Name of treatment/therapy token economy Systematic Desensitisation

(4) 1 Q16

~~Token economy~~

Systematic Desensitisation is a very effective way to help people suffering from phobias.

The therapy can be completed in up to a week and the patient can control <sup>the time taken for</sup> ~~how~~ quickly the therapy to be completed.

~~The~~ <sup>Systematic</sup> Desensitisation prevents the phobia from recurring because it does not involve operant or classical conditioning which can result in extinction.

However ~~is~~ the patient does not complete the therapy it can make the phobia much worse than before.

Also systematic desensitisation can only help people to deal with certain phobias where it cannot be applied to agoraphobia. Also it is only limited to phobias and cannot be applied to things such as addictions.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The first paragraph just tells us it is a treatment for phobias.

2nd paragraph tells us that the patient can control the therapy, but this is just description, if they had added that this makes it ethical, it could have gained a mark here.

4th paragraph Again the candidate has not elaborated enough to gain the mark.

5th paragraph. This gains a mark as it tells us it is limited and goes on to tell us what the therapy cannot be applied to.

O'leary 10'leary state that token economy has been seen to work in Society. They also describe it to be very effective as the recognition of desired behaviour and the association of the reinforcement/reward is instant.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This does not get a mark as it is too vague, and does not answer questions such as where exactly was the study carried out, and how did they find out it was effective?

Token economy systems are widely used in institutions like schools, hospitals and prison. This is an application to society which is effective. Token economy programmes are also cheap and easy to use and do not take lots of time or money to train staff how to use it.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The first sentence is too vague. It is just telling us where it can be applied but not how, and for what behaviours. The second sentence gains a mark, as they go beyond it is cheap and easy to use by telling us why.

Token economy systems are widely used in institutions like schools, hospitals and prison. This is an application to society which is effective. Token economy programmes are also cheap and easy to use and do not take lots of time or money to train staff how to use it.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Both sentences gain a mark for stating a problem and then elaborating and saying why it is a problem.

### **Question 17**

Most candidates were able to identify the correct practical and then go on to offer some description and evaluation of it, though some did write about a practical from another approach, often the learning approach, and so gained no marks. It is the teacher's responsibility to make sure the practicals carried out are ethical and within the capability of the candidate. Details on the procedure were limited due to the fact that a lot of candidates failed to mention the scoring system at all, so limiting them to level 2 of the mark scheme. Some candidates were disadvantaged as the practical had been led and designed by the teacher so they showed little grasp of the whole process and tended to just state that they had to answer a questionnaire that they were given.

The evaluation tended to be better than the description of the procedure. However a lot of candidates made generic points without referring them specifically to their practical. Many candidates did not understand the difference between reliability and validity. Many remarks about validity stated it was valid because "it showed what I was looking for", which does not necessarily make a study valid. Better candidates made good evaluation points about the honesty of the participants, the retrospective ratings of parental strictness and social desirability.

\*17 For part of your course you will have carried out a practical in the Psychodynamic Approach using a correlation.

When evaluating your practical you may look at:

Anal personality

- validity
- reliability
- credibility
- generalisability.

Describe the **procedure** of your practical, and **evaluate** your practical.

Title of your investigation

An investigation ~~to see if there is correlation~~ to see if there is correlation between Anal personality and tidiness of school folders. (10) 7 Q17

We ~~was~~ started by writing a pilot study into Anal personalities. We then got other people in our psychology ~~class~~ class to test it out as a way of checking the questions made sense and weren't too personal. We then wrote standardised instructions ~~saying~~ explaining that we were looking into Anal personalities and saying that the person had the right to withdraw at any time or choose to leave any questions they felt uncomfortable with. We remade the questionnaire using the feed back from the pilot. We gathered all the results from this in a table and then rated the tidiness of psychology folders using a peer rating system. We used a Spearman's Rho to find ~~the~~ ~~critical value~~ see if we had a positive correlation. We then accepted or rejected the hypothesis. As our practical was



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The variables are clearly identified in the title of the procedure. A good explanation of why the pilot study was used and how the ethics of the practical were addressed. We know how they collected their data about parental strictness and tidiness but not the actual scoring system, e.g. how did they rate the tidiness of folders? This limits the answer to band 2.

results meant that we had to reject the hypothesis and accept the null hypothesis, this does not seem very credible as you would think someone who an anal personality would have a tidy file. However, this may ~~be~~ have been effected by the fact that our psychology teacher makes us keep our files tidy, this would mean normally untidy people ~~would~~ <sup>might</sup> have tidy files. This makes the results less valid. Also, the peer rating system may have made the results less valid as peers are more likely to ~~be~~ over kind or extremely unkind to each other. The results can be generalised to some extent as we used a large sample, all within the same age group. This means it can be generalised to ~~be~~ <sup>16-17</sup> 16-17 year olds. However, as it was all psychology students the sample is not very representative making it more difficult to generalise



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

A good evaluation, relating validity to the actual practical and how the tidiness of the files was affected by the teacher, as well as peers not wanting to appear unkind so their ratings may not be accurate. Generalisability is also related to the actual sample. If it had mentioned the scoring system this answer would have got into level 3. This answer scored 7 marks.

\*17 For part of your course you will have carried out a practical in the Psychodynamic Approach using a correlation.

When evaluating your practical you may look at:

- validity
- reliability
- credibility
- generalisability.

Describe the **procedure** of your practical, and **evaluate** your practical.

Title of your investigation How parental strictness effected  
how tidy we are. (10) 3 Q17

During our procedure we were given an envelope, a questionnaire and a pen. We were asked to fill in the questionnaire, re-seal the envelope and hand it in anonymously. The ~~procedure~~ experiment was a field experiment.

Because our experiment was a field experiment it gained ecological validity because participants were in their own natural environment.

Our practical experiment had bad controls because it was a field experiment and experimenters were unable to control the surroundings and any extraneous variables.

Our ~~results~~ questionnaire ~~was~~ consisted of closed questions therefore it was quick and easy to complete and the ~~answers~~ answers came from numerical / qualitative



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The description of the method is very weak, showing how a teacher led practical affected the understanding of the procedure. The comment on ecological validity is a general comment and not related to this practical, e.g. what was the natural environment? The comments on the controls were also weak, what exactly was not controlled in this practical? This is limited to level 1; there was some coherence in the writing so 3 marks.

### **Question 18**

Part (a) contained some very good answers though there were some common mistakes. Candidates tended to misunderstand the role of oestrogen on the foetus, saying it needed to be in the womb to become female. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the role of genes only, whilst stronger candidates looked at genes, hormones and brain lateralisation. There was however, some confusion over brain lateralisation with some candidates saying men only use one side of the brain, when in fact they use both but one is more dominant. Some candidates seemed to misread the question and focussed on gender abnormalities rather than gender development.

Part (b) saw a variety of answers with the good answers using studies as evidence, comparing the biological approach to gender with other approaches and offering opposing evidence. Weaker candidates offered a description of the biological approach to gender, often repeating what they had written in part (a), and evaluating the biological approach in general without focusing on gender. The David Reimer study was often used as supporting evidence, but the weaker candidates often included little else in their answer. Candidates who offered this as the only study were unable to get into the top level of the mark scheme. It was clear that some candidates had prepared a comparison of gender development answer, and wrote this without focusing on what the question actually asked. A few candidates lost marks by writing in bullet points rather than in essay format.

18 (a) In the Biological Approach you studied factors affecting gender development.

Describe how genes, hormones and/or brain lateralisation affect gender development.

(4) 3 Q18a

The genes you receive from your parents are part of chromosomes. You receive 23 pairs from mother & 23 from father. The final pair is the sex chromosome. XX = female XY = male. All foetus' will begin as the female route & at about 8 weeks, the presence of the hormone testosterone, will decide if it follows a male/female route. Testosterone is linked to aggressive behaviour. The above is known as sex differentiation. Brain lateralisation is the uneven division of labour between the left & right hemispheres. Typically, language is linked to the right hemisphere & visuospatial skills are linked to the left. It is thought that males brains are unequal, whereas females is equal. Studies (next question) support this idea.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This shows a good use of evidence to support the approach, with clear comments on the results and how they support the biological approach to gender.

\*(b) Evaluate the biological explanation for gender.

You may like to include comparisons with other explanations as well as other evaluation points.

(12) 11Q18b

~~the~~ Continuing brain lateralisation, studies such as McGlone have found that when a stroke occurs, mens language skills (left) become increasingly more affected than womens. Kulynyan '92 supports this saying that male <sup>left</sup> ~~frontal~~ temporal planes are 38% longer than womens. This supports that ~~men~~ men have a more uneven division of labour than women.

There are studies that support gender identity for the biological approach - for example the Batista boys (Imperato McGinley) in the Dominican Republic had 4 sons brought up as <sup>girls</sup> ~~male~~ but age 12, 4 of them grew penis & testes descended. This supports because they all took to their new gender roles perfectly. Donner also found a sex centre in rats brains that when damaged/removed (lesioning/ablation) they would become homosexual. This is transferable to humans ~~also found that~~

The learning approach criticises the biological approach to gender as they believe gender is learnt from environment



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Page 2. A clear explanation of how the learning approach is different, with evidence to support what they are saying, which can be seen as opposing evidence for the biological approach. The comparison to the psychodynamic approach is also clear. The writing style lets this essay down a little and it scores 11 marks.

\*(b) Evaluate the biological explanation for gender.

You may like to include comparisons with other explanations as well as other evaluation points.

(12) 3 Q18b

The biological explanation for gender believes that genes and hormones mainly determine <sup>a person's</sup> ~~person's~~ gender, and the chromosome combination of either XX (female) or XY (male) determines gender development through a person's life, and also determines the gender differences we have noticed. The biological explanation believes fully that gender is determined by "nature," and this partly agrees with the psychodynamic ~~approach~~ explanation for gender, as Freud believed that gender was partly determined by biological factors, for which the libido and Thanatos are included, but also environmental "nurture" factors, such as the Oedipus and Electra complexes. The psychodynamic approach believes that the Oedipus and Electra complexes are crucial to gender development, as through these the child learns gender appropriate behaviour through identifying and consolidating learning with the same-sex parent. The biological explanation for gender completely disregards any "nurture" or environmental influences on gender development. The ~~learning~~ social learning theorist explanation for gender completely disagrees with the biological one, as social learning theorists believe that children develop their gender through copying same-sex role models and learning gender-appropriate behaviour through this. Behaviourist explanation for gender also completely disagrees ~~with~~ with the biological explanation, as it believes that gender is learnt through "nature," as in learning ~~through~~ gender appropriate behaviour through reinforcement (operant conditioning) and association (classical conditioning).



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The description at the start of the essay is irrelevant. This answer is just comparing the biological approach to the psychodynamic and learning approaches, and has very little to say about the biological approach so is limited to level 1 and scores 3 marks.

## Statistics

### 6PS01

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	80	64	56	48	40	32
Raw boundary mark	60	46	41	37	33	29

### 6PS02

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
Raw boundary mark	80	58	53	48	43	38

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

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481  
Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)  
Order Code US021630 June 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

