

Examiners' Report

June 2014

GCE Psychology 6PS02 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2014

Publications Code US039794

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

Introduction

This seemed to be an accessible paper on the whole with very few blank pages, and the vast majority of students completed the whole paper. Issues include a lack of detail from the students when explaining their answers; examiners cannot make any assumptions about what the students mean, they can only mark what is written. Some evaluation still tends to be generic, especially when evaluating studies. In such cases, the points made could apply to a variety of studies and do not show understanding of the particular study being considered. Evaluation of the practical is also generic at times. Examiners have seen improvement in students' responses to the scenarios; they often accurately link the points they are making to the given scenario, though again lack of detail can hinder the level of achievement. The report that follows aims to point out good practices and common weaknesses that occurred throughout this paper to give guidance on how to answer questions in future series and avoid common mistakes.

Question 14 (a)

Most students were able to gain 1 mark here for a directional hypothesis, with very few giving a non-directional or null hypothesis. However, most candidates failed to gain the full 2 marks as they did not fully operationalise both variables. Most responses had operationalised the IV but only the best operationalised the DV and gave a unit of time. Those who only got 1 mark tended to talk about faster/quicker, without giving a unit of time.

Male pupils will complete a jigsaw puzzle faster than female pupils.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gets 1 mark.

This response failed to operationalise the DV. The student just says faster, and gives no unit of time.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Fully operationalise both the IV and the DV to get 2 marks for a hypothesis.

Females will complete the jigsaw in fewer minutes than men/males.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response scores 2 marks as both the IV (female and male) and the DV (minutes) are operationalised

Question 14 (b)

Whilst the majority of students did gain some marks, very few achieved full marks. The **strength** tended to be done better than the **weakness**. The strength tended to be about an unbiased sample but those who did not get the second mark failed to expand on their answer and explain why it was unbiased or why having an unbiased sample was a strength.

The weakness was less well done with many students writing about a weakness of Jamila's sample, linking it to the school or the age range rather than focusing on a weakness of random sampling. Those who did focus on a weakness of random sampling often failed to gain the second mark through lack of elaboration; eg, they said it was time consuming but not **why** it was time consuming.

Some students did confuse **random sampling** with **opportunity sampling** and gained no credit.

Everyone has ~~to~~ an equal chance of being chosen to take part in the experiment. ~~Jamila selected participants from the local~~ ^{all pupils} all had an equal chance of being picked.

Weakness

There ~~will~~ ^{may} not be an equal amount of males and females.
Eg. In Jamila's experiment she would need an equal amount of males and females to find a fair difference and with random sampling this may not happen.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 1 mark.

1 mark for the strength but there is no elaboration in the second part of the first bullet point for the second mark.

0 marks for the weakness, as uneven numbers of males and females would be balanced out by the statistical tests, nor is it a weakness specific to random sampling. There could be uneven numbers with any type of sample.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When a question, or part of a question is worth 2 marks then elaboration is needed to gain the second mark.

It ensures every participant has an equal chance of being picked reducing the chance of bias results e.g. bias results could occur if Jamila used older males than females as the age could effect the pupils' ability to complete the jigsaw puzzle.

Weakness

The sample is only as ~~not~~ representative as the group chosen meaning that some groups may not be represented ^{e.g.} so the results could lack generalisability. e.g. Jamila did not include home-schooled children so may not be able to generalise her results to them.

(Total for Question 14 = 6 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 4 marks (2+2):

Strength 1 mark for the first sentence and 1 mark for elaboration using Jamila.

Weakness 1 mark for "lack generalisability" because it is qualified by saying "some groups may not be represented" and 1 mark for the example using Jamila and home schooled children who would not be included.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

If there is a scenario with the question the scenario **can** be used to gain the elaboration mark, though it does not have to be used.

Question 15 (a)

Better responses could gain full marks here by using ARRM (attention, retention, reproduction and motivation) in relation to the scenario, explaining each point and adding explanations of vicarious reinforcement and/or role models. However, many responses did not gain full marks as they relied solely on the **use** of the terms ARRM without further explanation. Whilst a good number did explain the terms in relation to the scenario, all too often students did not explain them or responses were repetitive e.g. Attention: Tim paid attention to... Repetition was commonly seen in responses to this question which limited the marks which could be awarded.

Some students confused SLT with operant conditioning, and then realised their mistake when looking at Q15(b), resulting in frequent crossings out. Weaker responses were about operant or classical conditioning with no mention to SLT.

Tim may have observed his mother doing this and so imitated her. Factors can increase the likelihood that Tim would copy his mother e.g. if his mother is a very likeable person Tim would be more likely to copy her. Also, if Tim has low self esteem he would be more likely to copy his mother. Vicarious reinforcement could have also played a part in this. This means that Tim could have taken into account what happens to other people when they wash up the dishes. For example, he may have observed his mother praising his sister after she washed up the dishes. This praise and attention given to the sister acts as vicarious reinforcement making it more likely that Tim would copy. This could explain how Tim might have learned to help his mother. Vicarious reinforcement

could also be shown in other ways e.g. Tim could have watched a TV programme which showed a boy helping his mother being praised by him family for being helpful and kind. This could also explain how Tim learned to help his mother wash the dishes.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 5 marks.

1 mark for the first sentence.

1 mark for the mother being likeable. The reference to self esteem is irrelevant. "Vicarious reinforcement" alone needs more detail to get the mark but 1 mark is given for "vicarious reinforcement" and the example of his sister. 1 mark for saying "it makes it more likely he will copy"; 1 mark for the example using the television.

Tim might have seen his mother before washing the dishes and he is trying to immitate her behaviour to get rewarded or praised. He might do that as a result from nurture, where he sees everyone in the environment acting in the same way and decides to do the same. Tim's father might have told him to help his mother and he is doing that as a fear of castigating him.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response scores 1 mark only for the first sentence.

A 6 mark question needs six different points to be made to access full marks.

Question 15 (b)

This was generally better answered than part (a), with many students gaining full marks.

Students developed the use of operant conditioning in explaining how Tim washed up, by discussing positive/negative reinforcement and punishment. A few responses just discussed a token economy programme, which is based on operant conditioning principles, but were not developed. The students who did not gain full marks often confused punishment and negative reinforcement, or failed to give examples relating to the scenario. Some students confused operant conditioning with social learning theory and went on to write about vicarious reinforcement. A small minority used classical conditioning rather than operant conditioning in their answer.

Operant conditioning largely involved the work of Skinner and Skinner's box where Rat could learn to press a lever for food. Tim may help his mother wash up as he may receive a secondary reinforcer such as money and those are things which help bring around our primary reinforcers which are biological needs. If he receives money this would also be a positive reinforce which would then encourage a repeat of the behaviour, although he may receive a negative reinforcer like being shouted at for not doing the dishes, which also encourages the desired behaviour. He may also have negative punishment for not doing the dishes for example his mum may take away his sweets or on the other hand is positive punishment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 3 marks.

1 mark for "secondary reinforcer such as money" 1 mark for "money" and "positive reinforcer" and "encourage repeat of behaviour". There is no reward for "negative reinforcer" and "shouted at" as it needs to add "to avoid being shouted at he washes the dishes". 1 mark for "negative punishment" with example. "Positive punishment" is not rewarded; it needs explaining or an example.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Explain terms when they are used.

This may have been to help his mother by washing up the dishes through reinforcement. If this had wasted the dishes for his mum previously and been regarded for it he would want to repeat this behaviour in order to get rewards therefore learning to do the dishes.

Also, if Thi did not do the dishes one night and he got punished for this - a negative consequence occurred, this would cause him not to want to repeat the behaviour therefore making him learn to do the dishes.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response scores 2 out of 4 since only two points are made.

The first paragraph scores 1 mark for the reference to repeating the behaviour because he was rewarded for it. 1 mark for the second paragraph for "punished" and "negative consequence" and "not want to repeat the punishment" and "do the dishes".



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure enough is written to access all the marks.

Question 16 (i)

This tended to be well answered with most students gaining full marks.

Question 16 (ii)

This tended to be well answered with most students gaining full marks.

Question 16 (iii)

This tended to be well answered with most students gaining full marks.

Question 16 (iv)

This tended to be well answered with most students gaining full marks.

Question 16 (v)

This tended to be well answered with most students gaining full marks

Question 17 (a)

The most popular study by far was Watson and Rayner. Students who used this study showed good understanding of the study with plenty of detail in their answer. However, there were a minority of students who mixed up the animal used in the conditioning, talking about a white rabbit or a white mouse rather than a white rat. This is a study in detail and such details are expected to be accurate. A smaller number also confused what was used to make the loud noise which again limited the marks they could get.

The students who used Skinner; some wrote about the superstitious pigeons and some about the rats in the Skinner box. Both were credit worthy but those who wrote about the Skinner box lacked detail, possibly because it is not a named study in detail, and often wrote about several experiments as one experiment. Some students mixed Skinner's study with Pickens and Thompson, writing descriptions that contained elements of both studies.

A minority of students wrote about Pavlov's study, again this lacked detail and accuracy, thus limiting the marks. This is possibly because Pavlov's study is not a named study in detail and students who chose to write about this one did not know enough detail to access all the marks.

There were a few students who described Bandura, Ross and Ross despite the instructions in the question, and a very small minority who wrote about Dibs from the psychodynamic approach rather than a study from the learning approach.

Chosen study Little Albert

The aim of Little Albert's study (by Watson & Rayner) was to investigate if a fearful response can be classically conditioned. They also investigated if the fearful response can be generalised to similar stimuli. They chose an emotionally stable 9 month year old and presented him with a rat and a loud noise separately. 2 months later they tested him again. They made the loud noise as he reached for the rat. This was repeated five times a week later. He was then tested 31 days later. Watson & Rayner found that initially he was not afraid of the rat but was afraid of the loud noise. When he was tested 2 months later, he became wary when the loud noise and rat were presented together and ran away. A week later, he was afraid of the sight of the white rat and similar white objects such as cotton wool and a rabbit.^{misgeneralisation} When he was tested 31 days later, he reached for the rat hence extinction had occurred. Watson & Rayner concluded that a fearful response can be classically conditioned and generalised to other similar stimuli. Watson and Rayner also used wooden blocks throughout the experiment which were presented each time (without the loud noise) and were the control in the experiments, which Little Albert was not afraid of.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 6 marks.

1 mark for the first sentence (aim) 1 mark for the second sentence (aim) 1 mark for reference to making loud noise and reaching for the rat (procedure) 1 mark for "initially he was not afraid of the rat, but was afraid of the loud noise". This could have been taken as either a procedure mark or a results mark, whichever worked best for the candidate.

1 mark for - "he was afraid of the white rat" (results) 1 mark for - "similar white object" with examples (results) "Extinction" is incorrect. 1 mark for the conclusion and 1 mark for the blocks (procedure).

Chosen study Bradimir Pavlov.

(10)

In this study, the aim was to see if a specific behaviour can be learned. In this case, Pavlov wanted to learn his dog to salivate when he ^{ns} will hear the bell. The ~~condit~~ ^{NS} at first was food the UCR was salivation. Pavlov replaced the NS with CS - the bell. At the end the CS became the bell and CR has the salivation. This means that Pavlov succeeded in learning his dog to ~~salivate~~ produce saliva each time the dog hears a bell. Pavlov also suggested that there is a spontaneous recovery. This means that Pavlov's dog after a period of time when finished the investigation would have spontaneously salivate when the bell is rung.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response gained 3 marks.

1 mark for second sentence (aim); the aim in the first sentence was not detailed enough.
1 mark for "at the end the CS became the bell and CR was salivation" (result).
1 mark for next sentence (conclusion). There is some confusion about the NS being the food.

Spontaneous recovery is the theory of classical conditioning, not Pavlov's study.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure details about studies are accurate.

Question 17 (b)

Many students who chose Little Albert. Good responses made clearly linked, elaborated points in relation to generalisability, ethics and reliability. However, application tended to be less well done with many students not explaining how it could be applied in terms of treatments; they often just repeated the results. Weaker responses evaluated on general terms and so the points could have applied to several studies so limiting their marks; they also tended to focus on ethics, repeating themselves when writing about psychological harm. There was some confusion about consent and withdrawal with weaker responses about how Little Albert didn't have these as he was a child, and ignoring the mother's right to these for Little Albert. Some wrote about it being a factor in his death when this was never the case. A minority of students failed to write about replicability properly saying it couldn't be replicated as he would be grown up and so not the same as at the time of the study.

Those who evaluated Skinner's or Pavlov's study, often wrote generic points about the ethics of animal studies in general.

Little Albert's study is not generalisable as Watson and Rayner only used a sample of one child. This means that results may not be representative of other children of a similar age. The study does have reliability as Watson and Rayner used a standardised procedure of testing him at given times e.g. 2 months later. This means that the study can be replicated exactly in order to reconfirm results about classically conditioning a fearful response. The study lacks ecological validity as it was a laboratory experiment hence it was an artificial experiment for Little Albert. This means that his behaviour may have been unnatural and not representative of one an everyday situation. The study is not deemed to be ethical as Little Albert was not deconditioned. This means that he left the study fearful of rats hence was not protected from harm. The findings from Little Albert's study can be used to treat addictions such as alcoholism by pairing the alcohol (neutral stimulus) and an earache (unconditioned stimulus) together. Little Albert's experiment also had high internal validity as all extraneous variables were controlled further more they used the wooden blocks as a control to ensure his fearful response was due to the classical conditioning hence establishing a strong cause and effect relationship.



This response gained 6 marks

1 mark for the first sentence which is clearly linked to Little Albert.

1 mark for second and third sentences together; the second sentence clearly links reliability to Little Albert in terms of the procedure and the third sentence explains how this makes it replicable. 1 mark for the fourth and fifth sentences about an unnatural setting and lack of ecological validity. This could have been linked more, eg, by saying that we are not usually made afraid of a rat by someone deliberately making a loud noise behind us. 1 mark for the sixth sentence about ethics, again clearly linked to Little Albert. 1 mark for the seventh sentence where the application is explained in terms of addiction. 1 mark for last sentence (ignoring "extraneous variables were controlled") linked to Little Albert in terms of the blocks and his fear response.

- The study had ethical issues as it had children observing violence which may have caused them distressed.
- The study also had high ecological validity as the experiment took place in a natural setting, which meant that the children PPS wouldn't act up and behave naturally.
- However the study may have some lack in ecological validity due to although being done in a natural setting, the task given to the children wasn't normal, e.g. hitting a doll violently. Therefore it wouldn't be generalisable to an everyday situation.
- The study has a lack in generalisability as the sample size was small and also the children were ~~go~~ really young. Therefore it wouldn't have been valid enough to apply the results of the study to the population as a whole.
- The study however ~~research~~ had high reliability due to it having standardised procedures with a control group and an exper-

mental group, meaning it was an independent groups design. Therefore the study can be replicated in order to see if similar results were produced.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 mark for the 1st paragraph. 1 mark for the third paragraph; it repeats the second paragraph but does it better, so the mark is given here. Maximum 2 marks as the response uses Bandura, Ross and Ross (1961) and the rubric clearly states that candidates should **not** write about Bandura, Ross and Ross (part a).



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Read the question carefully and answer the question that is asked across **both** parts (a) and (b).

Question 18 (a)

For this question, very few students achieved full marks. Most could define nature but very few went on to give an example or further elaboration, limiting themselves to only 1 mark per item. Of the few who did offer examples a significant number selected non-psychological examples such as eye colour.

"Nature" is defined as being uncontrollable occurrence influenced by our genes e.g. what gender we are is determined by whether a Y chromosome is present or not.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 2 marks.

1 mark for the first sentence "uncontrollable occurrence (sic)" and "genes";
1 mark for the example using the Y chromosome.

Characteristics that are due to our genetics.
This may include eye colour which has been identified to be the same as a parent.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response was awarded 1 mark for the first sentence. No marks for eye colour as an example because it is not psychological.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When using examples make sure they are psychological examples.

Question 18 (b)

Very few students gained both marks, often due to lack of elaboration. Most students could write about the difference between nature and nurture but failed to offer the elaboration for the second mark, or elaborated on one of them but not the other. The few students who did get both marks often related both nature and nurture to gender. A few students failed to include both viewpoints in their answer and therefore no comparison was offered.

Nature says that certain behaviours are genetic (E.G. may say schizophrenia is genetic)
However nurture would say our environment can surprise or enhance behaviour (E.G. if you grow up with adoptive parents with schizophrenia this will enhance the chance of you getting that behavior.)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 37 MARKS



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 2 marks.

1 mark for the difference between nature and nurture and then the second mark for using schizophrenia as an example for both nature and nurture.

Biological psychology looks at behaviour being genetically helped. Characteristics are decided through our genes and hormones whereas learning psychology thinks behaviour is learnt through different theories.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained no marks.

The student does not mention the terms nature and nurture in the response. The examiner cannot assume knowledge that is not clearly expressed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Be very clear about what is written, don't assume that the examiner knows what you mean.

Question 19 (a) (i)

A well answered question, however, there were some who hadn't read the whole paragraph and did put XY as the gene received by a male from the father; these responses didn't get the mark.

Question 19 (a) (ii)

A well answered question with most students getting it correct.

Question 19 (a) (iii)

A well answered question, though a minority of students put down "gender neutral" or the equivalent.

Question 19 (a) (iv)

A well answered question with most students getting the answer correct.

Question 19 (a) (v)

A well answered question with most students giving the correct answer.

Question 19 (b)

This was generally not well answered with very few responses gaining above half marks. The marks were often gained for saying that males were more lateralised and that lateralisation looks at the different activities for which each side of the brain is responsible. The better responses explained why males may be affected by strokes on one side of the brain more than females.

There was a much confusion and inaccuracy, many students stating that males use **only** the right side of the brain for spatial tasks, whereas, they use both sides, although the right side more. students often focused on which tasks males and females were more successful at rather than focusing on brain lateralisation. A significant number of students failed to recognise that brain lateralisation refers to specific functions in the brain and not the entire brain. students also confused the roles of different sides of the brain.

Brain lateralisation is looking at the different hemispheres in the brain, the left and the right. When comparing males and females ~~there are~~ there have differences in brain activity. Males have a more lateralised brain to girls as they have speech and communication focused on the left and spatial awareness focused on the right. Females have a less lateralised brain with speech and communication focused on both sides and spatial awareness focused on both sides.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 4 marks.

There is insufficient detail in the first paragraph to gain credit.

1 mark for males more lateralised;

1 mark for speech communication on the left; 1 mark for spatial awareness on the right;

1 mark for the last paragraph.

Brain lateralisation affects gender development. Females are said to use both halves of the brain more equally. Whereas males are said to be more right brain dominant, therefore males are better at spatial tasks. Males use the left side of the hemisphere less than females. Males use the left side of the hemisphere for language. Therefore in society males are better at spatial tasks such as construction whereas females are better at verbal tasks. For example in my biological practical I found that on average females answered more questions requiring verbal skills compared to males which shows that females are better at verbal tasks and use both halves of the brain more equally.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 1 mark.

Credit is given in the second sentence about males being more right dominant.

"Males use the left side of the hemisphere for language" gains no credit without the addition of "more" (males use both sides for language). The rest of the answer is repetition.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure what is written is accurate.

Repetition of a point already made does not gain more marks.

Question 19 (c)

There were some good answers to this question with the best responses using research and saying how it supported or opposed the explanation, as well as strengths/weaknesses with the methods used in the biological approach and comparisons to other explanations. However, many students appeared not to have read the question properly and they described the biological explanation of gender adding a bit of evaluation at the end, or not evaluating at all. Some students also wrote about the Money study in full rather than focusing on using the results as an evaluation point. Lack of detail was sometimes an issue, eg, saying that the approach is scientific but not explaining **why** it is scientific, or writing about studies but not saying whether they supported the explanation or not. Some students strayed off into points about the biological approach that were not relevant to gender, such as Gottesman and Shields or Raine et al.

The biological approach explains gender as being naturally determined by our genetics. This claim is supported by the study which Money conducted into twins and aimed to discover whether gender was something which was biologically determined development

or whether it could be changed by the environment. In the study he found that for the first few years, the participant was raised and nurtured as a girl and the girl's name was changed to Brenda. This was because even though the participant was classed as a girl, she was born as a boy and this boy lost his penis accidentally ^{when} ~~because~~ a routine circumcision went wrong ~~when~~ when too much electrical current was given and the penis was destroyed ~~it~~ flush to the abdominal wall. As Brenda aged she was having boyish urges which she came to realize she could not truly be a girl, and not long after her part was confirmed by her mother. This shows how the biological approach describes gender. It explains it as something which is naturally determined and cannot be changed by the environment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained 1 mark for sentence referring to Money which shows how this approach describes gender. No further credit could be given.

If using a study to evaluate a theory, focus on the results and whether it supports (or not) the theory, don't describe all of the study.

The biological approach explanation for gender development has much supporting evidence for example; is the most objective explanation as much evidence scientifically can be measured using MRI or PET scans.

Also, within the approach methods such as lab experiments and observations are used which are high in reliability due to standardised instructions

and strict controls, which makes it easy to replicate.

In addition, this explanation has led to real-life application such as; earlier pregnancy scans which can reveal the sex of the child.

However, this explanation is reductionist as it only takes into account biological factors such as; genes and hormones. It ignores other factors such as environment.

There is also other approaches that can explain gender. The learning approach suggests our gender can be learnt through observation and imitation. The psychodynamic approach suggests that our gender is determined by the balance of our ID, EGO, SUPEREGO. It also suggests our gender is determined by the oedipus and electra complex.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good response to the question, which gained 5 marks

1 mark for the first paragraph about objective data, linking it to scans and saying this makes it scientific. 1 mark for the second paragraph linking methods used in this explanation, such as lab studies, with controls and replicability. Application is not relevant and is not rewarded. 1 mark for the fourth paragraph - "reductionist" and "biological factors" and "ignores ... environment" 1 mark for other approaches and learning and observation and imitation 1 mark for "other approaches" carries forward as it is clearly plural and "psychodynamic" and "oedipus/electra complex".

Question 20

A large number of students were able accurately to name the test used, however a large minority named the wrong test or put down a method, such as correlation. Those who did correctly name the test often failed to gain the 2 marks for not stating why they used that test. Repetition was an issue, with most being able to say that it was a **correlation**, but then going on to write about a **relationship**. The best students knew that the data they collected was ordinal, however of those that did write about data many said it was nominal.

Question 20 (b)

The majority of the practicals were about parental strictness and anal characteristics, though there were a few that replicated aspects of Cramer's study.

Better students were able accurately to evaluate their psychodynamic practical with clear links to what they did specifically in this practical.

Unfortunately most responses failed to make the top band due to comments that could have applied to any of the students' practicals and only making specific links once or twice. A large minority made no comments specific to their psychodynamic practical and marks were limited to level 2. These students tended to go through GRAVE adding little else. Good responses had points about the weakness of using a correlation and some could write points that were beyond GRAVE, or link it, eg, by saying why their sample may be biased in terms of generalisability and strictness of parents.

Some students appeared not to have carried out the psychodynamic practical and therefore there was a lack of any detail in their answers; a small minority wrote about a practical from either the learning or the biological approach.

Spearman's rank.

- (ii) State **two** reasons for choosing the statistical test you named in (a) (i) for your Psychodynamic investigation.

(2)

The level of data being used was interval ratio - meaning meaning it could be expressed with numbers, in ~~the~~ independent and dependent variables. Also, both variables. Also, we were looking for a relationship between them, not a difference, so Chi² or man - whitney U would have been inappropriate tests to use.

over investigation aimed to see if there was a correlation between people's self-esteem and their use of defence mechanisms. The data were collected objectively, as each participant completed the same questionnaire, so there was less chance of extraneous variables affecting the results. However, we did not include any open questions, so it was impossible to collect more detailed, in-depth data which could have given more insight into an individual's level of self-esteem and use of defense mechanisms, therefore the results may lack validity. Also, some participants said that a number of questions tested intro/extraversion, not self-esteem, and since intro/extraversion is unrelated to self-esteem it may have invalidated our results. A strength of the study was that the results were shown to be statistically significant, with the observed value of 6.1 being greater than the critical value of 5.3, on a Spearman's rank test, so there is less than 5% chance that the results are due to probability. Also, there were no ethical issues as I did not ask participants to put their names or any other details on the questionnaire, so there were no issues of confidentiality or privacy. Another advantage of this anonymity was that participants were less likely to lie, as they knew the experimenter would not know who's paper was which, so the results were less affected by social desirability and more valid.

One weakness was that we did not carry out a pilot study, which could have improved the quality of the questions in the full study and reduced issues with validity. However, we used 20 questions, so the 3 said to test intro/extraversion would not have had a large impact on an individual's score, so a low impact on the validity of the study in this respect.



This response overall gained 15 marks.

(a)(i) - 1 mark (a)(ii) - 2 marks - 1 for interval and 1 for relationship (b) - 12 marks open questions clearly linked, issues with the intraversion extraversion questions clearly linked twice. Also includes ethics, demand characteristics and pilot study which are true for this practical, but could be true of others. At least three clearly linked points and a range of issues so level 4. This is a good answer under exam conditions.



When evaluating the practical make sure that your points are clearly and specifically linked to that practical. Try to avoid points that could be true of other practicals as well.

Spearman's rank coefficient test.

- (ii) State **two** reasons for choosing the statistical test you named in (a) (i) for your Psychodynamic investigation.

(2)

It is a test of correlation and it involves two variables.

My practical in the psychodynamic was to look at the correlation between the strictness of a parent and the cleanliness of a child.

In terms of generalisability, you can't generalise the findings from my experiment because the sample I used was 20 year 12 students, this sample is not a representation of the wider population as I only looked at year 12³ and my sample was a relatively small sample. To help make my experiment more generalisable, I could of used a range of participants from each year group so I would have a range of ages and I could of used a larger sample.

In terms of reliability, my experiment is reliable since it can be replicated since I used a questionnaire however my sample could somewhat be replicated since it was 20 participants, I did however use a random sampling method so the data gained might not be replicated.

In terms of application, you can apply my experiment to real life as generally parents who are more strict have more clean and smart children.

In terms of validity, my experiment lacks ecological validity since it is an artificial task.

as normal people would not have a stranger come up to them asking them to do a questionnaire however it was a natural setting as it was conducted in the Sixth form break out area where many year 12s usually hang out.

In terms of ethics, I didn't break ethical guidelines I got informed consent of my participants before they did the questionnaire. I made sure they were competent enough to complete the questionnaire and I made sure they would understand it. I kept confidentiality as I made sure the participants names weren't on the questionnaire and made sure it was anonymous. I debriefed afterwards, this ensured the participant was the same physically, emotionally and mentally after the experiment. I also helped explain the aim and what I was hoping to find after my investigation was complete.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response overall gained 7 marks

(a)(i) - 1 mark (a)(ii) - 1 mark - for correlation (b) - 5 marks - all points are true of the Psychodynamic practical but could be true of other practicals; there is no point that is specific to the Psychodynamic practical, therefore level 2. The points about reliability and application are both very weak. The application point is not really a point as it does not tell us how the results could be used to help society, it is just a repeat of the results.

The points about how the practical could be improved are not relevant to the question.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, students are offered the following advice:

- Read the question carefully and focus on what the question is asking when formulating your answer
- Read both of the question parts (a) and (b) before starting to write your answer to (a)
- When evaluating studies, make sure that the point you make is relevant and linked to the study being evaluated
- Include elaboration when a question is worth 2 marks in order to gain the second mark
- Make sure that examples used are **psychological**.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

