

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCSE Psychology 5PS02 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 2013

Publications Code UG036689

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

This paper enabled candidates across the ability range to demonstrate their understanding of Psychology across the range of three topics. Topics C & D appeared to be less problematic than Topic E but there was a wealth of evidence of good practice across all topics. Many candidates appear equipped with a 'tool kit' of knowledge and skills that can help them to tackle the range of different question styles. For example, for question 12, candidates were able to outline preparedness quite well and then *use* the findings of Bennett-Levy and Marteau to explain how there is evidence for preparedness. In addition, candidates were able to use their knowledge of content analysis to devise a study in question 2(e). Pleasingly, candidates appeared, in the main, to be prepared for the extended writing of question 15 with some very thorough answers.

Many candidates showed evidence of having learned the content well and their answers suggested that they had actively engaged with the material during their studies, producing clear and detailed responses that demonstrated thorough understanding and meaningful evaluation. This GCSE course continues to provide an interesting and effective way to assess Psychology at an introductory level and a sound basis for stepping up to AS level.

In general, the biological concepts that appeared on this paper, stretched the field out somewhat and is was probably more pronounced on this paper as it appeared in both Topics C & E as direct questions. Also, it was pleasing to see candidates moving away from the simple answers of 'quicker' 'fairer' or 'easier' when responding to research methods questions, showing a 'firmer' appreciation of concepts linked to research. For example in question 10(d), many candidates could give a developed answer as to why closed questions may be preferable.

A couple of areas of difficulty were seen in the paper. The first was the candidates' ability to compare two ideas as this was mainly just a description of one idea followed by the second idea with no linking at all from them. The second was about ethical issues rather than ethical guidelines (question 2(e)) – most candidates simply wrote about how Burt may adhere to ethical guidelines rather than the ethical issues raised by research into aggression. The second was the biological aspects of criminality which candidates did struggle on at times.

Question 1 (b) (c)

Many candidates did well on this question by correctly identifying both the IV and DV and then operationalising them. Common mistakes included mixing up the IV and DV or getting the study confused with Charlton *et al.*

(b) What was the **independent** variable in Anderson and Dill's experiment? (2)

The type of video game played. - Violent or non-violent.

(c) What was the **dependent** variable in Anderson and Dill's experiment? (2)

the length and loudness of the blasts of noise given



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A clear 2+2 as the IV is operationalised and so is the DV.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Always ensure that IVs and DVs are operationalised if there are 2 marks available.

Question 1 (d)

The majority of candidates could clearly outline the conclusion of Anderson and Dill's study in general terms. A sizeable minority wrote a very specific result here (usually about the noise blast) and could not gain credit.

(d) What did Anderson and Dill conclude from their experiment?

(1)

That violent videogames caused aggressive behaviour



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A clear, concise conclusion here.

Question 1 (e)

This was the stronger of the two Anderson and Dill evaluation questions with many candidates choosing ethics or ecological validity as the starting point for their answers. Less able candidates wrote either a result of the study or some generic fact about the method and could not gain credit.

(e) Explain **one** problem with Anderson and Dill's study.

(2)

The study was not entirely ethical. Deception was used as participants were told it was a study into motor skills rather than aggression.

(f) Explain one strength of Anderson and Dill's study.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate was awarded 2 marks. A clear problem is identified here and put into the context of the study.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

When asked for a problem or strength and it is 2 marks, make sure that the answer is in the context of the study.

Question 1 (f)

Candidates tended to struggle on this question as many gave a generic methodological strength that could be applied to many studies. As the question asked the candidate to *explain* a strength, it had to be in the context of Anderson and Dill to gain the second mark.

Question 2 (a)

Usually very well answered with candidates writing about the how, what and recording mechanisms. There were some very clear, succinct, answers here that scored three very quickly. The element that tended to get missed out was the 'how' part as these answers focused a lot on the tallying of behaviours seen. A small minority wrote about setting up an experiment to watch Burt's brother's behaviour before and after playing the game which was not creditworthy.

2 Burt is concerned about the video games that his younger brother plays. Burt wants to investigate the violent content of one of the video games that his brother has been playing. He decides to conduct a content analysis.

(a) Describe how Burt might go about conducting a content analysis on the video game.

Burt will create categories ~~regarding to~~ ^{asso across} associated with violence, for example punching. Then, along with some other people to avoid bias, they will watch the game being played and tally each violent incident into the correct category. The results will be averaged, by adding up the total of each category and dividing it by how many ~~different~~ analysis were done.

(b) Burt was worried that his content analysis may be subjective.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This clearly outlines what is being looked for (punching etc.), how they will conduct it (watch some playing) and the recording mechanism (tallying). Full marks.

Question 2 (e)

Many candidates struggled to gain marks on this question as they tended to focus on ethical *guidelines* rather than ethical *issues*. Stronger answers did focus on a variety of issues like the potential long term effects of playing the game or how Burt's brother may imitate some of the behaviours witnessed in the game.

(e) Burt decided to see if playing aggressive video games did have an effect on his brother's behaviour. He decided to conduct an experiment. Burt made his brother play a violent video game and then he observed his brother's behaviour afterwards.

Describe **ethical** issues that need to be considered when conducting experimental research into video games and aggression.

(4)

The participant ~~Burt's brother~~ needs to give ^{their} ~~his~~ permission to take part in the experiment, but ~~he~~ ^{Burt's brother} was not told about it. He doesn't have the right to withdraw as he is not aware he is participating. It's also deceptive as he hasn't been told of the experiment.

Information and personal details need to be confidential (confidentiality) and ~~was~~ protected from harm. They need to ensure ^{the participant} ~~he~~ is not harmed during or after the experiment.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The whole answer is simply outlining ethical guidelines in general, with no linking to games and aggression. Therefore, no marks were awarded.

- (e) Burt decided to see if playing aggressive video games did have an effect on his brother's behaviour. He decided to conduct an experiment. Burt made his brother play a violent video game and then he observed his brother's behaviour afterwards.

Describe **ethical** issues that need to be considered when conducting experimental research into video games and aggression.

(4)

If someone does become aggressive and violent after playing a video game, it is not ethical to force them to do so without informed consent.

This is also the case when considering the nature of the content. Even though it is not real, it still may cause distress in a participant which is not ~~ethically~~ ethically right. The participant needs to be given the right to withdraw and be protected.

Another ethical issue is the long-term effects it may have.

Anderson and Dill concluded from their study that playing videogames too much could lead to life long aggressive tendencies which ~~is happened~~ could ~~going~~ ~~with~~ ~~protect~~ ~~of~~ ~~participants~~.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

1 mark for the first sentence. It is much clearer if you bracket out 'without informed consent'. Second mark for 'even though it's not real it may cause distress'. Third mark for long-term effects of playing the game.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When asked for ethical issues ensure that the answer is about issues rather than just simply guidelines.

Question 2 (f)

Most candidates could identify a correct theory here.

Question 5 (a)

The majority of candidates could identify some biological feature that could explain aggression. Hormones and the amygdala were by far the most popular choices. Some candidates did pick up the ID mark but then failed to expand on this to gain the second mark for outlining *how* it may cause aggression.

Question 5 (b)

There were many good answers here that easily scored the one mark available. However, some candidates merely stated 'there is evidence' or would name-drop Whitman or King without saying why it supports the biological explanation. Candidates needed to state what the findings were to gain credit here.

(b) Outline **one** strength of a biological explanation of aggression.

(1)

King's study showed that someone could be made more aggressive if the amygdala was stimulated

(Total for Question 5 = 3 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A good example of how a study supports an explanation here to gain one mark.

Question 6

Most candidates gained 1 mark here as they simply wrote about two different explanations *without* doing any comparison work which is what the question required. Most could easily highlight two explanations but only a small amount of candidates completed some *explicit* comparison work between their choices.

6 Compare **two** explanations of the causes of aggression.

Comparisons include similarities and/or differences.

Social learning theory states that all of our behaviours including aggression are learned from those around us when we identify with them (see things between ~~us~~ ourselves and them which are the same or we would like to be the same). Social learning theory supports the nurture side of the argument.

On the other hand, the theory that the amygdala is responsible for aggression is on the nature side because it states that aggression spans from the amygdala in the centre of our brain. Charles ~~Whitman~~ Whitman killed thirteen people and his mother and wife and he left a note because he thought something was wrong with his brain. When surgeons looked at his brain, he had a tumour pressing on his amygdala.

(Total for Question 6 = 4 marks)

TOTAL FOR TOPIC C = 30 MARKS



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A common example where the candidate has simply written two explanations without any direct comparison, therefore the candidate was only awarded 1 mark.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

When asked to compare, make sure that you complete explicit comparisons.

Question 10 (b) (ii)

The majority of candidates could highlight a reason for standardised instructions with 'control' and 'making it ethical' being popular choices. Some candidates ignored the advice in the question and wrote about it telling students how to complete the questionnaire.

Question 10 (c)

Most candidates understood what open-ended questions were and could give reasons as to why they may be preferable. Some candidates got open-ended and closed questions confused and could not gain credit here.

Question 10 (d)

Many candidates could identify a feature of closed questions that made it preferable *for the teacher* - however, some candidates did not fully read the question as they were still answering it from the 'student perspective' rather than the teacher.

Question 11 (a)

Most candidates could place these in the correct order.

Question 11 (b)

Some candidates clearly understood Classical Conditioning and could easily apply it to the Angharrad scenario to gain maximum marks. Other candidates drew good diagrams to show the process but then failed to develop their answers any further and could only score 2 as a result. In addition, other candidates did not fully identify the UCS so could not score maximum marks. There were only a handful of candidates that did not use Classical Conditioning here (e.g. they used Social Learning).

(b) Angharrad has a phobia of cats. Her teacher explained that she may have developed her fear through the process of classical conditioning.

Using your knowledge of classical conditioning, describe how Angharrad's teacher may have explained how she developed her fear of cats.

You may use a diagram as part of your answer.

(3)
Angharrad's teacher might of mentioned how something bad might of happened in the presence of a cat, so everytime she sees a cat, she associates it with that ~~event~~ event, thus creating a fear and a phobia of cats.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate was awarded 2 marks. A good answer, but the UCS is not clear at all (just states 'something bad') so could not gain maximum marks.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Ensure that examples are specific for UCS, NS etc. in questions about Classical Conditioning.

Question 11 (c)

Many candidates could correctly identify nurture here and then explain why.

Question 11 (d)

Many candidates could identify systematic desensitisation for (d)(i). Most candidates could identify at least one feature of systematic desensitisation to gain credit in (d)(ii) whilst others easily picked up two marks here for clearly outlining how it could treat the fear of cats. Only a few candidates mentioned therapies like Flooding and CBT which, of course, could not gain credit.

(d) In the case of Little Peter, Cover-Jones (1924) used the process of classical conditioning to treat Little Peter's phobia of rabbits.

(i) Name the therapy used to treat Little Peter.

(1)

Systematic desensitisation

(ii) Describe how this therapy could be applied to treat Angharrad's phobia of cats.

(2)

A nigharrad could (with the help of the psychologist) compose a hierarchy of her fears (a list of the tasks she could do that range from not being scared to triggering) and slowly climb through the hierarchy until she was no longer scared of cats.*

** like seeing a photo of a cat to petting a cat*



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate was awarded 3 marks. 1 mark for systematic desensitisation 1 mark for hierarchy of fear. 1 mark for the example of photo of cat to petting of cat.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always remember to link your answer to the stimulus material as it is stated in the question.

Question 11 (e)

A generally well answered questions. Candidates tended to be able to note the 'exposure' to the feared object with an elaborated example to gain two marks. Stronger answers then covered aspects like associating the relaxation with the feared object or the not being able to escape aspect of flooding. Some candidates wrote about cognitive factors which could not gain credit.

(e) Other therapies such as flooding can be used to treat phobias.

Describe flooding as a treatment for phobias.

(3)

flooding is where you are are totally exposed to your fear with no steps involved. Your body firstly would enter go into a state of panic but will eventually calm down into your normal state, the goal is to associate your phobia with the relaxation your body feels over time which will eventually cure your phobia, Flooding is highly distressing and only useful for extreme phobias.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A clear answer that tells the examiner three things about Flooding. The marks were awarded as follows:

First mark for 'total exposed to your fear'. Second mark for state of panic then calming down. Third mark for associating phobia with the relaxation.

Question 11 (f)

Many candidates could pick an ethical issue linked to flooding and then contextualise it in their answers. Common choices were the right to withdraw argument and the psychological/physical stress.

Question 12

Candidates appeared well prepared for this question as many tackled both halves of it and did well. There were some strong descriptions of preparedness and then some equally strong answers linking Bennett-Levy and Marteau to preparedness. Weaker answers tended to either write about the Bennett-Levy and Marteau study with no linking or mix up their studies and wrote about Cook and Mineka instead.

*12 Describe the evolutionary preparedness theory of phobias **and** explain how the findings of Bennett-Levy and Marteau's (1984) study can be used to support this theory.

The evolutionary preparedness theory of phobias is that we have phobias now from things that we have learnt to be afraid of whilst we were evolving, as well as other species. The preparedness theory is linked with 'survival of the fittest'; animals were more likely to survive if they ran from fear instead of facing it. Because of this, animals and humans have fears / phobias that we have gathered from evolution, such as deep sea waters and larger, more vicious animals such as lions.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer is just all description which is very good, but there is no mention of Bennett-Levy, hence the 3 marks.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Always ensure you answer both halves of a question.

*12 Describe the evolutionary preparedness theory of phobias and explain how the findings of Bennett-Levy and Marteau's (1984) study can be used to support this theory.

Seligman (1971) said that we are prepared by evolution to learn to fear some things more than others. We are more likely to fear things that would have been a threat to early humans such as ~~fox~~ spiders, deep water and thunder. ~~The~~ People who feared these dangerous things were more likely to survive (survival of the fittest) and went on to reproduce more. So eventually the population is made up of more people who are prepared to have the fears than people that aren't. Bennett-Levy and Marteau wanted to find out if the characteristics of an animal make us more likely to fear it. They used questionnaires to find out. ~~There~~ Their results found that we are more scared of ugly, slimy, sudden and quick moving animals and that females were less likely to approach animals than males. These results support the preparedness theory as they suggest that we are prepared by evolution to be afraid of animals with certain characteristics. It would have benefited early ~~humans~~ ^{humans} to be afraid of quick and sudden animals. The animals found to be most feared by Bennett-Levy and Marteau included jellyfish, spiders and rats, which would all have been threats to early humans. ~~They~~ This supports preparedness. We are prepared by evolution to more easily fear some animals with certain characteristics as they're more dangerous.

(Total for Question 12 = 6 marks)

TOTAL FOR TOPIC D = 30 MARKS



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good description of preparedness with an excellent usage of Bennett-Levy, so gets maximum marks.

Question 13 (a)

Most candidates could identify two characteristics for (a)(i) that were creditworthy - attractiveness, race and accent were popular. There were some answers that did not cover characteristics or wrote vague examples which could not gain credit (e.g. 'looks' or 'the way they dress'). Many candidates could score one mark for (d)(ii) for giving a general indication of how a characteristic may affect decision-making but it was quite rare for an answer to be developed and *explain how* it could affect.

13 Jurors are presented with facts during a court case. Psychologists believe that members of a jury can be affected by other factors as well, such as the characteristics of the person accused of the crime (the defendant).

(a) (i) State **two** characteristics of a defendant that have been shown to affect jury decision-making.

(2)

Characteristic 1

Attractiveness

Characteristic 2

Race

(ii) Explain how **one** of the defendant characteristics you have stated in (a)(i) might affect jury decision-making.

(2)

If the jury have stereotypes about people of a certain race, these may have an effect on their final decision.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Full marks were awarded for part a(i). In part (ii) this answer does not tell us how it may affect decision-making so only scored one mark. This is for stereotypes about certain race. The candidate does then not qualify how this affects decision-making (they just state 'it will have an effect').

Question 13 (b)

Many candidates could identify general strength and weaknesses to gain 1+1 but not too many could then *contextualise* it by linking it directly to Sigall and Ostrove as the question asked them to *explain* rather than outline. There were some very well thought through answers that did link and these scored maximum marks.

(b) Sigall and Ostrove (1975) conducted an experiment on jury decision-making.

Explain **one** strength and **one** weakness of this study.

(4)

Strength

They used a control group. This is successful when making experiments more reliable, as they have something to compare their results too.

Weakness

It was not realistic, as in real court cases the jury are not responsible in giving the defendant a sentence - that is the judges job.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Two marks were awarded for this response. Under strength, 1 mark was given for control group/compare and for weakness, 'It was not realistic' does not gain credit by itself, see rule in Mark Scheme, but the rest is creditworthy, about not giving out a sentence, therefore 1 mark awarded.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always remember that if asked to explain (and it is worth two marks) make sure the strength or weakness is linked directly to the study.

Question 14 (a)

Candidates found it easy to score one here about the comparison angle of twin studies but it was quite rare to see a two mark answer. There were many tautological answers that could not gain credit here.

14 (a) Describe what is meant by 'twin study' as a research method.

(2)

~~Twin study is when you~~
a twin study is when you
compare the identical twins and if
one is a criminal the other is
likely to be too because of the
same DNA.

(b) Describe what the findings of twin studies tell us about the biological basis of



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The first mark is for the first two lines on comparison. This is the first marking point on the Mark Scheme. The second mark is for the rest, which is similar to the fifth marking point on the Mark Scheme.

Question 14 (b)

Candidates tended to use Christiansen to good effect here to show what twin study findings have told us about the biological basis of criminality. Many candidates picked up a 'general conclusion' mark here. However, there were candidates who either did not answer this question or made very general comments about twin studies.

(b) Describe what the findings of twin studies tell us about the biological basis of criminality.

(2)

If one twin is a criminal or has committed a crime the other twin is most likely to commit a crime in their lifetime as well.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Only 1 mark was awarded for a generic conclusion.

(b) Describe what the findings of twin studies tell us about the biological basis of criminality.

(2)

52% of identical twins and 22% of non-identical twins both have criminal records which is a ~~large~~ high percentage and it explains that criminality is genetic.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The findings are clearly Christiansen, even though not named (see rule on Mark Scheme), so it gains a mark. The second mark is for the last line.

Question 14 (c)

There were some very good answers here that tended to focus on small sample sizes (using Theilgaard as an example study) and rarity to gain the two marks. However, there were many answers that had a hint of a practical issue but candidates chose ones that were not linked to *conducting biological research into criminality*. Many of these answers were about general issues of research into criminality rather than ones specifically linked to biology.

(c) Explain **one practical** issue when conducting biological research into criminality.

(2)

Self fulfilling prophecy - if identical twins knew what scientists were expecting then if one turned to crime the other is more likely to follow.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

No marks could be awarded, this is not an issue that is linked to *biological* research into criminality.

(c) Explain **one practical** issue when conducting biological research into criminality.

(2)

It is hard to get a ^{large} sample of participants. For example to research the impact of the XYY chromosome abnormality would be hard, as it is very rare. Also it is hard to track down people with it as they don't stand out from the crowd and it doesn't run in families (not inherited).



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A clear practical issue for research into the biological aspects of criminality.

Question 14 (d)

Many candidates got full marks here.

Question 14 (e)

There were some very strong answers here that used evidence to make a judgement about the biological explanation of criminality. Theilgaard tended to be used very well as did Christiansen - King and Charles Whitman were also popular choices and in the main were used effectively. However, there were many candidates who appeared to be poorly prepared for this question and they could only write about very general ideas of twin studies or criminality in general without ever answering the question set.

(e) Using evidence from research studies into criminality, evaluate the biological explanation of criminality.

(3)

If someone has an xyy chromosome pattern they are more aggressive and less intelligent (as found by ~~The~~ Theilgaard). Mednick found that even when a criminals children had never known them or "been influenced them they had a chance of becoming a criminal.

(Total for Question 14 = 12 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Two results from studies that support the idea of a biological foundation for criminality.

Question 15

There were some brilliant answers here that scored maximum marks very easily. Candidates tended to know a lot about John Duffy (especially the profile) and could also write more than one developed evaluation point to get into Level 5. It would appear that many candidates were well prepared for this question. Popular evaluation points were about helping to narrow down the amount of suspects, how it may well just be guesswork and the Rachel Nickell case. All of this said, there were some answers seen here where the candidate simply wrote about what is involved in offender profiling or wrote about a different case to that of John Duffy.

*15 The case of John Duffy is an example of the use of offender profiling.

Describe the case of John Duffy **and** evaluate offender profiling as a tool to catch criminals.

(10)

In the 1970s, many ~~dead~~ corpses were found of women who had been murdered. In total, there were four bodies found. ~~Refer~~

A forensic psychologist was called in by police to ~~be~~ examine the evidence and details of the crime scene to create an offender profile.

The aim of the profile was to narrow down the list of suspects by creating a list of key details about the murderer. ~~Through patterns~~ The psychologist found many patterns linking the four crimes. Firstly, all the women had been bound by rope and raped before being killed. They were all young women who were travelling at the time and were alone.

All of the crimes were committed near railway stations in London.

From these details, the criminal profile was made and contained the following details:

Sex - male

Age - ~~young~~ middle aged, around 30

Race - White British

Occupation - carpenter, ex British railway employee

Marital status - divorced, living alone

Location - living in London

Interests - martial arts

Appearance - physically unattractive, small, weak

IQ - ~~was~~ unwell/unintelligent

The psychologist thought that the murderer must be small and weak as he used rope to ~~tie~~ tie up his victims. However, he also knew how to hold his victims, linking to the interest in martial arts. The ~~rep~~ idea that he was an ex-British rail employee was based on the fact that all the crimes took place near railway stations, almost as a ~~to~~ revenge attacks.

Using his criminal profile, the police questioned numerous suspects until finding John Duffy. They found he matched the profile and when questioned, confessed his crimes.

Using a criminal profile does have advantages. Like in the John Duffy case it can be used to greatly narrow down the number of suspects, saving the police valuable time and resources.

However, it does have its weaknesses. A criminal profile can have the opposite effect and hinder the criminal investigation. If it is wrong, the police may look for someone completely different or even in a different location.

A wrong profile can also lead to the arrest of a innocent man. A famous instance of this happened, leading to ~~a~~ the real murderer remaining free while a not guilty man was charged instead. Some critics also say that a profile is just educated guesswork and should not be used in a criminal investigation; the focus should be on scientific evidence.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This get Level 5 (10 marks). This is a very good description of John Duffy, most notably the profile. There are a series of well-developed evaluation points. All points are well-expressed, hence full marks.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Ensure that both halves of an essay are answered to be able to get towards the top end of marks.

*15 The case of John Duffy is an example of the use of offender profiling.

Describe the case of John Duffy and evaluate offender profiling as a tool to catch criminals.

(10)

offender profiling as a tool to catch criminals because you can then create an image of what the criminal is supposed to look like and act like, this can then be put out in the world so that people can have an idea of what this person looks like and what they do. It can help the police catch the person as they can probably get more information about who it is that if they did not have an offender profile for the criminal the case of John Duffy supports this as the offender profiler guessed everything about him. So it scared him to owning up.

By also using offender profiling it can help innocent people

out there watch for this person
and make them weary that
there is someone out there so
they up their security.

offender profiling can sometimes
go wrong and information is
wrong which then makes the
case harder to crack and
find the person that committed
the crime. also a wrong
profile could lead to someone
who is completely innocent, getting
the blame for someone else's
crime.

John Duffy case inspired lots more offender
profiling which helps people get caught.
The John Duffy case was so accurate
and detailed it was almost perfect
to the the man himself.
offender profiling is easy to get wrong
but amazing when it's right.

(Total for Question 15 = 10 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is Level 2 (4 marks). The first paragraph has an OK evaluation, referring to getting more information as a result of a profile. The second paragraph is not creditworthy. The third paragraph has an evaluation point about getting the wrong criminal. The fourth paragraph is very generic. So Level 2 states 'reasonable attempt at evaluating offender profiling with no description of John Duffy'. This is exactly what this candidate has done.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates should:

- put their answer into the context of a study if it asks them to 'explain a strength...' as generic evaluations cannot score maximum
- find ways to differentiate between ethical guidelines (rules researchers have to adhere to) and ethical issues (the potential effects of running studies, say, into aggression or criminal behaviour)
- ensure that when asked to 'compare' two ideas, they must do the comparing themselves rather than simply writing out the two ideas separately. Using key phrases like 'both show...' or whereas can help them to make sure they are doing the comparing as the examiner cannot do this for them
- find strategies to help them fully answer questions that ask them to 'use evidence....' by practicing using different topics (e.g. biological aspect of criminality).

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