



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

October 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level

In Biology (WBI06) Practical Biology and
Investigative Skills

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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.

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

October 2018

Publications Code WBI06_01_1810_ER*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

In general students showed knowledge of the core practical methods. Students clearly identified variables that needed to be controlled but their descriptions as to how the control could be achieved lacked the precision required for this examination. Most students did try to tailor their answers to the given context of each question.

Question 1

1(a)

This question asked students to describe a suitable method to investigate the effect of two different pesticides on the heart rate of *Daphnia*. The dependent variable was not always clearly stated, however, most candidates provided details of a method that was appropriate giving them access to all the marking points.

1(b)(i)

Most students correctly identified one abiotic and one biotic variable other than the independent variable. A minority of candidates seemed not to distinguish between abiotic and biotic variables, giving answers in the wrong section of the question paper.

1(b)(ii)

Students were then asked to choose one of the variables they had identified and explain how it could be controlled. Most students selected an appropriate variable with a method of control. Many candidates then went on to describe an effect that it would have on the results that was worthy of credit.

Question 2

The context of this question was the effect of bile salts on the release of pigments from beetroot tissue.

2(a)

Most students wrote a null hypothesis that both marks.

2(b)

Most students presented the data in a clear table. In a few cases the full headings from the information given were not included and units were repeated in one or more columns.

2(c)

Most students presented graphs with both axes fully labelled. The plotting was usually easily checked as a sensible scale was chosen in most cases. If a student had calculated incorrect means in part (b) they could still be awarded the plotting mark here as an error carried forward. Only a small number of students failed to include any range bars on their graphs.

2(d)

Most students correctly identified the critical value of 0.48 from the table and compared this with the calculated value of r .

Very few candidates made the mistake of accepting the null hypothesis and suggesting there was no significant correlation between the concentration of bile salts and the absorbance.

2(e)

Most students commented on the limited data available and variability of the raw data. All the other marking points were suggested by at least some candidates.

Question 3

This question was centred around the colonisation of bare ground beyond a melting glacier.

3(a)

Students were asked to identify the possible risks involved in undertaking the investigation. Most students gave sensible answers that related to this investigation.

3(b)

Candidates were asked to describe preliminary work to ensure a proposed method would work. The candidates that had engaged with the context of the investigation gave good descriptions that covered at least three of the points on the mark scheme. Only a small number of answers were only given credit for the idea of practising the method to see if it works.

3(c)

Nearly all the students described a suitable method for their investigation in a logical sequence. Most answers gave many of the detailed points shown in the mark scheme.

3(d)

Students were asked to explain how the data from their investigation would be recorded presented and analysed. Most candidates either described or drew tables with headings and graphs with labelled axes. Light intensity was often stated without any appropriate units. Only a small number of students suggested a statistical test that was not a suitable for the data they had described.

3(e)

The students found this question difficult to answer as they may have never carried out an investigation in the field. Only a small number of students commented on seasonal variations affecting species present.

Advice for students:

- Read the whole question before you start to answer, and check that your answer covers everything the question asks for.
- Make sure your answer relates to the specific context of the question.
- When studying Core Practicals, think about what the techniques might also be used for and the types of scientific question they might help to answer.
- Carry out every Core Practical for yourself, so you understand how it works and any difficulties that might be encountered.
- If you are given the procedure for a practical technique, put yourself in the shoes of the person writing the procedure: how would they have worked out the details (such as volumes, concentrations and times)? They will have used preliminary practical work.
- Consider the strengths and limitations of each Core Practical technique.
- Practice writing null hypotheses for experiments you carry out, even if you will not necessarily be applying a statistical test.

