Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for the candidates below has achieved the following marks for each section of the course assignment.

Candidate 1

Topic: How age affects conformity

<u>Section A</u>
The candidate has provided 5 accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of how age affects conformity, as follows:

- ♦ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept **2 marks**
- ♦ Mori and Arai study **2 marks**
- ♦ Detail on the procedure of the Knoll study is lacking **1 mark**
- ♦ Description of Jenness study is inaccurate **0 marks**

The candidate provided three studies, however marks are only available for two. Marks were awarded to those most relevant to the candidate's own research.

5/8

<u>Section B</u>
The aim described clearly relates to the background research **1 mark**.
No marks were awarded for the hypothesis as it was insufficiently operationalised with regard to the Dependent Variable (DV), which does not infer conformity. **0 marks.** Furthermore, the study is not measuring how similar the estimates are, this is inaccurate. The fact that the lower age group will have more similar estimates to the fake estimates provided than the higher age group, should have been included in the hypothesis.

1/2

Section C

The candidate has provided 4 accurate points of description of the method used, as follows:

- The method used was accurately identified as a field experiment, but the design was not given.
- A justification for the choice of the method was given **1 mark**.
- Both Independent Variable (IV) and Dependent Variable (DV) were given **1 mark**.
- Extraneous/confounding variables were given **1 mark**.
- There was a lack of relevant detail given on participant characteristics, for example no gender breakdown or identification of who participants were in general. As a result, the method cannot be replicated.
- Materials were identified and supplied in appendices, and the procedure was described (albeit to a minimum standard) **1 mark**.

4/6

Section D

The candidate has provided 4 accurate points of explanation of how British Psychological Society (BPS) ethical guidelines have been implemented. The candidate has identified appropriate ethical principles and has made considerable effort to relate them to their own study, for example:

- In relation to protection from harm in the first paragraph of this section, the candidate shows awareness of the potential for participants to 'feel stupid', so were given the right to withdraw, and were told that this was not a test of intelligence, guesses were kept anonymous by being given an identification number and were assured that conformity was normal.
- Careful consideration was also given and described in relation to deception, informed consent and debriefing.

4/4

Section E

The candidate provided 5 accurate points of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

- An appropriate form of statistical analysis was chosen **1 mark**
- This choice was justified in terms of the candidate's own data set **1 mark**.
- Calculations were present in Appendices and accurate **1 mark**.
- Data was presented in an appropriate format (a summary table and bar chart) **1 mark**.
- The labels and legends were uninformative and the graph does not start at zero **0 marks**.
- An accurate statement was provided about whether the results support or refute the hypothesis **1 mark**.

5/6

Section F

The candidate provided 4 relevant points of analysis, as follows:

- ♦ A link was made between the candidate's mean estimates and their hypothesis **1 mark**.
- ♦ The range was analysed in terms of how it supports the hypothesis **1 mark**
- ♦ The median was interpreted **1 mark**.
- ♦ The candidate's results were related to the Mori and Arai (2010) study in terms of their hypotheses **1 mark**.
- ♦ No marks were awarded for the Knoll study, the candidate has described this, but there is no analysis **0 marks.**
- ♦ No marks were awarded for the Jenness study because there was not enough analysis of this in terms of the candidate's results **0 marks.**
- ♦ No marks were awarded for the conclusion as it is a repetition of the first paragraph which has already been awarded a mark. Furthermore, no real conclusion was actually made **0 marks.**

4/8

Section G

The candidate provided 4 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

- ♦ A strength of the candidate's sampling technique was explained **1 mark**.
- ♦ An evaluative explanation of the confounding variable of behaviour relating to age group was provided and was specific to the candidate's own method **1 mark**.
- ♦ The potential confounding effects of noise during break time were explained **1 mark**.
- ♦ A generic evaluation of the field experiment was explained **1 mark**.

4/4

Section H

The references were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information **1 mark**.

No marks were awarded for style/format as the candidate occasionally wrote in the first person, used contractions and the word 'prove' **0 marks**.

1/2

Total marks 28/40

Candidate 2

Topic: How does prelim stress correlate with winter illnesses?

Section A
The candidate has provided 7 accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of how exam stress affects health as follows:

- ♦ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept **4 marks**
- ♦ Kiecolt-Glaser study **2 marks**
- ♦ Malathi study (procedure was not outlined) **1 mark**

7/8

Section B
The aim described clearly related to the background research **1 mark**.
No marks were awarded for the hypothesis as variables were insufficiently operationalised **0 marks.**

1/2

Section C
The candidate has provided 1 accurate point of description of the method used, as follows:

- ♦ The method was identified as being non-experimental and a survey **1 mark**.
- ♦ The choice of the survey method was not justified **0 marks.**
- ♦ Covariables were not identified **0 marks.**
- ♦ Extraneous/confounding variables were not identified **0 marks**.
- ♦ The sampling technique was identified, but here was a lack of relevant detail given on participant characteristics, for example no gender breakdown or identification of who participants were in general. As a result, the method cannot be replicated **0 marks**.
- ♦ Not all relevant materials were identified, and the procedure was not described in enough detail to allow replication **0 marks**.

1/6

Section D
No marks were awarded as the procedure was unethical as the survey was conducted online and there could therefore be no guarantee that participants were over the age of 16 **0 marks.**

0/4

Section E

The candidate provided 1 accurate point of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

- An appropriate form of statistical analysis was chosen **1 mark**
- The choice of statistical analysis was not justified in terms of the candidate's own data set **0 marks**.
- Calculations were not provided **0 marks**.
- Data was not presented in appropriate format (no raw data table provided, and a scattergram was not used) **0 marks**.
- There was no title on the table provided **0 marks**.
- An accurate statement was not provided about whether the results support or refute the hypothesis (the statement regarding the hypothesis does not follow from the results shown in the table and graph) **0 marks**.

1/6

Section F

The candidate provided 1 relevant point of analysis, as follows:

- The candidate has made some attempt at analysing their results in terms of the hypothesis. **1 mark**

1/8

Section G

The candidate provided 3 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

- The ecological validity of the candidate's procedure was evaluated, in that 'students were going through prelims anyway' **1 mark**.
- The potential confounding effect of some participants having 'other illnesses' was evaluated **1 mark**.
- A generic evaluation of the use of questionnaires was explained **1 mark**.

3/4

Section H

The references were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information **1 mark**.

No marks were awarded for style/format as the tenses varied throughout, the word 'effect' was used inappropriately a content page was not provided **0 marks**.

1/2

Total marks 15/40

Candidate 3

Topic: Conformity

Section A
The candidate has provided 7 accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of conformity, as follows:

- ♦ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept **3 marks**
- ♦ Asch study **2 marks**
- ♦ Jenness **2 marks**

7/8

Section B
- ♦ The aim described related to the background research 1 mark.
- ♦ The hypothesis was operationalised with clear expression of the research variables 1 mark.

2/2

Section C
The candidate has provided 4 accurate points of description of the method used, as follows:

- ♦ The method and design were identified **1 mark**.
- ♦ The choice of the laboratory experiment method was not justified **0 marks.**
- ♦ Both IV and DV were given **1 mark**.
- ♦ Extraneous/confounding variables were given **1 mark**.
- ♦ Sampling technique was given and sufficient detail was provided on participants to allow replication **1 mark**.
- ♦ No fake estimates were provided, so the study cannot be replicated **0 marks**.

4/6

Section D
The study's procedure was unethical as participants were strangers from a community centre, which compromised the welfare of the candidate **0 marks**.

0/4

Section E
The candidate provided 3 accurate points of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

♦ An appropriate form of statistical analysis was chosen **1 mark**.
♦ The choice of statistical analysis was not justified in terms of the candidate's own data set **0 marks**.
♦ Calculations were not provided **0 marks**.
♦ Data was not presented in an appropriate format (a summary table was provided, however the use of a line graph was not appropriate for the data set) **0 marks**.
♦ Labelling and legends were informative (the title is given below the graph) **1 mark**.
♦ An accurate statement was provided about whether the results support or refute the hypothesis **1 mark**.

3/6

Section F
The candidate provided 4 relevant points of analysis, as follows:

♦ The candidate made an analytic point in the first sentence relating their results to their hypothesis **1 mark**.
♦ Their results were linked to those of background study, Jenness **1 mark**.
♦ Their results related to Deutsch and Gerard and Informational Social Influence **1 mark**.
♦ A real-life example of conformity was provided **1 mark**.

No marks were given where the candidate attempts to link their method/procedure with that of Jenness. Links made should relate to results, as specified in the Marking Instructions **0 marks.**

4/8

Section G
The candidate provided 3 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

♦ The candidate accurately explains the generic evaluative point of the use of controlled variables **1 mark**.
♦ An evaluative explanation of the sample being unrepresentative is given **1 mark**.
♦ An evaluative point specific to the candidate's own sample being unrepresentative is also explained **1 mark**.

3/4

<u>Section H</u>
The references were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information **1 mark**.

♦   No marks were awarded for style/format as the report contained the use of the first person **0 marks**.

1/2

Total marks 24/40

Candidate 4

Topic: Quality of Sleep and Device Use

Section A
The candidate provided 8 accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of how the use of electronic devices affects the quality of sleep, as follows:

♦ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept **4 marks**
♦ Hysing study **2 marks**
♦ Oxford University study **2 marks**

8/8

Section B

♦ The aim described related to the background research **1 mark**.
♦ Null hypothesis was operationalised with clear expression of the research variables **1 mark**.

2/2

Section C
The candidate provided 6 accurate points of description of the method used, as follows:

♦ The method and design were identified (non-experimental method using a survey and correlation) **1 mark**.
♦ The choice of the survey method was justified **1 mark**.
♦ Both covariables were given (devices and hours of sleep) **1 mark**.
♦ Extraneous/confounding variables were given **1 mark**.
♦ Sampling technique was given and sufficient detail was given on participants to allow replication **1 mark**.
♦ Materials were identified and the procedure described in sufficient detail to permit replication **1 mark**.

6/6

Section D
The candidate has provided 1 accurate point of explanation of how BPS ethical guidelines have been implemented:

♦ The candidate has made some attempt to explain how they ensured participant confidentiality by keeping their data in a locked cabinet/classroom **1 mark**.

1/4

Section E

The candidate provided 3 accurate points of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

♦ An appropriate form of statistical analysis was chosen **1 mark**
♦ The choice of statistical analysis was not justified in terms of the candidate's own data set **0 marks**.
♦ Calculations were provided (raw data table was given) **1 mark.**
♦ Data was presented in an appropriate format (raw data table and scattergram) **1 mark**.
♦ Labelling and legends – no titles were given **0 marks**.
♦ The statement provided linking the results with the hypothesis was inaccurate **0 marks**.

3/6

Section F

The candidate provided 1 relevant point of analysis, as follows:

♦ The candidate has analysed their results in relation to those of Hysing **1 mark**.
♦ No marks were given for the analysis involving the Chahal study, as it was not present in the Introduction **0 marks.**
♦ The direction of the correlation was not given, therefore no mark was given for the conclusion **0 marks.**

1/8

Section G

The candidate provided 3 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

♦ The candidate accurately explains the generic evaluative point of the age of participants **1 mark** and the gender of their sample **1 mark**.
♦ An evaluative point specific to the candidate's procedure of using two rooms to complete questionnaires was explained **1 mark**.

3/4

Section H

The references were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information **1 mark**.

No marks were awarded for style/format as the report referred to 'effect' in relation to correlation **0 marks**.

1/2

Total marks 25/40