

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this question paper.

Candidate 1

Question 1(a) Explain why using a smartphone before bed is not a good idea

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** because they provided five accurate points of explanation about the impact of light on sleep.

More specifically, they explained that smartphones emit blue light which disrupts production and release of melatonin (**1 mark**), that melatonin induces feelings of sleepiness (**1 mark**), that melatonin is impacted by environmental factors such as light levels (**1 mark**), they explained that more melatonin is produced when it gets darker and linked this with research evidence linking blue light and smartphones and the impact of this on sleep (**1 mark**). The candidate also explained the detrimental effect of blue light from smartphones on sleep quantity and quality based on a research study (**1 mark**).

Question 1(b) Analyse Oswald's (1966) Restoration theory of sleep

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 14 marks** because they provided three descriptive points, one fully developed evaluative point and four analytical points related to restoration theory.

Description marks were awarded for the details provided about the body and brain undergoing restorative functions **(1 mark)**, REM sleep restoring the brain by replenishing neurotransmitters and strengthening neural connections **(1 mark)** and that the purpose of non-REM sleep was to restore the body and heal minor injuries **(1 mark)**.

The evaluation mark was awarded for the use of the Shapiro study as supporting evidence **(1 mark)**. If the candidate had given more detail on why this study supported restoration theory, this could have been awarded an analysis mark.

Analysis marks were awarded as follows:

Where the candidate had provided a link between restoration theory and reorganizational theory **(1 mark)**, the comparison point made between restoration theory and information processing **(1 mark)**, the application point made of students with poor sleep not performing well in exams **(1 mark)** and the application to real life relating to minor injuries taking longer to heal with insufficient sleep **(1 mark)**.

Question 6(a) Describe indirect discrimination

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** because they provided three points of description of indirect discrimination.

Discrimination was described as the behavioural aspect of prejudice (this could have more accurately referred to discrimination as the behavioural component of an attitude) **(1 mark)**, it was also described as 'treating someone differently based on an aspect of their character' **(1 mark)**. The unintentional aspect of indirect discrimination was also described **(1 mark)**.

The examples provided were considered more reflective of direct discrimination and so were not awarded marks.

Question 6(b) Explain the stereotyping explanation of prejudice

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** because they provided five points of explanation about stereotyping.

More specifically, they explained what stereotyping is (an unconscious judgement about someone based on a specific characteristic) **(1 mark)**, what can create it (we apply that judgement to others within the same group based on what we have been told to believe) **(1 mark)**, that it is part of an attitude (although the candidate has used the term 'discrimination') **(1 mark)**, and given an example **(1 mark)**. The candidate has also explained one way that stereotypes can be challenged **(1 mark)**.

Question 6(c) Analyse one study into ways of reducing prejudice

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 10 marks** because they provided two descriptive points, two fully developed evaluative points and four points of analysis about their chosen study.

Description marks were awarded for the aim of the Jane Elliot study **(1 mark)** and for the information provided on the sample and some procedural information regarding which eye colour the participants had been told was superior **(1 mark)**.

An evaluation mark was awarded for the explanation of the ethical issue of consent regarding the age of the participants in the study **(1 mark)**. The other evaluation mark was awarded for the information provided about the ethics of the study in relation to protection from harm **(1 mark)**.

Analysis marks were awarded as follows:

Where the candidate had analysed the long term impact of the study on the participants involved **(1 mark)**, providing an application of the study where teachers could inform their students about the impact of it **(1 mark)**, providing an implication of the study regarding people who may become prejudiced/speak out against prejudice **(1 mark)**, and an application of the study relating to parents and children **(1 mark)**.

Candidate 2

Question 2(a) Explain situational factors affecting obedience

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they provided six accurate points of explanation about relevant situational factors affecting obedience.

More specifically, they explained the impact of uniform on perceived authority levels (**1 mark**), explained that people understand this impact through the socialisation process (**1 mark**), gave an example of authority figures and why we obey them (**1 mark**), gave a further example of a uniform that has lower levels of authority and people's response to this (**1 mark**), explained the impact of the reduced proximity of the authority figure in one of the Milgram variations (**1 mark**), and explained the impact of the proximity to the learner in one of the Milgram variations (**1 mark**).

Question 2(b) Evaluate Mori and Arai's (2010) study into conformity

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they provided two fully developed evaluative points of the Mori and Arai study.

A mark was awarded for the information provided relating to the lack of actors in this study and the impact of this on participant behaviours (**1 mark**). The second mark for this evaluative point was awarded for the information provided about why this was a strength of the study (**1 mark**). Another mark was awarded for the information provided on the sample used in the study (**1 mark**) and the second mark for this evaluative point was awarded as the candidate explained the impact of this and why it was a strength (**1 mark**).

The candidate did provide more evaluative points which may have been awarded marks if the maximum mark allocation had not been reached.

Question 2(c)(i) Using your knowledge of normative social influence, explain the likelihood of Natasha conforming by joining the football team

Note: The candidate has numbered this as 3(c)(i) in the evidence.

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** because they provided two points of relevant psychological knowledge and one point of application to the scenario.

The candidate provided information about normative social influence being linked to conforming due to the desire to fit in (**1 mark**) and the research study by Asch as an example of normative social influence (**1 mark**).

The application mark was awarded for information provided, which linked joining the football club with wanting to fit in and not viewed as an outsider or different (**1 mark**).

Question 2(c)(ii) Using your knowledge of individual factors, explain the likelihood of Natasha conforming by joining the football team

Note: The candidate has numbered this as 3(c)(ii) in the evidence.

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they provided three points of accurate explanation of individual factors affecting conformity and three points of application to the scenario.

The candidate provided information about higher rates of conformity in women than men **(1 mark)**, explained a reason for this **(1 mark)**, and explained the age group most likely to conform **(1 mark)**.

The points of application were linked with the likelihood of conforming due to gender **(1 mark)**, age **(1 mark)** and low confidence/self-esteem **(1 mark)**.

Question 3(a) Describe the role of diathesis-stress in depression

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for providing three points of accurate description of the role of diathesis-stress.

More specifically, they described both parts of diathesis-stress; the role of genes and experiences **(1 mark)**, provided an example of a biological influence on stress (hormonal/chemical imbalances) **(1 mark)** and referred to a research study to support the role of diathesis-stress **(1 mark)**.

Question 3(b) Explain Beck's cognitive triad

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 6 marks** because they provided four points of accurate explanation of Beck's cognitive triad.

More specifically, they explained an example of negative thoughts of the self **(1 mark)**, provided an example of negative thoughts about the world **(1 mark)**, and explained negative thoughts of the future **(1 mark)**. In addition, the candidate explained an example of cognitive bias, maintaining the triad, where they explained that the negative views a person with depression may have, can lead them to behave in ways that impact them negatively, which confirms those beliefs **(1 mark)**.

Question 3(c) Analyse one study into the biology of depression

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 10 marks** because they provided two accurate points of description, three developed points of evaluation and five points of analysis relating to one study into the biology of depression.

Description marks were awarded for the aim of the study (**1 mark**) and for the procedural information about the analysis of medical records on twins diagnosed with depression (**1 mark**).

Evaluation marks were awarded for the strength of the large sample size (**1 mark**), the strength on the twins having the same genetics but also similar environmental upbringings (**1 mark**) and for the objective measurements used in the study, such as medical records (**1 mark**).

The candidate provided a further strength of the study and a weakness which would have gained evaluative marks if these had been available.

Analysis marks were awarded as follows:

Where the candidate provided a conclusion of the McGuffin study reflecting the causes of depression being linked to both genetics and environmental factors (**1 mark**), further development of this point, linked to diathesis-stress and concordance rates (**1 mark**), linking the study to the biological approach (**1 mark**), the information provided about removing the stigma associated with depression with knowledge of biological influences (**1 mark**) and the application of the study of preventative measures that could be put in place for twins where one has been diagnosed with depression (**1 mark**).

Candidate 3

Question 4(a) Describe the features of long-term memory

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they provided four points of accurate description about the features of long-term memory.

More specifically, they provided a descriptive point about the type of coding long-term memory predominantly uses (**1 mark**), described the process of encoding information into long-term memory through rehearsal (**1 mark**), gave an example of this (**1 mark**) and described the capacity of long-term memory (**1 mark**).

Question 4(b) Explain the trace decay explanation of forgetting

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 6 marks** because they provided two points of accurate explanation about trace decay.

More specifically, they provided an explanation of lack of rehearsal leading to trace decay (**1 mark**) and an example of trace decay (**1 mark**). The subsequent information is on the interference explanation of forgetting and was not awarded marks.

Question 4(c) Analyse one study relating to the working memory model

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 10 marks** because they provided two accurate points of description, three developed evaluative points and one point of analysis about a study relating to the working memory model.

Description marks were awarded for the aim of the study **(1 mark)** and for the information provided on the method of the study, although this was vague **(1 mark)**.

Evaluation marks were awarded for the weakness of the study, which related to individual differences within the sample, leading to differences in recall by the sample **(1 mark)**, the strength of the study linked to being a laboratory experiment **(1 mark)** and a weakness linked to the task lacking ecological validity **(1 mark)**.

The analysis mark was awarded for the conclusion of the study **(1 mark)**.

Candidate 4

Question 5(a) Describe the sympathetic medullary system in relation to stress

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they provided four accurate points of description on the sympathetic medullary system in relation to stress.

More specifically, they described that stress is a trigger for the sympathetic medullary system (**1 mark**), the initial biological response from the amygdala and the pituitary gland related to stress (**1 mark**), the release of adrenaline (**1 mark**) and that the body is put into a fight or flight response (**1 mark**).

Question 5(b) Explain the effects of workload and control on workplace stress

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 6 marks** because they provided three points of explanation about workload and control in relation to workplace stress.

More specifically, they explained that workload can overwhelm someone, which causes stress (**1 mark**), explained the impact of the workload (**1 mark**) and a way to cope with high workload in relation to emotional support (**1 mark**).

Question 5(c) Analyse one study into individual differences in the stress response

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 10 marks** because they provided two accurate points of description and two points of analysis about a study into individual differences in the stress response.

Description marks were awarded for the information provided on the result of the study (**1 mark**) and the sample/procedure (**1 mark**).

Analysis marks were awarded as follows:

For the conclusion of the study relating to the white blood cells counts and the individual differences in response to stress (**1 mark**) and for the link from the study to Type A and Type B personality and individual stress responses (**1 mark**).

Candidate 5

Question 7(a) Describe the filter theory of romantic relationships

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they provided four accurate points of description of the filter theory of relationships.

More specifically, they described the main idea behind filter theory (about potential romantic partners going through a series of filters) **(1 mark)**, provided the names of each of the three filters **(1 mark)**, described the first filter in the theory **(1 mark)** and provided examples of social demographic filters **(1 mark)**.

Question 7(b) Explain levels of parasocial relationships

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they provided six accurate points of explanation of levels of parasocial relationships.

More specifically, they explained what a parasocial relationship is **(1 mark)**, provided the names of each of the levels of parasocial relationships **(1 mark)**, explained the first level of parasocial relationships **(1 mark)**, explained the second level of parasocial relationships **(1 mark)**, provided an example **(1 mark)** and explained the third and final level of parasocial relationships **(1 mark)**.

Question 7(c) Analyse one study into virtual relationships in social media

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 10 marks** because they provided two accurate points of description, three developed points of evaluation

and five points of analysis about a study into virtual relationships in social media.

Description marks were awarded for the information provided on the aim of the study **(1 mark)** and the sample/procedure **(1 mark)**.

Evaluation marks were awarded for the information provided on the reliability of content analysis **(1 mark)**, the weakness of the difficulty with cause and effect in relation to content analysis **(1 mark)** and the difficulty of generalising the results from Facebook profiles from students from one university **(1 mark)**.

Analysis marks were awarded as follows:

For the point made about participants choosing to portray themselves as socially desirable **(1 mark)**, the analysis of the lack of information in the 'about me' section of the profiles **(1 mark)**, the conclusion of the study comparing Facebook 'selves' to real life **(1 mark)**, the comparison made between the anonymity of Facebook, the absence of gating and self-presentation **(1 mark)** and the implication provided linking enhanced self-presentation, self-image and the quality of interactions and relationships **(1 mark)**.

Candidate 6

Question 8(a) Describe ethological influences on aggression

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they provided four points of accurate description of ethological influences on aggression.

More specifically, they described ethological influences as innate behaviour (**1 mark**) which has an adaptive function (**1 mark**), expanded on this by linking to instinctive responses and aggression as a response to a threatening situation (**1 mark**), and provided a research study as an example of an ethological aggressive response in sticklebacks (**1 mark**).

Question 8(b) Explain Sykes' deprivation model of aggression

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they provided six points of explanation of Syke's deprivation model of aggression.

More specifically, they explained this model is based on situational factors (**1 mark**), that the model explains aggressive behaviour in prisons (**1 mark**), further developed this point in relation to aggression being linked with the institution rather than something within the individual (**1 mark**), explained some of the deprivations that occur in prisons (**1 mark**), gave an example of one deprivation (loss of liberty) (**1 mark**) and provided a further example (loss of heterosexual relationships) (**1 mark**).

Question 8(c) Analyse one study into media influences on aggression

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 10 marks** because they provided two accurate points of description, two developed points of evaluation and three points of analysis about a study into media influences on aggression.

Description marks were awarded for the aim of the study (**1 mark**) and the information provided on the sample (**1 mark**).

Evaluation marks were awarded for the information provided relating to the reliability of the study as it was a lab experiment (**1 mark**) and the ethical issue of giving children access to a gun (**1 mark**).

Analysis marks were awarded as follows:

Making the link from the results of the study to cognitive priming (**1 mark**), linking the results to disinhibition (**1 mark**) and for the information provided relating to the application of the results and the 9pm watershed (**1 mark**).

The candidate provided a number of examples of research into media influences on aggression, however, as these were not directly related to the study being analysed no marks were awarded.