

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each section of the assignment.

Candidate 1

Section A

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they clearly defined the topic and described the associated behaviour. They did not outline why this area was of psychological importance, so the second mark was not awarded.

Section B and G

The candidate was awarded **9 out of 9 marks** because they made detailed and accurate links between psychological concepts and research evidence from three research studies.

They accurately described the Ekman and Friesan research study. They linked the findings to nature and to universal facial expressions. The candidate also described the role of nature in NVC by linking to the Matsumoto research study.

They accurately described the Yuki research study. They linked the research evidence to nurture and the socialisation process.

The candidate referenced the three research studies.

Section C

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because the aim was described and is relevant to the topic and background research.

Section D

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks**. The hypothesis was connected to the aim but was not clearly expressed, so the second mark was not awarded.

Section E

The candidate was awarded **11 out of 12 marks**.

Variables: the candidate described the independent variable (emoji faces), the dependent variable (happiness ratings) and an extraneous variable (**3 marks**).

Method: the candidate described a laboratory experiment **(1 mark)**. They explained a strength of the laboratory experiment **(1 mark)**. They also explained a weakness of the laboratory experiment **(1 mark)** and justified why a laboratory experiment and a survey were chosen for this research **(1 mark)**.

Sampling: Opportunity sampling method was described **(1 mark)**. A justification for using opportunity sampling was described by comparing it to random sampling method – not having a full list of the target population **(1 mark)**. The suitability of opportunity sampling method was described with reference to it being inexpensive and not time consuming **(1 mark)**.

Procedure: Quantitative data was collected **(1 mark)**. No mark was awarded for the steps as it is not clear how the responses will be returned to the researcher.

Section F

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks**.

They described how confidentiality would not be breached by not asking for participants' email addresses and not having a box in the survey for names **(2 marks)**.

They described how they would avoid causing psychological distress by using emojis rather than real photos. In addition, responses would be given privately to avoid judgement **(2 marks)**.

Total marks: 27 out of 30 marks

Candidate 2

Section A

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks**. The topic was defined but the psychological importance of this area of study was not outlined.

Section B and G

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 9 marks**.

They described the Mori and Arai study (**2 marks**) and linked the evidence to the factors of gender and culture (**1 mark**).

They also described the Jenness study (**2 marks**) but no links to concepts were made.

They provided references (**1 mark**).

Section C

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** for the aim.

Section D

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** for the hypothesis.

The hypothesis was not clearly expressed and so the second mark was not awarded.

Section E

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 12 marks**.

Method: The candidate described the laboratory experiment (controlled environment and manipulation of the independent variable) (**1 mark**). The candidate described a weakness ('may act unnaturally because of the environment'), however did not describe a strength (**1 mark**). No marks were awarded for suitability or justification.

Sample: The candidate described opportunity sampling (participants chosen as 'they happen to be available at the time') (**1 mark**). They justified this method by comparing it to quota/self-selected, in that, 'most convenient and less time-consuming' (**1 mark**). No marks were awarded for suitability.

Variables: The candidate described the dependent variable and controlled variable (**2 marks**). No marks were awarded for the independent variable as the candidate did not describe the two conditions.

Procedure: The candidate described the procedure including consent and debrief **(1 mark)**. The data collected was clear – they were asked to ‘guess how much pasta was in the jar’ **(1 mark)**.

Section F

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks**.

They made it clear that to avoid causing psychological harm it would be explained to the participants that conformity is normal human behaviour. They will be given the opportunity to ask questions and be given contact details **(2 marks)**.

The candidate explained that to avoid breaching confidentiality, participants will be given an identification number **(2 marks)**.

Total marks: 21 out of 30 marks