

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each Discussion section of the course assessment component (assignment). Comments have been divided into marks awarded out of 8 for analysis and out of 4 for evaluation.

## Candidate 1

### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they provided 4 relevant points of analysis as follows:

- ◆ A link was made between their results and their hypothesis. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ The candidate has explained how other variables may have impacted on sleep. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A real-world application in terms of teenagers not getting sufficient sleep has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ The candidate has explained a conclusion and included the relationship between the co-variables. **(1 mark)**

No marks were awarded for the comparison of the candidate's research and the Hysing study or the Shetcher study as comparisons were linked to procedures and not results.

### Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they made 4 evaluative points as follows:

- ◆ A weakness regarding the small sample size has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A weakness relating to the gender balance of the sample size has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A weakness relating to the unrepresentative nature of the type of participants sampled has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A weakness regarding confounding variables such as the availability of the internet in terms of access to the survey has been explained. **(1 mark)**

## Candidate 2

### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they made 5 analytical points as follows:

- ◆ An explanation of the way in which their results support the hypothesis has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results and the Jenness study has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results and informational social influence has been explained. **(1 mark)**

- ◆ A real-world application regarding adding conformity to the curriculum in schools has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A conclusion with the mean results has been provided. **(1 mark)**

No marks were awarded for the conclusion about informational social influence as this is a repeat of a previous point.

No marks were awarded for the conclusion about age impacting conformity as this is not part of the candidate's research and does not link to information provided in the introduction section of the report.

## Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they made 2 evaluative points as follows:

- ◆ A weakness of field experiments has been explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A weakness of the sample related to their study has been explained. **(1 mark)**

## Candidate 3

### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because they provided 7 analytical points as follows:

- ◆ The mean results were analysed in relation to the hypothesis. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ The median results were analysed. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results and Oswald's restoration theory was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results and the Wolfson and Carskadon study was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ There was an explanation of the poorer recall in terms of low mood. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A real-world application relating to sleep and exam performance was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ An example of possible new research in relation to sleep and recall was explained. **(1 mark)**

No marks were awarded for the conclusion as no statistics were provided.

### Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they made 4 evaluative points as follows:

- ◆ A weakness regarding small sample size was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A strength relating to the controlled environment and the effect this had on participant concentration was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A weakness of the self-report mechanism used in this assignment was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A strength of lab experiments was explained. **(1 mark)**

## Candidate 4

### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided 6 points of analysis as follows:

- ◆ The mean results were analysed in relation to chunking. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results and the Multi-Store Model of memory was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results and Miller's magic number was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results of this study and the DeGroot study in terms of the impact of familiar chunks was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A link between the results of this study and the results of the Bower and Springston study was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ A real-world application relating to chunking and retaining information within educational settings was explained. **(1 mark)**

No marks were awarded for the conclusion as no statistics were provided.

### Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they provided 3 evaluative points as follows:

- ◆ The impact of demand characteristics within their study was explained. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ The possible effect of testing at particular times of day was explained. **(1 mark)** (this point was not awarded marks for analysis as there was no explanation of the specific impact the time of day might have had on the results in this study)
- ◆ The possible effects of eating breakfast and participants not having enough sleep was explained. **(1 mark)** (this point was not awarded marks for analysis as there was no explanation of the specific impact these variables might have had on the results in this study)