

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each Ethics section within the Method of this course assessment component (assignment).

Candidate 1

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they explained in some detail the ways candidates were protected from harm (the test not being a test of intelligence and no judgment about how many words they were asked to recall and that the participants felt relaxed and not pressured, no names and no possibility of ridicule).

The candidate also explained the way in which participant data was held confidentially (no names on recall sheet and numbers on the results sheets, consent form signatures kept separately from results, so no names associated with number of words recalled).

Candidate 2

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they made 1 point about the way candidates were protected from harm (reassurance that the study was not an intelligence test).

All other points made were generic so are awarded **0 marks**.

Candidate 3

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they explained the ways candidates were protected from harm in some detail (points made about conformity being normal and nothing to be ashamed about and the task being light-hearted and not likely to offend, as well as giving a contact for further support – this was a holistic 2 marks given for the last paragraph).

All other points are generic so are awarded **0 marks**.

Candidate 4

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they explained in some depth the ways in which participant data was held confidentially and participants being protected from harm as a result. The candidate also gave details on the deception used in their research and how this was dealt with.