

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 2

Topic: Recall of words depending on location

The candidate was awarded **33 out of 40 marks** for their assignment.

Section A (Introduction)

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 8 marks** because they provided some theoretical background related to their topic of memory and described two relevant research studies accurately.

The following points were awarded marks:

- Description of memory and cue-dependent forgetting (**2 marks**).
- Description of the 'tip of the tongue' phenomenon (**1 mark**).
- Description of the Godden and Baddeley (1975) study into context dependent forgetting (**2 marks**). The procedure and results of the study were provided in sufficient detail to award 2 marks.
- Description of the Tulving and Pearlstone (1966) study of categories as cues (**2 marks**). The procedure and results of the study were provided in sufficient detail to award 2 marks.

Section B (Introduction – aim and hypothesis)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they provided an aim that was clearly related to their background research (**1 mark**) and an operationalised

hypothesis with clear expression of the research variables of context and recall **(1 mark)**.

Section C (Method)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 6 marks** because they have provided three accurate descriptions of the method, as follows:

- The research method was accurately identified as a laboratory experiment and the design was accurately identified as independent groups **(1 mark)**.
- The mark awarded for the justification of the use of lab experiment was removed due to an ethics breach in the candidate's research process.
- No mark was awarded for the research variables as the conditions of the independent variable were not provided.
- An appropriate extraneous variable was provided (control of background noise) **(1 mark)**.
- The number of participants and the sampling technique was provided **(1 mark)**.
- No mark was awarded for the materials/procedure as there was no mention of how/when the debrief was given so the research could not be replicated, and there was an ethics breach in the candidate's research.

Section D (Method – ethics)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have provided three accurate points of explanation of the way the British psychological Society (BPS) ethical guidelines have been implemented. The candidate has identified appropriate ethical principles and made some effort to relate them to their own study. The candidate explained the right to withdraw, linked with the timing of the research and their memory recall results **(1 mark)**, explained the ethics of the sampling technique used in order to protect the researcher **(1 mark)** and explained that the participants were protected from harm by giving reassurances about memory performance **(1 mark)**. The information provided on informed consent was considered a generic point about ethical guidelines **(1 mark)**. The information provided on confidentiality

would have been awarded marks if the maximum marks had not been achieved already.

There was an ethics breach in the candidate's research consisting of a data protection breach. This occurred due to the date of birth and other personal information being requested from the participants. Marks were removed from the method section (justification and procedure) in line with the way ethical breaches are considered.

Section E (Results)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** because they have provided five accurate points related to the interpretation and presentation of their data, as follows:

- An appropriate form of statistical analysis (mean) was chosen **(1 mark)**.
- No mark was awarded for the justification of using the mean as the information provided on this did not relate to the candidate's own data set.
- Calculations were present in appendices and accurate **(1 mark)**.
- Data was presented in an appropriate format (a summary table and bar chart) **(1 mark)**.
- Appropriate labelling of table/graph **(1 mark)**.
- An accurate statement was provided about whether the results support or refute the hypothesis **(1 mark)**.

Section F (Discussion)

The candidate was awarded **11 out of 12 marks** because they provided seven relevant points of analysis and four developed points of evaluation.

The following points of analysis were awarded marks:

- A link was made between their results and their hypothesis **(1 mark)**.
- The results were related to the Godden and Baddeley (1975) study **(1 mark)**.
- A link was provided between their results and cue-dependent forgetting **(1 mark)**.

- The possibility of memory loss conditions in the participants and the specific way these could have impacted participant recall was analysed **(1 mark)**.
- A conclusion was provided, including the means for each group **(1 mark)**.
- A real-life application of the results with contextual cues being utilised in witness statements was provided **(1 mark)**.
- The analysis of the possible impact of time of day on participant recall **(1 mark)**.

The following points of evaluation were awarded marks:

- Explanation of demand characteristics relating to some of the participants studying psychology **(1 mark)**.
- Explanation of the convenience of the sampling technique used **(1 mark)**. This was considered a generic point of evaluation.
- Explanation of the lack of generalisability of the study to males, given the gender bias in the sample **(1 mark)**.
- Explanation of the task not reflecting real life **(1 mark)**.

Section G (Other)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they presented their research in the style and format of a psychological research report, written in the third person. The report was organised correctly, included a title, and all sections were in the correct order, with all appropriate information in the correct section. The candidate used appropriate terminology and the correct tense throughout **(1 mark)**. No mark was awarded for the references as a third party would not be able to locate the information on the research studies provided in the introduction.