

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Introduction (i)

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because they provided full, accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of sleep and how sleep affects memory, as follows:

- ◆ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept **4 marks**
- ◆ Wolfson and Carskadon study **2 marks**
- ◆ Gais, Lucas, and Born study **2 marks**

Introduction (ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section:

- ◆ The aim is described clearly and relates to the background research. **1 mark**
- ◆ The candidate has a sufficiently operationalised hypothesis. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for Introduction **10/10**

Method

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they have provided 6 accurate points of description of the method used, as follows:

- ◆ The method used was accurately identified as a quasi-experiment, and the design as independent measures. **1 mark**
- ◆ A justification for the choice of the method was given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Both Independent Variable (IV) and Dependent Variable (DV) were given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Extraneous/confounding variables were given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Participant characteristics provided in sufficient detail and sampling technique identified accurately. **1 mark**
- ◆ Materials were identified and supplied in appendices, and the procedure was described in sufficient detail to allow replication. **1 mark**

Method — Ethical considerations

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this section.

They have provided 4 accurate points of explanation of how British Psychological Society (BPS) ethical guidelines have been implemented. The candidate has identified appropriate ethical principles and has made considerable effort to relate them to their own study, for example:

- ◆ Participants were not asked to sleep less or more than 7 hours the night before the experiment.
- ◆ Tables were separated to make sure participants could not see each other's results and avoid participants feeling pressure and to stop them from comparing their scores which may have affected their self-esteem.
- ◆ Participants were reassured that even if they performed badly in the 5-minute recall test, this does not reflect on their potential performance in exams. This is because exams measure understanding, unlike a 5-minute recall test which measures memory.
- ◆ At the start of the research, participants were given a random personal identification number which allowed them to withdraw at any time. That also guaranteed confidentiality. Therefore, participants did not feel any pressure to continue if they did not want to.

Overall marks awarded for Method **10/10**

Results

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided 6 accurate points of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

- ◆ An appropriate form of statistical analysis was chosen. **1 mark**
- ◆ This choice was justified in terms of the candidate's own data set. **1 mark**
- ◆ Calculations were present in Appendices and accurate. **1 mark**
- ◆ Data was presented in an appropriate format (a summary table and bar chart). **1 mark**
- ◆ The labels and legends were reasonably informative, and the graph starts at zero. **1 mark**
- ◆ An accurate statement was provided about whether the results support or refute the hypothesis. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for Results **6/6**

Discussion — Analysis

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** as they provided 8 relevant points of analysis, as follows:

- ◆ Effect of the difficulty of participants to remember concrete nouns on results. **1 mark**
- ◆ Effect of difficulty of task for those whose first language is not English. **1 mark**
- ◆ Effect of the potentially confounding effects of alcohol consumption on results. **1 mark**
- ◆ Link to restoration theory. **1 mark**
- ◆ Link to reorganisational theory. **1 mark**
- ◆ Comparison with Wolfson and Carskadon study in terms of representativeness. **1 mark**
- ◆ Effect of differences in circadian rhythms across cultures. **1 mark**
- ◆ Conclusion includes relevant statistics and implications for hypothesis, with which to provide an appropriate conclusion. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for analysis **8/8**

Discussion — Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** as they provided 4 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

- ◆ A disadvantage of using the independent measures research design explained. **1 mark** (generic evaluative point)
- ◆ A strength of using the quasi-experimental research method explained. **1 mark** (generic evaluative point)
- ◆ How the researchers controlled for extraneous variables (separating tables to discourage copying). **1 mark** (specific to own study)
- ◆ The potential confounding effect of the opportunity sample of students who are well-versed in using learning techniques. **1 mark** (specific to own study)

Overall marks awarded for evaluation **4/4**

Other

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** as they provided references that were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information **1 mark**. The Style/format was appropriate throughout. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for Other **2/2**

Total marks awarded for this assignment 40/40

Candidate 2

Introduction (i)

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** as they provided 7 full and accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of how gender affects sleep, as follows:

- ◆ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept **4 marks**
- ◆ Vgontzas study **2 marks**
- ◆ De Souza study - outline of method is vague **1 mark**

Introduction (ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section:

- ◆ The aim is described clearly and relates to the background research. **1 mark**
- ◆ There is a sufficiently operationalised hypothesis. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for Introduction **9/10**

Method

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** as they provided 5 accurate points of description of the method used, as follows:

- ◆ The method used was a survey, not a quasi-experiment. **0 marks**
- ◆ A justification for the use of a questionnaire given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Both Independent Variable (IV) and Dependent Variable (DV) were given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Extraneous/confounding variables were given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Participant characteristics provided in sufficient detail and sampling technique identified accurately. **1 mark**
- ◆ Materials were identified and supplied in appendices, and the procedure was described in sufficient detail to allow replication. **1 mark**

Method — Ethical considerations

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they have provided some accurate points of explanation of how British Psychological Society (BPS) ethical guidelines have been implemented. The candidate has identified appropriate ethical principles and has made some effort to relate them to their own study, for example:

- ◆ Participants informed in the brief and debrief that people sleep for different lengths of time, so they do not feel judged.
- ◆ Reference to research link between 'owls' and cancer – participants were told that this was not a concern.

Overall marks awarded for Method **7/10**

Results

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they provided 5 accurate points of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

- ◆ An appropriate form of statistical analysis was chosen. **1 mark**
- ◆ This choice was justified in terms of the candidate's own data set. **1 mark**
- ◆ Calculations were present in Appendices and accurate. **1 mark**
- ◆ Data was presented in an appropriate format (a summary table and bar chart). **1 mark**
- ◆ The labels and legends were reasonably informative, and the graph starts at zero. However, the title for the summary table could have been more informative. **0 marks**
- ◆ An accurate statement was provided about whether the results support or refute the hypothesis. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for Results **5/6**

Discussion — Analysis

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

- ◆ First paragraph reiterates results and implication for hypothesis. **1 mark**
- ◆ Potential confounding effects of similarity of participants on results. **1 mark**
- ◆ Potential confounding effects of the impact of personal lives of participants on results. **1 mark**
- ◆ Comparison of age of participants with de Souza study. **1 mark**
- ◆ Comparison of DV with that of the de Souza study. **1 mark**
- ◆ Comparison with Vgontzas study in terms of implications. **1 mark**

Overall marks awarded for Analysis **6/8**

Discussion — Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as they provided 3 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

- ◆ A strength of using questionnaires explained. **1 mark** (generic evaluative point)
- ◆ The high ecological validity of the research explained. **1 mark** (generic evaluative point)
- ◆ Lack of awareness of mental state as a weakness explained. **1 mark** (specific to own research)

Overall mark awarded for Evaluation **3/4**

Other

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** as they provided references that were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information. However, the Introduction section has no title. **0 marks**

Overall mark for Other **1/2**

Total marks awarded for this assignment 31/40

Candidate 3

Introduction (i)

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** as they provided 7 full and accurate and relevant descriptions relating to the topic of how gender affects sleep, as follows:

- ◆ Description of relevant psychology theory/concept. **4 marks**
- ◆ Jenness study **2 marks**
- ◆ Asch study – outline of method is vague **1 mark**

Introduction (ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**:

- ◆ the aim described clearly relates to the background research. **1 mark**
- ◆ Hypothesis insufficiently operationalised. **0 marks**

Overall marks awarded for Introduction **8/10**

Method

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as they provided 3 accurate points of description of the method used, as follows:

- ◆ The method and experimental design accurately identified. **1 mark**
- ◆ No justification for the choice of method given. **0 marks**
- ◆ Both Independent Variable (IV) and Dependent Variable (DV) were given. (not operationalised, but marks not given for this in 'hypothesis' section in 'Introduction') **1 mark**
- ◆ Extraneous/confounding variables were given. **1 mark**
- ◆ Participant characteristics provided in sufficient detail but sampling technique inaccurately identified as 'random'. **0 marks**
- ◆ Not all materials were identified so study cannot be replicated (also no debrief supplied), and the procedure was not sufficiently detailed to allow replication (no reference as to how confederates were placed). **0 marks**

Method — Ethical considerations

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** as the use of confederates is unethical. It breaches the BPS Ethical Principle 3.1 – 'Respect' (ii), in that participants cannot provide consent as they are being deceived, and (viii) The importance of compassionate care, including empathy, sympathy, generosity, openness, distress tolerance, commitment and courage. It also contravenes Principle 3.3 – 'Responsibility' – "Awareness of responsibility ensures that the trust of others is not abused, the power of influence is properly managed and that duty towards others is always paramount". Principle 3.4, 'Integrity' includes the statement "Acting with integrity includes being honest, truthful, accurate and consistent in one's actions, words, decisions, methods and outcomes": using confederates clearly is dishonest and untruthful.

Overall marks awarded for Method **3/10**

Results

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because they provided 0 accurate points of interpretation and presentation of data, as follows:

- ◆ Measures of central tendency and dispersion would have been the best choice of statistical analysis, not percentages. **0 marks**
- ◆ This choice was not justified in terms of the candidate's own data set. **0 marks**
- ◆ Calculations were not present in Appendices and accurate. **0 marks**
- ◆ The candidate has displayed their analysed data in a summary table, which is appropriate, but a bar graph rather than a line graph should have been used. **0 marks**
- ◆ Neither table nor chart have informative titles. **0 marks**

Overall marks for Results **0/6**

Discussion — Analysis

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as they provided 3 relevant points of analysis, as follows:

- ◆ Conclusion provided in paragraph two. **1 mark**
- ◆ Links made to studies: Asch, Jenness, Sherif. **1 mark**
- ◆ Relevance to 'current political climate'. **1 mark**

Overall mark awarded for Analysis **3/8**

Discussion — Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as they provided 3 accurate points of evaluation, as follows:

- ◆ Low ecological validity explained. **1 mark** (generic evaluative point)
- ◆ Low generalisability due to use of student participants. **1 mark** (specific evaluative point)
- ◆ Weakness of using small sample. **1 mark** (generic evaluative point)

Overall mark awarded for Evaluation **3/4**

Other

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** as references were organised in such a way as to enable a third party to locate information. Layout is untidy for example front page, and sections not sufficiently separate so **0 marks** were awarded.

Overall marks awarded for Other **1/2**

Total marks awarded for this assignment 18/40