

# Student responses with examiner commentary (based on SAM2)

AS Psychology 7181/1  
Introductory Topics in Psychology

---

[First teaching: September 2015]

[First Examination: Summer 2016]

## Introduction

These resources should be used in conjunction with the Specimen Assessment Material (7181/1) from the AQA website. This document illustrates how examiners intend to apply the mark scheme in live papers. The question papers will be marked using a levels of response mark scheme. These answers and the accompanying commentaries have been produced to help you understand what is required to achieve the different levels and how the mark scheme is to be interpreted. These principles of marking apply across all papers.

While every attempt has been made to show a range of student responses, the following responses, and examiner comments provide teachers with the best opportunity to understand the application of the mark scheme. Responses have not been produced for every question but rather cover a variety of different types of questions and topic areas.

\*Please note that the students' responses have been typed exactly as they were written.

---

## Section A

### Social influence

#### QUESTION

**02 Many people have criticised Zimbardo's prison study.**

**Identify and briefly discuss two reasons why people have criticised Zimbardo's prison study.**

**[6 marks]**

#### MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 2 and AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	Two criticisms are clearly identified. There is some clear and effective discussion of each criticism. The answer is coherent and well organised, with effective use of specialist terminology.
2	3–4	Two criticisms are identified. There is some discussion of each but it is limited. The answer is mostly clear and organised, with appropriate use of specialist terminology. <b>OR</b> One criticism is presented at top of Level 3
1	1–2	Criticism(s) are muddled but can be inferred. Discussion is absent/very limited. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. <b>OR</b> One criticism is presented at Level 2
	0	No relevant content.

#### Possible criticisms:

- Ethics – psychological harm – participants soon became distressed
- Zimbardo himself took part in the action/was a participant observer.

#### Possible discussion points:

- whether or not the distress should have been anticipated
- whether or not the consent gained was sufficiently informed
- Zimbardo's own behaviour affected the way in which events unfolded, thus the validity of the findings could be questioned
- use of examples from the study to support argument and elaborate on the criticisms given.

Credit other valid criticisms and other valid discussion points. Can credit two separate ethical criticisms.

---

### Exemplar response

The prisoners became extremely distressed by their experience in a very short space of time. This is unethical as it breaks the guidelines “protection from psychological harm”. Although the study was stopped earlier than intended (ie 6 days not 14 days) it could be argued that it should have been stopped far earlier, to reduce the stress and emotional distress felt by prisoners. Another ethical issue is the extent to which the participants (especially the prisoners) gave their full informed consent.

### Examiner commentary

This is a Level 2 response. One criticism is identified (psychological distress) and discussed well in relation to the BPS guidelines. A second criticism, again an ethical issue, ‘informed consent’, is identified clearly but there is no discussion.

**Marks awarded = 4**

---

## QUESTION

**03 Social influence research helps us to understand how it is possible to change people's behaviour: for example, understanding how to persuade people to eat more healthily.**

**With reference to this example of social change, explain how psychology might affect the economy.**

**[4 marks]**

## MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO2 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Explanation of how psychology/social influence research might affect the economy is clear. There is effective application to the example of eating healthily. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology
1	1–2	There is limited/partial explanation of how psychology/social influence research might affect the economy. There is limited application to the example of eating healthily. The answer lacks coherence. Use of terminology is either absent or appropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible content:

- Social influence research tells us how behaviour and attitudes can be changed: eg how minority influence can be exerted or how people tend to conform to perceived norms (or reference to any other relevant social influence process)
- In this case, the resulting change of eating more healthily means that people should be more healthy
- Economic implication: eg saves health service/care resources; means less time off work sick

Credit other relevant information.

### Exemplar response

Social change is caused by a minority being consistent, not dogmatic and being flexible, challenging the views held by the majority. The minority would start to persuade some of the majority that healthy eating is good for their health and healthy people will not be off work and this would be good for the economy.

### Examiner commentary

This is a Level 2 response. There is an appropriate link between social change and minority influence indicating what the 'minority' would need to do to change attitude and behaviour of the majority towards healthy eating. There is a brief but appropriate link to the economy and a little more detail here would have ensured full marks. For example, how would more people at work be good for the economy? Possibly - greater productivity, less need to engage 'cover' staff, etc.

**Mark awarded = 3**

## QUESTION

**04 Discuss two explanations for conformity. Refer to Polly and Jed in your discussion.**  
**[12 marks]**

## MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO2 = 2 and AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
4	10–12	Knowledge of two explanations for conformity is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is mostly effective. Application to the stem is appropriate with clear links between the explanations and the stem content. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion sometimes lacking.
3	7–9	Knowledge of two explanations for conformity is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. Application to the stem is appropriate although links to explanations are limited/absent. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately. Lacks focus in places.
2	4–6	Knowledge of two explanations is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. Any application to the stem is partial. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. <b>OR</b> one explanation answered at Level 3 or 4.
1	1–3	Knowledge of explanation(s) is (are) limited. Discussion/application is very limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. <b>OR</b> one explanation answered at Level 2.
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible content:

- Normative social influence occurs where people conform so as to be part of the majority and not stand out.
- Normative social influence often (although not always) results in compliance or superficial change in behaviour.
- Informational social influence occurs when people conform because they are not sure how to behave so use the majority as a source of information.
- Informational social influence often results in internalisation – adopting the views and behaviours of the majority.

### Possible discussion points:

- Informational social influence tends to have a more permanent effect whereas normative is transient.
- Use of research evidence to support discussion: eg different conditions of the Asch study to illustrate normative and informational social influence.
- Overlap between the effects of the two types of social influence; we often look to others for information, but partly because we do not want to be different.

---

**Possible applications:**

- Polly's change in behaviour is due to normative social influence because she is wanting to be the same as everyone else/be part of the norm
- Jed is using colleagues as a source of information – informational social influence – he will put his coat in the right place and take the appropriate amount of time for lunch

Credit other relevant evaluation points.

**Exemplar response**

There are two explanations for conformity – Informed Social Influence (ISI) and Normative Social Influence (NSI). ISI occurs when someone changes their behaviour because they want to be right, they believe that the group (majority) has more information or correct information and so they change their own behaviour. They take on the behaviour and beliefs of the group as their own. This is likely to explain Jed's behaviour, he believes his new colleagues know what the right thing to do is. This tends to result in a change in both public and private belief. The other explanation is where there is a public but not a private change. It is much more short term than ISI and behaviour may revert back to its original form when the group is not present. Polly is most likely conforming due to NSI. She wants to look just the same as her friends do, so she fits in. However, it could be argued that Jed is watching his colleagues closely not just so he doesn't make any mistakes, but also so he fits in with them and is accepted.

**Examiner commentary**

This is a Level 3 response. It is a brief answer which would benefit from the use of paragraphs. Knowledge of two explanations for conformity is evident and there is an appropriate link to the stem for both Jed and Polly, with some explanation. The answer is reasonably clear. Some specialist terminology is used effectively (e.g. normative social influence) although 'Informed' is used rather than the usual term 'Informational', and other specialist terms such as 'internalisation' would have enhanced the answer.

There is a hint of discussion in the final sentence when the idea that Jed's behaviour could be explained by both Normative and Informational social influence, suggesting the two are not always separate, although this is not developed.

**Mark awarded = 7**

---

## Section B

### Memory

#### QUESTION

06 Use your knowledge of the multi-store model of memory to explain the purpose of this research and the likely outcome.

[4 marks]

#### MARK SCHEME

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

1 mark for each valid point as follows:

- **purpose** is to test the capacity of short-term memory
- short-term memories are coded verbally/ acoustically/task requires verbal rehearsal
- **outcome** – most of the people tested would be able to repeat correctly a sequence of between 5 and 9 items
- because according to the multi-store model, short-term memory has a limited capacity of 7 + or - 2

#### Exemplar response

By gradually increasing the sequence, it would be testing the capacity of STM, how much can be held in the store at any one time. The likely outcome would be that people would on average recall between 5-9 items. This is what Miller would predict (“The magical number 7 +- 2”) As STM has only a limited capacity, it would be unlikely to hold many more than 9 digits.

#### Examiner commentary

The first bullet point on the mark scheme is dealt with in the first sentence. The remainder of the answer covers the likely outcome and an explanation. There is no reference to acoustic/verbal coding in STM (2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point on the mark scheme).

Mark awarded = 3

---

## QUESTION

**07 Suggest one 4-letter sequence and one 5-letter sequence that the researcher could use. In the case of each sequence, give a justification for your choice. Use a different justification for each sequence.**

**[4 marks]**

## MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO3 = 4**

**1 mark** for an appropriate 4-letter sequence (to be creditworthy, this sequence should not make up a word or a recognisable abbreviation of a word, be a recognisable acronym or include multiple repetitions, eg 'p,p,p,p')

Plus

**1 mark** for appropriate 5-letter sequence (to be creditworthy this sequence should not make up a word or a recognisable abbreviation of a word, be a recognisable acronym or include multiple repetitions eg 'p,p,p,p,p', have any similarity to/connection with the 4-letter sequence (eg partial repetition, rhyme with)

Plus

**1 mark each** for any **two** valid justification points: eg

- words – have meaning – can be recalled as wholes
- recognisable abbreviations – have meaning – can be recalled as wholes
- acronyms – have meaning – can be recalled as whole
- multiple repetitions – reduce cognitive demand
- rhyming letters – reduce cognitive demand

Do not accept the statement 'letters must be random' without further elaboration because random selection could, by chance, result in a word, acronym etc.

Exemplar response

'CBXW' these letters do not make a word which would be easy to recall.

'VFDQM' these letters are not akrons like BBC, because if they were it would help to recall.

## Examiner commentary

Although the spelling of 'acronym' is incorrect, the meaning (with the use of an example) is clear. The sequences and justifications are appropriate.

**Mark awarded = 4**

---

## QUESTION

**08 Discuss two explanations for forgetting. Refer to Martin's experiences in your answer.**

**[12 marks]**

## MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO2 = 2 and AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
4	10–12	Knowledge of two explanations for forgetting is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is mostly effective. Application to the stem is appropriate, with clear links between the explanations and the stem content. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion sometimes lacking.
3	7–9	Knowledge of two explanations for forgetting is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. Application to the stem is appropriate although links to explanations are limited/absent. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately. Lacks focus in places.
2	4–6	Knowledge of two explanations is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. Any application to the stem is partial. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. <b>OR</b> one explanation answered at Level 3 or 4.
1	1–3	Knowledge of explanation(s) is (are) limited. Discussion/application is very limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. <b>OR</b> one explanation answered at Level 2.
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible Content:

- Interference is an explanation for forgetting – two sets of information become confused
- Proactive interference is where old learning prevents recall of more recent information
- Retroactive interference is where new learning prevents recall of previously learned information
- Retrieval failure is where information is available but cannot be recalled because of the absence of appropriate cues
- Types of cues that have been studied by psychologists include context, state and organisation
- Cues improve recall if recall is in same context as learning, if the person is in same bodily state as when material was learned, if the organisation gives a structure which provides triggers, eg categories.

---

**Application:**

- French and Spanish are similar types of material which makes interference more likely
- Recalling French word for 'chair' is proactive interference.
- Martin's mum gives him cues (first letter) which can then be used for him to access the material he has failed to retrieve

**Possible discussion:**

- Use of evidence to support or contradict explanations
- Credit evaluation of evidence where used to discuss explanations
- Question of whether interference involves over-writing of other information
- Role of similarity in interference and response competition
- Issue of accessibility versus availability
- Semantic memory more resistant to interference than other types of memory
- General implications for revision and other situations
- Relevant links to memory theory: eg stage at which interference might occur in the multi-store model

Credit other relevant information.

**Exemplar response**

The main reason he forgets is due to interference. This could be proactive interference, where initial learning stops him recalling more recent learning. Or it could be retroactive interference, when more recent learning stops him recalling material he learnt previously. In this case it might be the Spanish (recent) stops him from recalling the French (earlier). In this case, as he recalls the French word for chair, not the Spanish, it demonstrates proactive interference. The help he gets from his mum is that by providing the first letter of the word, She is giving him a retrieval queue, which then helps him retrieve the correct word.

Since French & Spanish are similar, interference is quite likely. Martin would do better to revise each language on a separate input, to reduce interference. He could also revise a language with a completely different subject (eg maths) to also help reduce this problem.

Tulving's research suggests that interference might not be the only reason why Martin cannot recall the correct words. It might be better explained by availability versus accessibility. The problem for Martin might be at the retrieval stage.

**Examiner commentary**

This is a Level 2 response. There is a reasonable explanation for Interference and a sound link to Martin. There appears to be a little confusion on the 4<sup>th</sup> line which starts "in this case..." but when you read on it is evident this is being used as an example of retroactive interference (and not a link to this case i.e. Martin). In the next sentence, also starting with "in this case..", proactive interference is appropriately linked to "the French word for chair" and Martin. The idea of a retrieval cue (queue) is explained with respect to Martin's mum providing the first letter. There is a brief discussion of interference being more likely with similar material.

---

The naming of Tulving's research suggests the second explanation is lack of retrieval cues but this not developed. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately in places e.g. 'queue' which has quite a different meaning to 'cue'.

**Mark awarded = 6**

---

**Section C**  
**Attachment**

**QUESTION**

**09.1 Using the data in Table 1, explain the procedure used for the time sampling technique in this study.**

**[3 marks]**

**MARK SCHEME**

**Marks for this question: AO2 = 3**

**1 mark** for each of the following points:

- The total observation time for each parent was 10 minutes.
- The psychologist made 20 observations for each parent.
- To generate 20 observations for each parent she must therefore have recorded her observation every  $\frac{1}{2}$  minute or every 30 seconds.

**Exemplar response**

Time-sampling is where the boy will be observed for brief periods eg several periods of a few seconds each. She spent 10 minutes with each parent and generated 20 observations.

**Examiner commentary**

The first bullet point is covered (total observation time for each parent was 10 minutes) but 'generated 20 observations' needs clarifying, i.e. 20 observations for each parent. The third point has not been explained.

**Mark awarded = 1**

---

## QUESTION

**09.2 In what percentage of the total observations was the baby gazing at his mother? Show your calculations.**

**[2 marks]**

## MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO2 = 2**

**1 mark** for the correct answer: 30%

Plus

**1 mark** for showing correct workings: 12 divided by 40 multiplied by 100

Exemplar response

40 divided by 100 x 12 = 30%

## Examiner commentary

The answer is correct but if it was calculated in the stated way it would be 4.8 and so the calculations are incorrect.

**Mark awarded = 1**

---

## QUESTION

**09.4 The study in Question 09 was an overt observation.**

**Explain what is meant by 'overt observation'.**

**[2 marks]**

## MARK SCHEME

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 2**

**1 mark** for stating that overt observation is where the observer is clearly visible (not hidden from view).

Plus

**1 mark** for explanation – people being observed know that they are being observed

Exemplar response

An observation where the observer is not hidden but is in the room with the parent and child.

## Examiner commentary

There is an implication that if the child, parent and observer are in the same room then the people being observed know this, however this has to be explicitly stated. This answer gains the first mark but not the second mark.

**Mark awarded = 1**

## QUESTION

10 Outline the procedure used in one study of animal attachment.

[4 marks]

## MARK SCHEME

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Outline of a relevant procedure is mostly clear, logically sequenced and coherent with some relevant detail of test conditions and apparatus/materials. Minor detail is sometimes lacking or there is slight inaccuracy. The answer as whole is clear with use of specialist terminology.
1	1–2	A relevant procedure is discernible although the outline lacks clarity, logical sequence and coherence. There is some relevant information in relation to test conditions, apparatus or materials. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and coherence. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible content:

- Harlow – wire and cloth mother research or any later variations
- Suomi and Harlow – therapist monkey research
- Lorenz – imprinting research with greylag geese

Credit other relevant research.

### Exemplar response

Harlow & Harlow, took baby monkeys away from their mothers. They were kept isolated in a cage with a wire 'mother' that gave milk through a feeding bottle and a cloth covered 'mother' who was soft to touch. They then stressed these babies by putting a small wind-up toy in the cage, to see which of the two 'mothers' they ran to for security,

### Examiner commentary

This is a Level 2 response. The outline of the procedure is clear and logically sequenced with enough detail to understand the study.

Mark awarded = 4

## QUESTION

11 Briefly discuss one limitation of using animals to study attachment in humans.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	A limitation is clearly presented and discussed in some detail. Links to the study of attachment are explicit. The answer as a whole is mostly clear and coherent with appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1–2	A limitation is identified although discussion is limited and lacks coherence. Links to the study of attachment are either obscure or absent. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Most likely limitations:

- Problems of extrapolation to attachment in human infants – what applies to non-human species may not also apply to human infants
- difference in nature and complexity of the bond

Credit other relevant limitations.

Exemplar response

Just because animals behave in a certain way, is no guarantee that humans will also behave in this way. It is dangerous extrapolating findings from animals and using them to explain human behaviour. Humans are more complex than animals. Therefore we should be cautious generating findings from animals to humans.

### Examiner commentary

This is a Level 1 response. There is an appropriate limitation identified (extrapolation) with a discussion. However, there is no explicit link to the study of attachment in humans, instead this is a very generic answer which limits the marks that can be awarded.

Marks awarded = 2

## QUESTION

12 Outline and evaluate Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment.

[8 marks]

## MARK SCHEME

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4 and AO3 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
4	7- 8	Knowledge of Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused on formation of attachment. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	5-6	Knowledge of Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised, with focus on formation of attachment. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively.
2	3-4	Knowledge of Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy, organisation and focus in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Knowledge of Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology, either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible outline:

- Infants have an innate drive to survive
- Babies seek proximity to carer (mother) for safety
- Sequence of development – non-focused, one or more, signalling, safe base behaviour
- Evolutionary explanation – security equals survival
- Monotropy – this attachment is to a single specific caregiver
- Babies use signals – social releasers to attract the carer-reciprocity
- There is a critical (sensitive) period for attachment to take place (approx. up to 2 years)

### Possible evaluation points:

- Contrast with alternatives: eg learning theory states that attachment is based on reinforcement (cupboard love theory)
- Discussion in relation to continuity hypothesis
- Use of evidence to support Bowlby's theory: eg animal evidence in favour of critical / sensitive period
- Use of contradictory evidence: eg Schaffer and Emerson's findings re multiple attachments
- Implications (including economic implications) of monotropy theory: eg role of fathers, mothers returning to employment, use of daycare etc.
- Role of the internal working model

Credit other relevant information.

---

### Exemplar response

Bowlby's theory argues that attachment is innate and we have evolved this way in order for babies to survive. He felt that babies develop this attachment in a fixed sequence going from non-focus signals to a clear secure-base behaviour. He believed that babies are innately programmed to form one close, special bond with the mother (or primary care giver): namely a monotropic relationship. There is a critical period (of up to about two and a half years) in which this relationship must be formed and if not, it never will.

However, there are studies that challenge some of these ideas. Schaffer & Emerson's Glasgow baby study showed that many infants had more than one attachment and this goes against the idea of monotropy. Other studies felt that a critical period of 2 years was too restrictive and in fact children as old as 4 years were able to form close relationships with a primary care giver (eg Putter's adoption studies). Bowlby's idea that the mother is usually the primary attachment figure has been criticised as research has shown the father is just as important and can even have a more positive influence on development. However, when Bowlby was investigating this the mother usually stayed at home with children and this is different today.

### Examiner commentary

This is a Level 4 response. Given the limited time available (10 minutes for 8 marks) it is a detailed answer with accurate knowledge of Bowlby's monotropic theory. The evaluation is all concerned with the discussion of contradictory evidence, but this is detailed and accurate and makes several points. There is sound knowledge and understanding of the research that undermines the monotropic theory of attachment.

The answer is clear and focused on the formation of attachment, with good use of specialist terminology.

**Mark awarded = 8**