



AS

Psychology

7181/1
Final Mark scheme

Paper 1: Introductory Topics in Psychology
June 2017

Version/Stage: v1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A – Social influence**0 1**

Which of the following statements best describes the agentic state?

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

D

0 2

Select the phrase that describes internalisation.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

C

0 | 3

Briefly outline and evaluate normative social influence as an explanation for conformity.

[4 marks]

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

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Outline of normative social influence as an explanation of conformity is clear and has some detail. Some evaluation relevant to conformity is clear. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1–2	Outline of normative social influence lacks clarity and/or detail and/or link to conformity. Evaluation is limited. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. For 2 marks, either outline or evaluation is done well.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- People agree with the opinion of the majority in order to be liked and gain approval/acceptance/avoid rejection/avoid ridicule.
- This often leads to compliance which is where people will agree publicly with the group but privately they do not change their personal opinions.

Possible evaluation points:

- Evidence to support, e.g. Asch – when interviewed afterwards participants said they conformed to avoid rejection by others
- There are individual differences in how much people want to be liked by others and therefore not everyone will conform due to this desire
- Other explanations, e.g. informational social influence, conformity to social roles, social identity theory.

Credit any other relevant points

0 4 Using your knowledge of locus of control, identify which boy is most likely to resist the social influence of his friends. Explain why.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

1 mark for correct identification of boy: Daniel

Plus

1 mark for reference to Daniel's internal locus of control

Plus

2 marks for elaboration

Possible content:

- He believes that people are successful due to hard work and determination
- Daniel is less likely to rely on the opinion of others in the class, making him more immune to social influence
- Daniel will see himself as more of a leader than a follower, making him less likely to follow the majority
- Daniel will not seek social approval as much as those who are externals
- Use of research to support the explanation or as part of the explanation can get credit (eg Avtgis, 1998) but not required to get full marks.

Credit other relevant points.

0 5 Explain how Tom's refusal to take part might affect Daniel's and Matthew's ability to resist social influence.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation referring to both Daniel and Matthew

1 mark for a muddled or limited explanation OR clear explanation in relation to one of the boys

Possible content:

- Tom's refusal will increase their ability to resist social influence/they will be less likely to take part in the play.
- Tom acts as social support/presence of a role model of non-conformity
- Tom may not affect Daniel due to Daniel's internal locus of control
- Tom may affect Matthew due to Matthew's external locus of control

Note: explanations based on obedience are not creditworthy

0 | 6

Outline research into the effect of situational variables on obedience and discuss what this tells us about why people obey.

[12 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 6

Level	Marks	Description
4	10-12	Knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	7-9	Knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is evident, but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.
2	4-6	Limited knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. Or knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables at level 4 can be awarded 6 marks.
1	1-3	Knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is very limited. Discussion is 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.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

Knowledge of procedure and/or findings of research into the effects of:

- Proximity - Milgram - teacher and the learner were in the same room, obedience decreased; touch proximity condition; experimenter leaves the room, obedience decreased
- Location - Milgram – run-down office block vs Yale; Hofling hospital location
- Uniform - Bickman – more likely to obey a man dressed as a guard. In Milgram's experiment the experimenter wore a grey lab coat

Possible discussion points about what the research tells us about why people obey:

- Analysis of the effects of variations
- Discussion of reasons why rate of obedience changes (agentic/autonomous state; legitimacy of authority; personality/dispositional factors)
- Methodological evaluation of research when used to analyse the variables eg demand characteristics, external validity may be more a feature of some variations than others
- Use of systematic procedures to ensure that cause and effect could be established. This enables conclusions to be drawn
- Use of evidence/real-life examples to support or contradict the research into the effect of variables eg Mandel (1998) – mass killing of Jews was undertaken in close proximity of the victims without protest; Slater's (2006) study in a virtual environment included a condition where the participant had to shock the leaner via text from a mobile phone.

Credit other relevant information.

Section B - Memory**0 | 7**

Identify the main type of coding used in **each** of the following components of the multi-store model of memory.

[2 marks]**Marks for this question: AO1 = 2**

Short term memory = acoustic (accept sound or similar).

Long term memory = semantic (accept meaning or similar).

0 | 8

Memory studies are sometimes criticised for being unrealistic. Briefly explain **two** ways that this criticism could be addressed in memory research.

[4 marks]**Marks for this question: AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Two ways for dealing with issues of artificiality in memory research are clearly explained. Minor detail is sometimes lacking or there is slight inaccuracy. The answer as a whole is clear with use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Two ways are identified. Any explanation lacks detail/accuracy. The answer as a whole lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one suggestion at Level 2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- Researchers could use environments that are natural for participants such as school classrooms when learning and recalling information
- Researchers could ensure that the task are everyday tasks for their participants, such as learning definitions if they are student participants
- Realistic stimuli can be used to recall information such as visual tasks so that they more closely reflect everyday memory tasks.
- Different methodology/data collection techniques

Credit other relevant modifications.

0 | 9 Using your knowledge of research into the effects of anxiety on eye-witness testimony, explain why Zina's and Amanda's statements are different.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Explanation of the difference is clear and appropriate, and based on relevant research. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1-2	Explanation of the difference is evident but lacks clarity. Use of research is limited. The answer lacks coherence and specialist terminology not always used appropriately.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible explanation for the difference:

- When anxiety/arousal is high, as is the case for Zina, this leads to a decrease in accuracy/detail compared with Amanda. This is supported by research, e.g. Johnson and Scott who found that those in the high anxiety condition were less likely to accurately identify the man; Duffenbacher (1983) meta-analysis found that high levels of anxiety negatively affected the memory of eyewitnesses
- When anxiety/arousal is high, as is the case for Zina, this leads to increased accuracy/detail compared with Amanda. This is supported by research evidence, e.g. Christianson and Hubinette where victims were more accurate than onlookers; Yuille and Cutshall's study where those witnesses that were close to the shooting were accurate, even months later.

Credit any other relevant explanation.

1 | 0 A psychologist decided to interview both Zina and Amanda five months later to see if they could still remember the same level of detail about the incident.

Explain **one** ethical issue the psychologist must consider before interviewing Zina and Amanda.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

2 marks for a clear and coherent ethical issue that is relevant to the question stem.

1 mark for a muddled answer and/or one that is not made relevant to the question stem.

Possible issues:

- Treating people with respect such as assuring their confidentiality, giving them the right to withdraw, etc.
- Protection from harm – Zina and Amanda could experience psychological harm from having to recall the details of the incident again so they could be offered counselling
- Informed consent – the psychologist must gain informed consent, so Zina and Amanda are aware that they will be interviewed about the incident.

Credit any other relevant ethical issues.

1 | 1

Describe and evaluate interference as an explanation for forgetting.

[12 marks]**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 6**

Level	Marks	Description
4	10–12	Knowledge of interference as an explanation for forgetting is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	7–9	Knowledge of interference is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.
2	4–6	Limited knowledge of interference as an explanation for forgetting is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. Or knowledge at Level 4 can be awarded 6 marks.
1	1–3	Knowledge of interference as an explanation for forgetting is very limited. Evaluation is 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.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- Interference is where two lots of information become confused in memory
- Proactive interference is where old learning affects recall of new information
- Retroactive interference is where new learning affects recall of old information
- Newer information may overwrite earlier information
- Interference is more likely to occur when the two pieces of information are similar/response competition
- The impact of passage of time/intervening events on forgetting

Credit other relevant material.

Possible evaluation points:

- Use of research evidence to support or contradict the role of interference
- Loss of information may only be temporary, therefore interference is not a true explanation for forgetting
- Issue of validity - evidence that interference can explain forgetting frequently comes from artificial laboratory experiments using artificial tasks, so interference may not occur to the same extent in more real-life settings and scenarios, so challenging interference as an explanation of forgetting
- However, everyday/real life situations have shown interference can explain forgetting, eg Baddeley and Hitch (1977); Schmidt et al (2000)
- Practical applications, e.g. revision strategies
- Alternative explanations can be used to critique.

Credit any other relevant points.

Section C – Attachment

1 2 Identify **two** infant behaviours that are characteristic of the insecure-resistant attachment type.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

Possible content:

- High or extreme stranger anxiety
- High or extreme separation anxiety
- Resist comfort from the caregiver on reunion
- Explore less
- More clingy.

Also credit examples of specific behaviours, e.g. pushing the caregiver away on reunion.

Note: If more than two distinct behaviours are given, **mark the first two**.

1 3 Using the information in **Figure 1**, estimate the percentage of **boys** and **girls** that are securely attached.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

Boys = between 26% and 37% inclusive.

Girls = between 63% and 74% inclusive.

Maximum **1 mark** if the two figures do not add up to 100.

1 4 In a different study, 150 children were classified as securely attached. Of these, 40% were boys. How many of the 150 children were girls? Show your workings.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

2 marks for the correct answer: 90

If the answer is incorrect, can award **1 mark** for the correct workings:

$$150 \times 0.6$$

1 | 5 The researcher collected quantitative data using the 'Strange Situation'. He then decided to collect qualitative data by conducting interviews with some of the parents of the infants.

Describe **two** differences between these types of data.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Knowledge of two differences between qualitative and quantitative data is clear and well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1-2	Knowledge of two differences is evident. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately. Or one difference at level 2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible differences (expressed as comparison):

- Quantitative data involves numbers (number of boys and girls), whereas qualitative data involves words, e.g. quotes from the interview
- Quantitative data can be measured objectively, whereas qualitative data is based on the subjective interpretation of language
- Quantitative data is immediately quantifiable, whereas qualitative data has to be transformed and is only quantifiable if the data is put into categories and the frequency is counted

Credit any other relevant differences e.g. ease of analysis, easier to identify trends/patterns, ease of comparison

1 | 6

Outline Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation.

[3 marks]**Marks for this question: AO1 = 3**

Level	Marks	Description
3	3	Outline of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is generally detailed, clear and coherent. There is effective use of terminology.
2	2	Outline of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is generally clear but some detail is missing. There is some effective use of terminology.
1	1	Outline of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation generally lacks detail and clarity. Terminology is either minimal, absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- Bowlby's use of the term 'deprivation'
- Effects on development – intellectual, emotional, social, e.g. affectionless psychopathy, delinquency, low IQ
- Critical period – an issue if prolonged separation, if before two and half years (but risk up to 5 years) and if no substitute available
- Internal working model – this can lead to inability to be a good parent
- Continuity hypothesis – if there are prolonged separations then there may be issues into adulthood.

Credit other relevant material.

1 | 7Explain **one** criticism of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation.**[3 marks]****Marks for this question: AO3 = 3**

Level	Marks	Description
3	3	Explanation of one criticism is clear and coherent. There is effective use of terminology.
2	2	Explanation of one criticism is generally clear but elaboration is missing. There is some effective use of terminology.
1	1	Explanation of one criticism lacks clarity. Terminology is either minimal, absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible criticisms:

- Contradictory research, e.g. Lewis (1954)
- Rutter's criticism that there could be an overstatement of the effects of deprivation
- Sensitive versus critical period
- Real-world application, e.g. the way children are cared for in hospital has changed as a result of Bowlby's theory/research
- Economic implications of the theory (care, work, etc.).

Can accept positive criticisms.

Credit other relevant information.

1 8

Outline and evaluate the learning theory of attachment

[8 marks]**Marks for this question: AO1 = 4 and AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of the learning theory of attachment is accurate with some detail. Evaluation is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Knowledge of the learning theory of attachment is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.
2	3-4	Limited knowledge of the learning theory of attachment is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasion. Knowledge at Level 4 can be awarded 4 marks.
1	1-2	Knowledge of the learning theory of attachment is very 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 content:

- Idea of 'cupboard love' - children learn to become attached to their caregiver because they give them food
- Secondary drive/drive reduction in relation to feeding and attachment
- Learning can be due to associations (classical conditioning) – outline of how this process works in attachment
- Learning can be due to patterns of reinforcement (operant conditioning) – outline of how this process works in attachment
- Dollard and Miller (1950) - Infants learn to associate the caregiver with the feeling of pleasure when they are fed (classical conditioning) and infants are reinforced in the behaviours that will produce these desirable responses from others (e.g. being fed when they cry - operant conditioning).

Possible evaluation points:

- Evidence that underpins theory
- Evidence to refute theory: e.g. Schaffer and Emerson – more than half of the infants were not attached to the person primarily involved in their physical care; Harlow – rhesus monkeys attach for comfort not food
- Other factors may act as reinforcers and not food – attentiveness and responsiveness (Ainsworth)
- Comparison with alternative explanations, e.g. Bowlby.

Methodological evaluation of evidence must be linked to the learning explanation of attachment to gain credit.

Do not have to include both classical conditioning and operant conditioning for full content marks.
Credit other relevant points.

Assessment Objective Grid

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Social influence				
01	1			1
02	1			1
03	2		2	4
04		4		4
05		2		2
06	6		6	12
Total	10	6	8	24

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Memory				
07	2			2
08			4	4
09		4		4
10		2 RM		2
11	6		6	12
Total	8	6	10	24

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Attachment				
12	2			2
13		2 RM/Maths		2
14		2 RM/Maths		2
15		4 RM/Maths		4
16	3			3
17			3	3
18	4		4	8
Total	9	8	7	24

Paper Total	27	20	25	72
--------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Research Methods (RM) = 10 marks

Maths = 8 marks