



A-level
PSYCHOLOGY
7182/1

Paper 1 Introductory topics in psychology

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final Mark Scheme

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 Examiner.

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.

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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. Answers in the standardising materials will correspond with the different levels of the mark scheme. These answers will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the standardised examples 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 **one** of the following is most associated with informational social influence? **[1 mark]**

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

C

- 0 2** Using your knowledge of minority influence processes, explain **two** ways in which Samina could convince the other students in the debating society to agree with her. **[4 marks]**

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

For **each** way award marks as follows:

2 marks for a clear, coherent explanation with some elaborated application.

1 mark for a limited, muddled explanation.

Possible content:

- Samina could demonstrate consistency by not deviating from her view that drugs should not be legalised – she could point out that this is a view she has held for many years
- Samina could demonstrate commitment by defending her view that drugs should not be legalised through some personal investment – for instance, offering to speak in assembly about the dangers of drugs. This will draw more attention to her case (augmentation principle)
- Samina should demonstrate flexibility by adapting her view/accepting other valid counterarguments. Perhaps some ‘softer’ drugs could be decriminalised, rather than legalised
- over time, the rest of the debating society may become ‘converted’ (snowball effect) – for example, if Samina makes her case particularly well
- credit other valid points, eg persistence, confidence.

There are **no marks** for simply listing, eg consistency, commitment, flexibility.

If more than two ways are presented the best two should be credited.

0 3 Explain how Asch's conformity research illustrates **one** of these features of science.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

3 marks for a clear, elaborated explanation of how Asch's conformity research illustrates the chosen feature – must be explicit contextualisation.

2 marks for an explanation with some elaboration. Contextualisation may be implicit.

1 mark for a limited or muddled explanation.

Possible content:

- replicability – Asch's studies had standardised procedures (eg the number of confederates; length of lines etc) which meant that they could be repeated/replicated to assess consistency/reliability of the findings; this increased the validity of the conclusions drawn
- theory construction – Asch's findings led to the development of explanations/theories of conformity, eg that people will conform to group pressure to avoid ridicule (normative social influence)
- hypothesis testing – Asch's research tested the assumption that naive participants would conform to an obviously wrong answer when placed under group pressure; this was achieved by manipulating an IV (fake/genuine answer) to measure the effect on the DV and keeping other (possible confounding) variables constant.

Credit other relevant content.

0 4 Discuss the legitimacy of authority **and** agentic state explanations of obedience.
Refer to Freddie’s behaviour in your answer.

[16 marks]

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

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is accurate and generally well detailed. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9–12	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Application and/or discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5–8	Limited knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion and/or application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions OR one theory only at Level 3/4.
1	1–4	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is very limited. Discussion and/or application 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 OR one theory only at Level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

Legitimacy of authority:

- when a person recognises their own and other’s position in a social hierarchy
- legitimacy is increased by visible symbols of authority, eg uniform
- legitimacy of setting, order, system.

Agentic state:

- when a person acts on behalf of an authority figure/person of higher status
- the actor feels no personal responsibility/does not feel guilty for their actions
- the opposite of an autonomous state in which people act according to their own principles
- reference to binding factors.

Accept other valid points.

Possible application:

Legitimacy of authority:

- Freddie pays no attention to his friend as they have equal status in the social hierarchy
- the deputy head is a legitimate authority within the social system (school)
- the deputy head is a visible symbol of authority (high-vis jacket).

Agentic state:

- when making fun of his friend’s request, Freddie is in an autonomous state
- when he sees the deputy head, Freddie enters the agentic state ‘without thinking’ and observes school rules (queuing in line).

Accept other valid application points.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the explanations, eg Milgram variations, Bickman, Hofling
- use of real-life examples to illustrate explanations, eg My Lai massacre
- neither explanation can account for rates of disobedience in studies
- obedience may be dispositional, not situational, eg authoritarian personality
- discussion of difficulty measuring and/or distinguishing between reasons why obedience occurs.

Accept other valid points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to the discussion of the explanations.

Section B

Memory

0 5 Which type of long-term memory would be most associated with the following?

Write the correct type of long-term memory in the spaces provided.

0 5. **1** Stored with reference to contextual information, eg time and place.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

Episodic

0 5. **2** Difficult to describe in words.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

Procedural

0 5. **3** Knowing the meaning of a word.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

Semantic

0 6 State **one** advantage of an independent groups design.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 1

Possible advantages:

- removes order effects/effects of practise/fatigue etc
- participants are less likely to work out the aim and change their behaviour/less influenced by demand characteristics.

Accept other valid advantages.

0 7 Suggest a more appropriate measure of central tendency for this data set **and** explain why it would be more appropriate.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 3

1 mark for the median.

Plus

2 marks for a clear, elaborated explanation of why the median would be more appropriate for this data set.

1 mark for a limited or muddled explanation, or no explicit reference to the data set.

Possible content:

- the median would be better as there is a large anomalous result in the data set (p4 has scored 28). This would distort the mean value making it unrepresentative of the data set as a whole

OR

- recall of words cannot be classed as interval data as not all words are equally difficult/easy to recall. As the data is ordinal, the median should be used rather than the mean.

0 8 Using an example, explain what is meant by retroactive interference.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3

2 marks for a clear, elaborated explanation of retroactive interference.

1 mark for a limited or muddled explanation.

Possible content:

- when new/recently stored information disrupts/affects the recall of old/previously stored information
- more likely if competing information is similar.

Plus

1 mark for an appropriate example.

0 9 Explain how the police could use the cognitive interview to help Danielle’s recall of the event.

[6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	Application of knowledge to Danielle’s experience is mostly clear and effective. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3–4	There is some application of knowledge to Danielle’s experience. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1–2	There is limited application of knowledge to Danielle’s experience. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- Danielle is encouraged to mentally reinstate the context, reminded of, eg why she was walking down the high street, the weather etc as this may trigger further information (reinstate the context)
- Danielle should be asked to report every detail even if it seems irrelevant, eg what the attacker was wearing, the style of the handbag etc (report everything)
- Danielle should be asked to recall the event in a different order, eg beginning from when she comforted the elderly woman and working backwards (changing order)
- Danielle should recall the event from the perspective of others, eg the couple of other witnesses who were present at the time (changing perspective)
- credit features of enhanced cognitive interview to facilitate recall if applied to Danielle’s experience.

Credit other valid applications.

Answers may cover fewer points in more depth or more points in less depth.

1 0 Outline and evaluate research into duration in memory.

[8 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3, AO3 = 5

Level	Marks	Description
4	7–8	Knowledge of research into duration in memory is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5–6	Knowledge of research into duration in memory is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3–4	Limited knowledge of research into duration in memory is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation present is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1–2	Knowledge of research into duration in memory 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

- knowledge of procedures and/or findings/conclusions of studies which investigate duration of sensory memory, STM or LTM, eg Peterson and Peterson - Trigrams study (1959), Bahrick - Yearbook study (1974).

Accept other valid studies of duration in memory.

Note: That the term ‘research’ may include theories/explanations and/or studies.

Possible evaluation:

- use of artificial material, eg recall of trigrams, lists of unconnected words etc
- use of artificial laboratory setting
- discussion of issues of validity (higher in Bahrick study), reliability
- alternative explanations – Peterson and Peterson’s findings may be more to do with interference than duration.

Note that one study is sufficient for full marks.

Section C

Attachment

1 1. **1** Identify the attachment type that Annie’s mother is describing.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

Insecure-resistant/anxious-resistant/insecure-ambivalent/resistant/ambivalent/Type C.

Do **not** credit ‘insecure’.

1 1. **2** Distinguish between **two other** types of attachment.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Distinction between two types of attachment is mostly clear and accurate, with evidence of either breadth or detail. The answer is mostly coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1–2	There is limited/partial distinction between two types of attachment. The answer may lack coherence. Use of terminology may be either absent or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- secure attachment/Type B shows moderate levels of stranger anxiety whereas insecure-avoidant/Type A shows low levels
- Type B shows moderate levels of separation anxiety whereas Type A shows low levels
- Type B shows joy on reunion whereas Type A shows little response
- Type B shows use of attachment figure as a safe base whereas Type A shows high levels of independent behaviour
- credit distinctions based on other types of attachment, eg disorganised; disinhibited.

No marks for simply naming two (other) types of attachment.

Full marks can be awarded if two types in (ii) are different from an incorrect answer in (i).

Credit other relevant distinction points.

1 2

Studies of attachment often involve naturalistic observations.

Suggest **one** way in which studies of attachment could be improved by using controlled observations.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 3

3 marks for a clear, elaborated suggestion of one way studies of attachment could be improved by using controlled rather than naturalistic observations.

2 marks for a suggestion with some elaboration.

1 mark for a limited or muddled suggestion.

Possible reasons:

- controlled observations can minimise extraneous variables
- controlled observations are likely to have standardised procedures, so reliability/replication is more of a possibility than in naturalistic observations
- cause and effect relationships are easier to establish than in a naturalistic observation.

Credit other relevant ways.

Credit reference to research examples, eg Ainsworth, if they support suggestion.

If more than one way is presented credit the best one.

1 3 Discuss research into caregiver-infant interactions in humans.

[16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	Knowledge of research into caregiver-infant interactions is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9–12	Knowledge of research into caregiver-infant interactions is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5–8	Limited knowledge of research into caregiver-infant interactions 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.
1	1–4	Knowledge of research into caregiver-infant interactions 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:

- description of features of caregiver-infant interaction in humans: reciprocity – two-way interaction between caregiver and child/turn-taking/mirroring; interactional synchrony – simultaneous co-ordinated sequence of movements, communication, emotions
- accept other relevant features, eg imitation; baby talk register/‘motherese’
- examples of features
- description of evidence of features, eg Isabella et al; Murray and Trevarthan; Condon and Sander; Meltzoff and Moore.

Note: that the term ‘research’ may include theories/explanations and/or studies.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support or contradict features
- use of controlled observations to capture micro-sequences
- infant’s intention is difficult to determine
- the purpose of synchrony and reciprocity in attachment is difficult to discern
- research is socially sensitive – impact on working mothers.

Accept other valid points.

Material from other parts of the specification can only be credited if there is a specific focus on caregiver-infant interactions in humans.

Section D

Psychopathology

1 4 Briefly evaluate the deviation from ideal mental health definition of abnormality. **[4 marks]**

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Evaluation is relevant, generally well-explained and focused on the deviation from ideal mental health definition. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.
1	1–2	Evaluation is relevant although there is limited explanation and/or limited focus on the deviation from ideal mental health definition. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately or is absent.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible evaluation:

- comprehensive criteria for mental health
- based on similar models of physical health – but mental health may not be the same
- criteria are too demanding – most of us would be defined as unhealthy
- Western individualist bias.

Accept other valid points.

1 5 Outline **two** cognitive characteristics of obsessive-compulsive disorder. **[4 marks]**

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

For each characteristic award marks as follows:

2 marks for a clear, coherent cognitive characteristic.

1 mark for a limited, muddled cognitive characteristic.

Possible characteristics:

- obsessive thoughts – persistent and intrusive thoughts of, eg germs
- hypervigilance/selective attention – increased awareness of source of obsession in new situations
- insight into irrationality of thoughts/behaviour
- cognitive strategies to deal with obsessions.

Award **1 mark** only for two cognitive characteristics just named.

Accept other valid characteristics.

1 6 Discuss the two-process model of phobias. Refer to Max’s phobia of the sea in your answer.

[16 marks]

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

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	Knowledge of the two-process model is accurate and generally well detailed. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9–12	Knowledge of the two-process model is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Application and/or discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5–8	Limited knowledge of the two-process model is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion and/or application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1–4	Knowledge of the two-process model is very limited. Discussion and/or application 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:

- development of phobia through classical conditioning – association of fear/anxiety with neutral stimulus to produce conditioned response; assumes experience of traumatic event; generalisation of fear to other similar objects; one trial learning
- maintenance of fear through operant conditioning – avoidance of phobic object/situation is negatively reinforcing; relief as reward/primary reinforcer.

Accept other valid points.

Possible application:

- Max’s phobia has developed through classical conditioning – association formed between the neutral stimulus (sea) and the fearful event (being carried away by the tide)
- the conditioned response is triggered every time Max is near the sea
- phobia has generalised to all ‘beach holidays’
- phobia is maintained through operant conditioning – avoidance of fear is reinforcing, so Max avoids the beach.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the two-process model, eg Watson and Rayner, DiNardo et al
- not all phobias are the result of trauma
- alternative evolutionary explanations for more common phobias, eg preparedness
- behavioural approach ignores cognitive aspects of phobias
- alternative explanations for avoidance, eg safety
- behavioural principles underpin therapies based on counterconditioning, eg systematic desensitisation.

Accept other valid points. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to the discussion of the explanations.

Assessment Objective Grid				
	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Social Influence				
01	1			
02		4		
03		3 (RM)		
04	6	4	6	
Total	7	11	6	24
Memory				
05	3			
06			1 (RM)	
07			3 (RM/maths) /strand 2	
08	3			
09		6		
10	3		5	
Total	9	6	9	24
Attachment				
11.1		1		
11.2	4			
12			3 (RM/strand 2)	
13	6		10	
Total	10	1	13	24
Psychopathology				
14			4	
15	4			
16	6	4	6	
Total	10	4	10	24
Paper Total	36	22	38	96