



A-level PSYCHOLOGY 7182/1

Paper 1 Introductory topics in psychology

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



2 4 6 A 7 1 8 2 / 1 / M S

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](https://www.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 © 2024 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
---	---

Outline **one** ethical issue that has arisen in social influence research. Refer to **one or more** social influence studies in your answer.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

Outline content:

Up to 2 marks for the outline of the ethical issue

Award 1 mark for identification of the ethical issue, and 1 further mark for elaboration

- Deception; protection from harm; the right to withdraw.
- Participants in a study should not be knowingly misled or lied to
- Participants should not be exposed to any more risk than they would encounter in everyday life
- Participants should be able to leave the investigation at any time

If more than one ethical issue is outlined credit the best

Up to 2 marks for reference to one or more social influence studies

2 marks for clear and effective reference to one or more social influence studies

1 mark for limited / muddled reference to one or more social influence studies

- In Milgram's obedience study, participants did not know the shocks were not real; in Asch's conformity study, participants were not aware the other participants were confederates of the experimenter
- In Milgram's study, participants exhibited signs of extreme stress – sweating, shaking, etc.; in Zimbardo's study, prisoners showed signs of disorganised thinking and behaviour
- Milgram's participants were encouraged to continue through the use of verbal prods; Zimbardo's participants were denied requests to leave.

Credit other valid points.

0 2

Use your knowledge of conformity to explain Charlie's behaviour.

[6 marks]**Marks for this question: AO2 = 6**

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

Possible content:

- Charlie may be conforming due to normative social influence – his decision to wear his jumper inside-out is motivated by a desire to fit in with the group and avoid being isolated. This pressure may be felt particularly keenly as he is new to the school (and presumably may not have many other friends).
- Charlie may be demonstrating compliance – his 'worrying' suggests that he is conflicted, but decides to wear his jumper inside-out (publicly) even though, internally, he may not agree with the behaviour
- Charlie may be demonstrating identification – the fact that he thinks the boys are 'cool', values the group membership and displays group behaviour

Credit other relevant application points, eg external locus of control; group size and unanimity (lack of an ally); research studies can be credited if they are clearly linked to the scenario

No explicit application to the scenario **maximum** of 1 mark

Note: that it would be difficult to make a case for internalisation/informational social influence in this scenario, but students may be awarded credit if they do.

0 3 Use your knowledge of obedience to explain the boys' behaviour.

[6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

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

Possible content:

- the boys obeyed because the Headteacher is a legitimate authority figure – in a hierarchical system, like a school, those who impose the rules have the power to punish, in this case with a detention
- the boys obeyed due to situational variables, eg location – the boys are summoned to the Headteacher's office; proximity of authority figure – the Headteacher is issuing orders face-to-face; lack of social support – the boys are called to the office 'one-by-one'
- the boys obeyed due to being in an agentic state – when the boys then decided to wear their jumper correctly.
- some of the boys may have an authoritarian personality, respect for those they perceive to be in authority and therefore blindly obey the Headteacher

No explicit application to the scenario **maximum** of 1 mark

Credit other relevant application points e.g. External locus of control, uniform. Research studies can be credited if they clearly linked to the scenario.

0 4 Discuss consistency **and** flexibility as processes involved in minority influence.

[8 marks]

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

Level	Marks	Description
4	7–8	Knowledge of consistency and flexibility as processes involved in minority influence is accurate with some detail. 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	5–6	Knowledge of consistency and flexibility as processes involved in minority influence 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	3–4	Limited knowledge of consistency and/or flexibility as processes involved in minority influence 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 consistency or flexibility at Level 3/4.
1	1–2	Knowledge of consistency and/or flexibility as processes involved in minority influence 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. OR consistency or flexibility at Level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- consistency – repetition of a message leads to a majority questioning their view; consistency can be over time (diachronic) or between minority group members (synchronic)
- flexibility – the minority should acknowledge/make concessions to the majority to avoid appearing too rigid/dogmatic. Minorities must strike a balance between consistency and flexibility to be successful
- over time, consistency and/or flexibility gives the members of the majority an opportunity to listen to the minority view and adopt it as their own
- description of relevant evidence.

Accept other valid content.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict processes, eg Moscovici et al (1969) – 8% of responses identified a blue slide as green when exposed to a consistent minority; Nemeth and Brilmayer (1987) – when a minority offered compromise in a jury situation, they were more likely to convince others of their view
- lab studies of consistency/flexibility lack ecological validity – lack of differential power/status in lab situations; tasks are trivial, eg naming colour of slides, compared to real-life struggles of minorities
- use of real-life examples to support wider discussion
- contradictory nature of consistency and flexibility
- discussion of alternative factors/processes, eg commitment; identification with the minority

Accept other relevant discussion points.

Section B**Memory**

0	5
---	---

Briefly explain how the use of inferential statistics would improve this investigation.

[3 marks]**Marks for this question: AO3 = 3****1 mark each for any 3 of the following bullet points****Content:**

- would allow the researcher to establish whether the relationship is significant/due to chance
- allows the (alternative) hypothesis to be accepted/null to be rejected
- can more accurately show the strength of the relationship
- the researcher would more easily deduce the relationship than from a scattergram
- to increase the scientific credibility/validity/objectivity of the research.

0	6
---	---

Suggest an appropriate statistical test to improve this investigation. With reference to the study, outline **two** reasons for your choice of test.**[5 marks]****Marks for this question: AO3 = 5**

1 mark for naming an appropriate test: Pearsons r (can also credit Spearman's Rho)

Note: if more than one test is given credit the first answer

PLUS:

For **each** of the following bullet points award:**2 marks** for a clear and coherent reason linked to the investigation**1 mark** for a limited/partial reason.**Possible content:**

- analysing the relationship/correlation between the time elapsed and the number of nonsense words recalled in long-term memory – test of relationship/correlation
- words were standardised (similar difficulty and length) **and** time is in fixed units, therefore it's interval data

OR alternative 2nd bullet point for Spearman's Rho

- some words could still be more difficult or memorable than others, suggesting the difference between words is not fixed/ equal, therefore the nonsense word list is to be treated as ordinal data

Appropriate reasoning can be credited even if an incorrect test is named or no test is given.

0	7
---	---

 Outline **two** ways in which episodic memories are different from semantic memories.
[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

For **each** difference award-

2 marks for a clear and coherent difference

1 mark for a limited/muddled difference

Possible differences:

- episodic memories are memories of (autobiographical) events in your life, semantic memories are memories of facts/general knowledge/the rules of language
- episodic memories involve (contextual) knowledge of when ('time-stamped') and where the information was learnt; however, such information is not necessary for recall of semantic memories
- episodic memories are more likely to involve the storage of emotional content in memory, such as how one felt at the time; however, such information is not necessarily encoded as part of semantic memories
- episodic memories are generally based on an individual's subjective experience whereas semantic memories are objective facts about the world.

Credit other relevant differences.

Note: Straightforward descriptions of each type of memory, without explicit/clear difference(s) maximum 1 mark

0	8
---	---

Briefly describe retrieval failure as an explanation of forgetting. Outline **one** limitation of this explanation.

[4 marks]

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

2 marks for a clear and coherent outline of the explanation.

1 mark for a limited/partial outline.

Possible content:

- forgetting is due to an absence of cues, preventing access to long-term memory
- cues may be context dependent (to do with the place where information was originally stored) or state dependent (the person's emotional/physical state at the time of encoding)
- credit explanation of the encoding specificity principle.

Credit other valid content.

PLUS

2 marks for a clear and coherent limitation.

1 mark for a brief or muddled limitation.

Possible limitations:

- the influence of context cues may be overstated so the explanation has difficulty accounting for successful recall in different contexts
- nature of supporting evidence, eg Godden and Baddeley is based on the recall of trivial material which reduced the validity of the explanation
- contradictory findings – the context effect disappears when participants are tested using recognition rather than free recall tasks
- reasoned comparison with alternative explanation, eg interference.

Credit other valid limitations.

0 9

Discuss the effect of post-event discussion on the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. Refer to the information above in your answer.

[8 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3, AO2 = 2, AO3 = 3

Level	Marks	Description
4	7–8	Knowledge of post-event discussion is accurate with some detail. 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	5–6	Knowledge of post-event discussion is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some appropriate application/effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3–4	Limited knowledge of post-event discussion is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any application/discussion 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 post-event discussion is very limited. Application/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:

- witnesses may discuss what they have seen (with co-witnesses or other people)
- this may lead to contamination of memory/unreliable recall/false memory/confabulation reducing the accuracy of eyewitness testimony
- knowledge of relevant research studies
- conformity effect – witnesses copy others' accounts to win social approval
- source monitoring – distortion of memory occurs when alternative accounts are heard, creating confusion).

Possible application:

- 'I'm not sure we're going to be able to use her statement...', suggests that contamination of memory has occurred/the account is unreliable
- '...may have just been repeating what she heard from other witnesses', suggests post-event discussion has occurred
- the witness is unsure whether her account is genuine – source monitoring/confusion.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support or refute the explanation, eg Gabbert et al (2003) – 71% of participants mistakenly recalled aspects of an event they had picked up in a discussion
- effects of post-event discussion can be reduced if participants are warned of the effects, eg Bodner et al (2009)
- difficulty in distinguishing between explanations
- comparison with alternative factors, eg leading questions, anxiety.

Credit other relevant material.

Section C

Attachment

1 0 Which feature of caregiver-infant interaction does this example illustrate?

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark for reciprocity

Note: if more than one feature is given credit the first answer

1 1 Which feature of caregiver-infant interaction does this example illustrate?

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark for interactional synchrony

Note: if more than one feature is given credit the first answer

1 2

Describe the concept of a critical period **and** the concept of an internal working model in the context of attachment.

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

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	Knowledge of both concepts is clear and generally well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3–4	Knowledge of both concepts is evident. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. OR one concept at L3.
1	1–2	Knowledge of one or both concepts is limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one concept at Level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:**Critical period**

- the time period when a human/animal infant is maximally ready to form an attachment
- if no attachment has been formed within this time, the child will find it difficult to form an attachment thereafter
- Lorenz's work – several hours in geese; approximately up to 3 years in humans according to Bowlby
- Not forming an attachment in the critical period would present irreversible consequences e.g. emotional difficulties.

Internal working model

- the first attachment forms a blueprint for future relationships
- a form of schema/mental representation of what relationships are like
- a child whose first attachment is loving and secure will go on to form successful relationships with peers, romantic partners, their own children, etc
- a child whose first relationship involves poor treatment will expect such treatment from others/will carry this forward to future relationships
- the quality of the IWM can be influenced by the consistency and/or responsiveness of the caregiver.

Credit other valid content.

1 3 Discuss Romanian orphan studies.**[16 marks]****Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10**

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	Knowledge of studies of Romanian orphans 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 studies of Romanian orphans 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 Romanian orphan studies 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 Romanian orphan studies 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:

- credit relevant background, eg fall of communist regime in Romania; banning of birth control; abandoned children 'warehoused' in extremely poor conditions; lack of physical and emotional care; very high child-to-staff ratio
- description of the procedures of research by Rutter and the ERA team, eg Rutter et al (2011) – progress of 165 Romanian adoptees matched against 52 British controls; emotional, social and physical development assessed at age 4, 6, 11 and 15 (most recent follow-up at ages 22–25)
- key findings – half were intellectually delayed at 4; at 11, recovery rates were related to age of adoption; those adopted after 6 months displayed a number of effects eg disinhibited attachment, quasi-autism, delayed language development, delayed intellectual development, poor physical growth
- credit details of other research, eg Zeanah et al (2005) – Bucharest early intervention project, randomised controlled trial, attachment assessed using Ainsworth's procedure, evidence of disinhibited and disorganised attachment.

Possible discussion points:

- implications for children in the care system, eg continuity of care, preference for adoption/foster care
- difficulty in generalising experience of Romanian institutions as conditions were so extreme
- implications of findings for theory – suggests critical period may be more of a sensitive period; lack of internal working model can be overcome with adequate aftercare
- lack of adult data so long-term conclusions difficult to draw
- importance of early adoption – before 6 months appears to mediate effects
- support from other studies, eg Tizard and Hodges, Quinton
- methodological issues in studies – confounding variable of sociability in adopted children (although this was controlled in the Zeanah et al study).

Credit other relevant material.

Section D**Psychopathology**

- 1 4** Which **two** of the following are emotional characteristics of obsessive-compulsive disorder? **[2 marks]**

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

Answer **C** – Low mood
 Answer **E** – Self-loathing

- 1 5** How would the two-process model of phobias explain Ken's fear of dogs? **[6 marks]**

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	Application of knowledge of the two-process model to the phobia of dogs is clear and generally well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3–4	Application of knowledge of the two-process model to the phobia of dogs is evident. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1–2	Application of knowledge of the two-process model to the phobia of dogs is limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content/application:

- Ken's phobia has developed through classical conditioning i.e. by association
- The pain or shock of breaking his arm/being knocked over by the dog was an unconditioned stimulus producing fear, an unconditioned response
- The dog is associated with pain/shock as they occur together in time
- the dog/Prince is a neutral stimulus which becomes a conditioned stimulus producing a fear of dogs as a conditioned response
- the conditioned response is generalised to all dogs
- Ken's phobia is maintained through operant conditioning
- the behaviour of avoiding dogs is negatively reinforced through the relief it brings.

Credit other relevant material – including reference to a classical conditioning diagram applied to the scenario

Note:

- If only one aspect of the two-process model is applied maximum 3 marks
- Two process model (classical and operant conditioning) without application to the scenario, maximum 1 mark

1 6

Discuss the cognitive approach to explaining depression.

[16 marks]**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10**

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	Knowledge of the cognitive approach to explaining depression 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 the cognitive approach to explaining depression 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 the cognitive approach to explaining depression 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 the cognitive approach to explaining depression 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:

- cognitive explanations suggest that some people are more vulnerable to depression because of the way they think
- Beck's theory – the negative triad (the self, the world and the future), negative self-schema that may be activated in childhood, faulty information processing, magnification/over-generalisation
- Ellis' theory – ABC model: activating event, irrational beliefs (musterbation, I-can't-stand-it-it is, utopianism, etc), consequence.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict explanations, eg Clark and Beck (1999) – cognitive vulnerabilities preceded depression; Cohen et al (2019) – prospective study of adolescents
- application to treatment – theoretical basis of cognitive behaviour therapy
- depression may be more to do with social circumstances, eg extreme poverty, than negative cognitions
- Beck's theory more effective at explaining endogenous depression, Ellis' theory more applicable to reactive depression
- cognitive explanations tend to underplay the emotional aspects of the disorder
- reasoned comparison with alternative explanations of depression, eg neurochemical basis.

Credit other relevant material.