

**AS  
PSYCHOLOGY  
7181/1**

Paper 1 Introductory topics in psychology

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2023

---

Version: 1.0 Final



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](http://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 © 2023 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. 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 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 informational social influence as an explanation for conformity.

**[3 marks]**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 3**

**3 marks** for a clear, coherent and detailed outline of informational social influence as an explanation for conformity, using appropriate terminology.

**2 marks** for a less detailed outline.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited outline.

**Possible content:**

- going along with the majority through acceptance of new information
- occurs because of a desire to be right/correct
- occurs in ambiguous/difficult/novel situations
- conforming for cognitive reasons
- leads to internalisation
- a permanent change in view/behaviour.

Credit other relevant content including the use of examples to illustrate informational social influence.

**0 2**

A teacher asked her class for a volunteer to talk to future A-level students. The teacher asked Sarah first, but she refused. The teacher then asked Emily to help.

Use your knowledge of resistance to social influence to explain Emily's likely response to the teacher's request.

**[3 marks]**

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

**3 marks** for a clear, coherent and detailed explanation with explicit links to the scenario, using appropriate terminology.

**2 marks** for a less detailed explanation where application might be implicit.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation.

**Social Support Possible content:**

- Emily resists the teacher because she is influenced by Sarah's refusal
- Sarah acts as social support/presence of a role model which makes Emily feel confident to also refuse

**Locus of control Possible content:**

- Emily resists Sarah's influence because of her own internal locus of control
- Emily's internal LOC makes Emily feel confident in making her own decisions, ignoring Sarah's behaviour.

For full marks the answer must refer to Emily being more likely to refuse/resist the teacher **OR** Sarah.

Credit answers where both alternatives are suggested.

---

**0 3 . 1** Explain why the median would be a more appropriate measure of central tendency than the mean for the data in **Table 1**.

**[2 marks]**

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

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

- there is a large anomalous result in the data set/ student 9 has been told off 25 times
- the median is not affected by this/this would distort the mean value

Accept answers based on the level of data (not interval/mean not appropriate).

**0 3 . 2** Explain how the sample of 10 participants could have been obtained from the students at the school using stratified sampling.

**[4 marks]**

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

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

- identify strata/sub-groups in their population: different year groups (accept other possible strata, eg gender)
- obtain 2 from each year group
- select sample at random/use a random sampling procedure eg hat/computer/random number generator
- how the random sampling procedure would be implemented, eg assign each student in each year group a number then use a computer, calculator or random number table to select 2 from each year (or hat method).

Credit answers where the correct proportionality is evident within a calculation.

**0 3 . 3** Investigator effects sometimes occur in interviews.

Explain **two** modifications that would help to minimise investigator effects in this study.

**[4 marks]**

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

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

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of an appropriate modification that might minimise investigator effects in this study

**1 mark** for a muddled/limited explanation.

**Relevant points:**

- have an interviewer who did not know the aims of the study so that they would not let their own expectations influence how they ask the interview questions (double blind technique)
- have an interviewer who was not the students' teacher so that the students would not be influenced by wanting to impress their teacher
- use open-ended questions/avoid leading questions so that the students are less likely to be led and are able to give a more detailed and accurate explanation of their views in their own words
- use a structured interview so that the investigator cannot alter the questions
- video the interviews and have another investigator watch and analyse them, improving the objectivity of the results
- use a questionnaire (or other means) to collect data without face-to-face interaction, so the students cannot be led/ are not affected by the presence of another person

Credit other relevant suggestions that would reduce investigator effects in this study eg closed questions, trained interviewers.

**0 4** Maya wants to encourage the workers in her office to use their own reusable cups at work, rather than the disposable paper cups provided by the company.

Explain how Maya might show **either** commitment **or** flexibility to persuade the workers to change their behaviour.

**[2 marks]**

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

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of how Maya might show **either** commitment **or** flexibility to persuade the workers in her office to change their behaviour.

**1 mark** for a muddled/limited explanation.

**Possible content:**

- commitment: Maya might place herself at some inconvenience – she may volunteer to buy some reusable cups. This will draw more attention to her 'cause' (augmentation principle)
- flexibility: Maya might adapt her view/accepting other valid counterarguments. She could agree that some paper cups could still be available in case anyone forgot to bring their reusable cup to work.

If both factors are applied, mark both and credit the best answer.

**0 5**

Briefly outline **three** findings from Asch's research into conformity.

**[3 marks]**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 3**

**1 mark each** for a brief outline of a correct finding that identifies an appropriate finding with a correct percentage **or** direction of influence.

**Possible content:**

- naïve participants gave a wrong answer about 37% of the time (do **not** accept '37% conformed')
- participants conformed on 32% of critical trials (do **not** accept '32% conformed')
- 25% of participants did not conform/75% conformed at least once
- 5% conformed every time
- the control group conformed (less than) 1% of the time
- increasing the size of the majority increased conformity
- increasing task difficulty increased conformity
- presence of a dissenter who did not conform reduced conformity (to 5%)
- withdrawal of a dissenter led to increased conformity
- writing the answer down (rather than saying aloud) reduced conformity
- individual differences, eg highly confident individuals conformed less

Credit an answer which may focus on explanations for behaviour eg some participants reported 'distortions of perception'/ 'distortions of judgement'.

Credit other relevant findings.

0	6
---	---

Explain **one** limitation of Asch's research into conformity.**[3 marks]****Marks for this question: AO3 = 3****3 marks** for a clear, coherent and detailed explanation of an appropriate limitation of Asch's research into conformity, using appropriate terminology.**2 marks** for a less detailed explanation of an appropriate limitation using some of the detail given below.**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation.**Possible limitations:**

- lacks temporal validity: Asch's findings may not be so relevant today – the outcome may have been influenced by social attitudes of the 1950s – post-war attitudes that people should work together and consent rather than dissent
- lacks mundane realism: Asch's task was artificial – therefore not a valid measure of real-life conformity where conforming takes place in a social context and often with people we know rather than strangers.
- lacks ecological validity: the research was carried out in a laboratory/controlled conditions, so behaviour may not represent real world conformity
- demand characteristics: artificiality of situation/task may have caused some participants to go along with the confederates, reducing internal validity
- gender bias/lack of generalisability: use of a male sample thus may not represent female behaviour.
- lacks population validity: use of volunteer sample whose behaviour may not represent that of a wider population
- ethical problems including deception (participants believed they were taking part in a test of perception) and protection from harm (participants were put in a stressful and embarrassing situation).

Credit other relevant limitations.



**Section B**

**Memory**

**0 7**

Which **one** of the following descriptions **best** describes semantic memory?

**[1 mark]**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 1**

**Correct answer = B** A long term store for knowledge of the world, requiring conscious effort to recall.

**0 8**

Briefly outline **two** criticisms of studies into short-term memory.

**[4 marks]**

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

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

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent outline of an appropriate criticism of studies into short-term memory

**1 mark** for a muddled/limited outline.

**Possible criticisms:**

- lack of mundane realism: use of artificial material (eg recall of trigrams, lists of unconnected words etc)
- early research often lacked adequate control, introducing confounding variables into the study, reducing validity
- inconsistent findings: span for letters is lower than span for digits
- overestimation of capacity: capacity is only 4 chunks not 7+/- 2 items
- lack of ecological validity: studies carried out in artificial laboratory setting or with artificial tasks, do not reflect real life memory
- alternative explanations in relation to specific studies, eg Peterson and Peterson's findings may be more to do with interference than duration
- issues with participant variables in studies that used independent measures design (eg Baddeley's study of coding)
- issues with order effects in studies that used repeated measures designs (eg Jacobs).

Credit other relevant criticisms including positive points.

Relevant studies would include: Baddeley, Jacobs, Miller, Peterson and Peterson. Studies of working memory could be made relevant.

**0 9**

Describe how post-event discussion can affect eyewitness testimony.

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

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Description of how post-event discussion can affect eyewitness testimony is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1–2	Description of how post-event discussion can affect eyewitness testimony is evident but lacks clarity and/or detail. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- occurs when there is more than one witness to an event
- witnesses discuss what they have seen (with co-witnesses or other people)
- memory conformity, false memory, reconstruction, confabulation can occur
- information is added to a memory after the event has occurred
- information that is added may be misleading
- the accuracy of the witness's recall may be reduced
- false memories can be stimulated by misleading post-event discussion
- use of evidence to illustrate, eg Gabbert et al. (2003)
- effects of post-event discussion can be reduced if participants are warned of the effects (eg Bodner et al. 2009).

Credit other relevant content.

There may be a depth/breadth trade-off: one effect in detail or more than one effect in less detail.

1	0
---	---

Kaleb is learning about models of memory. Last week the teacher taught the class about the multi-store model. This week she is teaching the working memory model. Kaleb is now finding it difficult to recall any of the information about the multi-store model of memory.

Using your knowledge of interference as an explanation for forgetting, explain Kaleb's difficulty.

**[3 marks]**

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

**3 marks** for a clear, coherent and detailed explanation of why Kaleb is having difficulty recalling the multi-store model.

**2 marks** for a less detailed explanation using some of the detail given below.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation.

**Possible content:**

- retroactive interference is occurring
- the newer learning of the working memory model (WMM) is affecting recall of the older information about the multi-store model (MSM)
- information about the WMM may have overwritten the earlier information about the MSM
- interference is more likely to occur because both topics were similar/models of memory
- there may not have been much time between learning the two models and so they have become confused/forgetting of the first model (MSM) is greater.

Credit other relevant material.

**1 1**

Briefly evaluate the use of the cognitive interview technique.

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

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Evaluation of the use of the cognitive interview technique is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1–2	Evaluation of the use of the cognitive interview technique is evident but lacks clarity and/or detail. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible evaluation:**

- use of evidence to support/challenge the effectiveness of cognitive interview (CI), eg Kohnken et al (1999)
- although CI leads to more correct information, incorrect information also increases (although some studies, eg Geiselman dispute this)
- some elements of CI may be more successful than others – Milne and Bull (2002)
- the success of CI may be related to the age of witness
- CI requires training and investment so it may not always be available because of limited resources
- credit evaluation of enhanced cognitive interview
- credit comparison with standard interview and enhanced CI
- ethical issues if made relevant to the processes involved in the CI eg distress from reinstating context
- credit time/cost if there is a reasoned discussion

Credit other relevant evaluation.

**1 2**

Describe and evaluate the working memory model.

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

Level	Marks	Description
4	7–8	Knowledge of the working memory model 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 working memory model 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	3–4	Limited knowledge of the working memory model 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.
1	1–2	Knowledge of the working memory model 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:**

- version of STM which sees this store as an active processor
- description of central executive/visuo-spatial scratch/sketch pad; phonological store/loop; articulatory loop/control process; primary acoustic store; episodic buffer (versions vary – not all systems need to be present for full marks)
- information concerning capacity and coding of each store
- allocation of resources/divided attention/dual-task performance.

Credit other relevant content.

**Possible evaluation points:**

- use of evidence to support or refute the model
- explains how cognitive processes interact
- memory is active rather than passive
- provides explanation/treatments for processing deficits
- highlights different memory tasks that STM can deal with by identifying separate components
- explains results of dual task studies
- vague, untestable nature of the central executive

- supported by highly controlled lab studies which may undermine the validity of the model
- comparison/contrast with alternative models of memory is creditworthy, but description, eg of MSM is not.

Credit other relevant evaluation.

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

**Section C**

**Attachment**

**1 3**

Explain the role of the internal working model in Bowlby’s monotropic theory of attachment.

**[4 marks]**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	Explanation of the internal working model in Bowlby’s monotropic theory of attachment is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1–2	Explanation of the internal working model in Bowlby’s monotropic theory of attachment is evident but lacks clarity and/or detail. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- attachment to primary caregiver provides a child with a schema/understanding of relationships (Bowlby)
- the model represents/gives a mental view/template of relationship with primary figure and acts as a template for future relationships (continuity hypothesis)
- someone with a positive internal working model will become a consistent/sensitive/responsive caregiver; someone with a negative internal working model will become inconsistent in caregiving or neglectful
- credit knowledge and research into the consequence of the internal working model on later childhood/adult relationships/bullying behaviour/parenting styles, eg McCarthy 1999; Myron-Wilson & Smith 1989; Hazan & Shaver 1987; Bailey et al., 2007.

Credit other relevant content.

**1 4**

In the 1990s, many children were found living in poor-quality orphanages in Romania. Cema and her sister Katti lived in one of these orphanages from birth but were later adopted. When they were adopted, Cema was 5 months old and Katti was 5 years old. Their development was then studied for several years.

Using your knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies, explain how Katti's development is likely to have differed from Cema's as they grew older.

**[6 marks]**

**Marks for this question: AO2 = 6**

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Explanation of the difference(s) between Katti's and Cema's development is explicit, clear, detailed and generally accurate, with clear application of knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies. The answer is generally coherent and specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	There is some effective and explicit explanation of the difference(s) between Katti's and Cema's development with evidence of some application of knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies. The answer may lack clarity and/or detail in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Explanation of how Katti's and Cema's development is likely to have differed from Cema's is either limited or implicit with limited application of knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- Katti was adopted at five years and therefore any effects may be more severe/long term/harder to overcome than the effects on Cema, who was adopted before six months
- delayed intellectual development/lower IQ/problems with concentration – Katti may struggle more at school than Cema/may not learn new behaviours, concepts as quickly
- impaired language and social skills – Katti may find it harder to learn her language/social skills than Cema
- Katti is less likely to be classified as securely attached than Cema
- Katti is more likely to show insecure/disinhibited/disorganised attachment than Cema: Katti may not know what counts as 'appropriate' behaviour towards strangers
- emotional development – Katti may experience more temper tantrums/ show more attention seeking behaviour
- lack of internal working model – Katti may have more difficulty interacting with peers, forming close relationships, etc
- quasi-autism – Katti may have a problem understanding the meaning of social contexts, may display obsessional behaviour, etc

Credit content that reverses the order, eg Cema is more likely to have a secure attachment.  
Credit other relevant content.



**1 5**

Briefly explain **one** economic implication of the findings of research into the role of the father in attachment.

**[2 marks]**

**Marks for this question AO1 = 2**

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of an implication of the findings of research into the role of the father.

**1 mark** for a muddled/limited explanation.

**Possible content:**

- increasingly fathers remain at home and therefore contribute less to the economy consequently more mothers may return to work and contribute more to the economy
- changing laws on paternity leave/shared parental leave – government-funded so affects the economy; impact upon employers
- gender pay gap may be reduced if parental roles are regarded as more equal
- early attachment research, eg Bowlby suggests fathers should provide an economic rather than an emotional function.

Accept other relevant points.

Answers may refer to personal/household or national/global economy.

Answers that focus on the economic costs of doing research into the role of the father are not creditable.

**1 6**

Discuss the learning theory explanation of attachment.

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

Level	Marks	Description
4	10–12	Knowledge of the learning theory explanation of attachment 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 learning theory explanation of attachment 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 learning theory explanation of attachment 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	1–3	Knowledge of the learning theory explanation of attachment 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:**

- 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: association of caregiver (NS) with food (UCS) causes conditioned response of pleasure
- learning can be due to patterns of positive/negative reinforcement (operant conditioning) – outline of how this process works in attachment, eg being fed when they cry – crying is positively reinforced by the caregiver; caregiver receives negative reinforcement when crying stops.

Credit other relevant content.

The explanation must be directly linked to attachment. Unrelated descriptions of classical or operant conditioning are not creditworthy.

**Possible discussion points:**

- plausible and scientific as founded in established theory
- use of evidence, eg Schaffer and Emerson - primary attachment figure not always the person who feeds the child; 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, eg Bowlby
- reductionist – the focus on basic processes (S-R links, reinforcement) too simplistic to explain complex attachment behaviours

- environmentally deterministic such that early learning determines later attachment behaviours.

Credit other relevant discussion.

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