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, 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 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.

Examiners are required to assign each of the students’ responses to the most appropriate level according to its overall quality, then allocate a single mark within the level. When deciding upon a mark in a level examiners should bear in mind the relative weightings of the assessment objectives and be careful not to over/under credit a particular skill. This will be exemplified and reinforced as part of examiner training and standardisation.
Section A
Social Influence

Question 1.1
Name three behaviours that enable a minority to influence a majority.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3

1 mark for each of the following:
- Consistency
- Commitment
- Flexibility/non-dogmatic

Credit other relevant behaviours eg building up idiosyncracy credits; appearance of objectivity; certainty of correctness/knowledgeable, creating cognitive conflict, showing self-sacrifice/augmentation, persistence, identification with the minority

Question 1.2
Marcus wants to persuade his group of friends to go travelling in the summer but the rest of the group would like to go on a beach holiday.

Briefly suggest how Marcus might use the three behaviours that you have identified in your answer to 01.1 to persuade his friends to go travelling.

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

1 mark for relevant application of each characteristic (no need to name again here but must be the behaviours identified in question 1.1 for credit).

If correct answer to 1.1 then application must relate to behaviour named in 1.1 for credit in 1.2.

If incorrect answer to 1.1 then can credit application in 1.2 if a relevant, correct behaviour is named as part of the application.

If no answer to 1.1 then can credit application in 1.2 if a relevant, correct behaviour is named as part of the application.

Possible applications:
- Marcus could show consistency by keeping on repeating the same message about how great it would be to go travelling
- Marcus could show commitment by explaining how he is taking time and working hard to plan the travelling trip and saving for the trip
- Marcus could show flexibility by listening to the others and agree to going on a beach holiday at the end of the travelling trip

The application must relate explicitly to the content of the stem.

Credit other relevant applications.
Question 2.1

How many students have a ‘value of research’ score of <6?
Shade one box only.

A  2 students  ☐
B  3 students  ☐
C  4 students  ☐
D  5 students  ☐

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark - A

Question 2.2

Give the mode for both sets of scores in Table 1.

Mode for value of research  
Mode for ethical concern

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

1 mark – value of research score = 6
1 mark – ethical concern score = 7
Question 2.3

The mode is one type of descriptive statistic. Identify two other descriptive statistics that could be used to further analyse the data in Table 1. In each case, explain how the descriptive statistics you have identified could be calculated.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

1 mark each for identifying an appropriate descriptive statistic.

Plus

1 mark each for an explanation how it could be calculated.

Possible content:

- Median could be calculated by arranging the scores in order then choosing the numerical midpoint (between 5th and 6th score)
- Range could be calculated by taking the lowest score from the highest (and adding 1)
- Standard deviation could be calculated by using the distance of each score from the mean (credit formula for SD)

If student provides calculations that illustrate ‘how’ then can award the explanation mark.

Can also credit answers based on mean - Mean could be calculated by adding all the scores and dividing by the number of scores (10).

Credit other relevant descriptive statistics with appropriate explanation (eg percentages, graphs, correlation). If no calculation is involved eg with graphs then accept some description of how the representation could be arranged.
Question 3

The study in 02 involves self-report.
Outline what is involved in self-report.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3

1 mark: where the participant gives information to the researcher/provides details of own feelings/thoughts/behaviour.

Plus

1 mark each for two further points:

• involves responding to questions on a questionnaire/during interview
• elaboration of a self-report method eg (open/closed questions, structured/unstructured)
• elaboration might also be by example eg the study in 02

Credit other relevant points eg involves subjectivity.
Question 4

Outline Asch’s findings in relation to two variables affecting conformity. Briefly explain two limitations of Asch’s conformity research.

[8 marks]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of Asch’s findings in relation to two variables affecting conformity is accurate with some detail. Explanation of two limitations is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Knowledge of Asch’s findings in relation to one/two variables affecting conformity is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective explanation of one or two limitations. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of Asch’s findings in relation to one/two variables affecting conformity is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any explanation of limitation(s) is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions. Or just limitations done well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of Asch’s findings in relation to at least one variable affecting conformity is very limited. Explanation of limitation(s) 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. Or just limitation(s) at level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
- Asch found that group size affected level of conformity – up to 3 confederates levels increased, thereafter they tended to plateau
- Asch found that task difficulty affected level of conformity – where the lines were of similar length making the judgement more difficult conformity levels increased (whereas when correct answer was obvious the levels decreased)
- Asch found that unanimity affected level of conformity – where the majority were unanimous in their wrong answer, conformity levels increased (whereas when there was an ally, conformity levels deceased)

Credit other relevant findings in relation to other variables studied by Asch.

Limitations:
- 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
- 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
- Gender bias – use of a male sample thus may not represent female behaviour
• 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)

Can credit two separate ethical limitations.

Credit other relevant limitations.
Section B
Memory

Question 5
Outline what psychological research has shown about short-term memory according to the multi-store model of memory. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Outline of what psychological research has shown about STM is clear and includes detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Outline of what psychological research has shown about STM is present but lacks detail. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
- Capacity is thought to be 7 items plus or minus 2 items (between 5 and 9). Capacity can be increased by chunking items together to reduce the number of separate items overall.
- Duration is thought to be approximately 18-30 seconds. Duration can be extended by verbal rehearsal ie information can be maintained in the rehearsal loop.
- Coding is acoustic, sound based, phonological, auditory. Causes confusion where material sounds the same.

A detailed outline of one aspect (capacity, duration, coding) can be awarded full marks.

Credit other relevant material e.g. ways of forgetting from STM (e.g. displacement)
Question 6

Annie can still skateboard even though she hasn’t skated for many years. Germaine can still recall what happened on his first day at university even though it was ages ago. Billy remembers the names of the tools he needs to repair the broken tap.

Identify three types of long-term memory and explain how each type is shown in one of the examples above.

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

1 mark for each correct application in recognising (naming/identifying) each type of long-term memory by matching to the person in the stem.

Plus

1 mark each for knowledge of a feature of the type of memory explained in the context of the behaviour in the stem.

- Annie’s case/remembering how to skateboard is an example of procedural memory (1) because she is remembering an action or muscle-based memory (1).
- Germaine’s case/remembering what happened is an example of episodic memory (or autobiographical memory) (1) because he recalls the events that took place at a specific point in time (1).
- Billy’s case/remembering the names of tools is an example of semantic memory (1) because he remembers factual/meaningful information (1).
Question 7

Below are five evaluative statements about the cognitive interview. Which two statements are correct?

Shade two boxes only.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark – B
1 mark – D
Question 8
Discuss what psychological research has shown about working memory. In your answer, refer to theory and/or evidence. [12 marks]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of what psychological research (theory and/or evidence) has shown about working memory is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>Knowledge of what psychological research (theory and/or evidence) has shown about working memory 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of what psychological research (theory and/or evidence) has shown about working memory 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Knowledge of what psychological research (theory and/or evidence) has shown about working memory 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
Full credit can be gained for theory and/or evidence.

- The working memory model proposed by Baddeley and Hitch in 1970s as an updated version of STM
- WM is understood as an active processor
- The components and their functions and properties; central executive; phonological loop/store (articulatory and acoustic processing); visuo-spatial scratchpad/sketchpad; episodic buffer. Credit diagram
- Description of what research evidence has shown/findings of studies/conclusions in relation to working memory in general or the different components including:
  - Concurrent/dual task studies
  - Articulatory suppression studies
  - Brain imaging research showing different areas of the brain are active when performing different types of task
  - Clinical evidence of selective impairments to STM

Possible discussion points:
- Explains how different cognitive processes interact
- Comparison with passive view of STM in the MSM
- Use of evidence to support or contradict the concept of working memory
- Discussion/evaluation of working memory research eg issues of validity in dual task research/scanning studies where tasks might be seen as unrealistic/artificial; sampling issues and generalisation
- Problem of testing/fully explaining the central executive
- Applications eg explains processing deficits like reading difficulties and offers possible routes to therapy

Credit other relevant material.
Note – ethical issues in relation to studies would not normally be relevant as they do not affect the understanding of working memory.
Section C
Attachment

Question 9
Below are five evaluative statements about the Romanian Orphan research. Which two statements are correct?
Shade two boxes only. [2 marks]
The Romanian orphan research is …

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2
1 mark – B good because it involves comparison with control groups.
1 mark – E useful because it shows long-term effects not just short-term.
Question 10.1

Give the name of Researcher A and state the type of animal studied by this researcher. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

1 mark – Harlow
1 mark - (rhesus) monkeys

Question 10.2

Give the name of Researcher B and state the type of animal studied by this researcher. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

1 mark – Lorenz
1 mark – geese/goslings

Note although most answers will refer to geese, credit references to other birds studies by Lorenz eg ducklings, pigeons, jackdaws, doves. Guiton studied chicks, chickens.

Credit also ‘precocial.’

Credit also ‘birds.’
Question 11
Abi had a happy, secure childhood with parents who loved her very much. She now has two children of her own and loves them very much too. The two children make friends easily and are confident and trusting.

Referring to Abi and her family, explain what psychologists have discovered about the internal working model.

[6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Explanation of the concept of an internal working model is clear and appropriate. Application is mostly effective. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. There is clear focus on the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Explanation of the concept of an internal working model is apparent and mostly appropriate. Application is partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>There is some explanation of the concept of an internal working model. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is often used inappropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application possible points:
- Attachment to primary caregiver provides child with internal working model of relationships (Bowlby)
- Abi’s secure childhood relationships would have ensured a positive internal working model
- The model represents /gives a mental view of relationship with primary figure and acts as a template for future relationships
- Continuity in quality/type of relationship across generations.
- Abi’s understanding of relationships has been carried forward so she now has positive secure relationships with her two children
- Abi’s children use their internal working model of the relationship they have with their mother to inform their interactions with other children – so they make friends easily and are confident
- Credit application of knowledge and research into the origin and/or consequence of the internal working model eg McCarthy 1999

Credit other relevant material.
**Question 12**

Discuss the Strange Situation as a way of assessing type of attachment.

[12 marks]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of the Strange Situation as a way of assessing attachment type is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>Knowledge of the Strange Situation as a way of assessing attachment type 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of the Strange Situation as a way of assessing attachment type 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Knowledge of the Strange Situation as a way of assessing attachment type 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content:**
- Observation in a controlled environment.
- Series of 3-minute episodes – mother and baby; stranger enters; mother leaves; mother returns etc.
- Recording of child’s response in the different stages eg proximity-seeking, accepting comfort from stranger, response to being re-united.
- Analysis of observations leads to measuring infant’s type of attachment as either securely attached, insecure-avoidant, insecure-resistant.

**Possible discussion points:**
- Strange Situation research can be replicated (high level of control, standardised procedure) and has been carried out successfully in many different cultures.
- Cultural relativity - the same method may not be appropriate for all cultures because of differences in child-rearing practices (eg van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg found percentages are different in other cultures eg more insecure-avoidant in Germany).
- Validity of some measures can be questioned – eg proximity-seeking may be a measure of insecurity rather than security.
- Variables measured did not take consideration of factors such as temperament and wider family influences.
- Focus on the mother as primary attachment figure.
- Credit use of evidence as part of discussion.
- Accept ethical discussion with justification/explanation.

Credit other relevant material including any references to procedure as used in replications and variations of the Ainsworth procedure.
**Assessment Objective Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social influence</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Paper Total      | 30  | 18  | 24  | 72    |

Research methods (RM) = 10 marks
Maths = 7 marks