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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 two, three or four levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are two, three or four 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 does not contain anything 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 (included for each question and summarised on page 13) and be careful not to over/under credit a particular skill. For example, in questions 6, 10 and 13 equal weight should be given to AO1 and AO3. This will be exemplified and reinforced as part of examiner training and standardisation.
Section A

Social influence

01 Which of the following statements is TRUE? [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

C

02 Suggest one limitation of the Authoritarian Personality as an explanation for obedience. [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 1

1 mark for a brief relevant limitation.

Possible limitations:
- contradicted by Milgram’s situational evidence
- measurement by F scale which has questionable validity
- based on limited sample

Credit other relevant limitations.

03 A senior army instructor is advising new instructors how to ensure discipline in training classes. He says, ‘Always wear your instructor jacket and stand up close when giving instructions. Make sure they all understand who has responsibility for the exercise. Serious problems should always be dealt with in the instructors’ office.’

Referring to research into obedience, explain three reasons why the instructor’s advice should be effective. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

1 mark – for knowledge of each relevant reason/factor

Plus:

1 mark for each brief application to situation

Content/Application:
- Uniform – Presence of a uniform, in this case the instructor’s jacket, conveys legitimate authority, as in Milgram’s experiment where the experimenter had a lab coat.
- Proximity – standing up close means that people are more likely to follow instructions, as in Milgram’s experiment where the authority figure was more effective when in the same room
• Location – the use of the instructor’s office again conveys the force of legitimate authority as in the Milgram’s study where Yale was more likely to result in obedience than a downtown setting.

Credit other relevant ways/factors/variables eg Assuming responsibility – if the instructor makes it clear that he/she has ultimate responsibility that then divests recruits from personal responsibility and so they are likely to assume an agentic state.

04 Identify three variables affecting conformity and outline how each of these was investigated in Asch’s experiment.  

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6

1 mark – for knowledge of each relevant variable

Plus

1 mark for each brief outline of how the variable was manipulated by Asch

Content:
• Group size – Asch varied the number of confederates/stooges
• Unanimity – Asch sometimes arranged for a confederate to give a different answer to the majority/same answer as the real participant
• Task difficulty – Asch made the right answer less obvious by having lines of similar length

Credit other relevant variables.

05 Studies of conformity are sometimes criticised for being unethical. Briefly explain two ways in which psychologists might address ethical issues in social influence research.

Marks for this question: AO3 = 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>Two suggestions for dealing with ethical issues in social influence research are clearly explained. Minor detail is sometimes lacking or there is slight inaccuracy. The answer as a whole is clear with use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Two suggestions for dealing with ethical issues in social influence research are identified. Any explanation lacks detail/accuracy. The answer as a whole lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one suggestion at Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible content:
- Participants should be given the right to withdraw (at the start; throughout the study; withdraw their data at the end)
- Participants should not be put in embarrassing/uncomfortable situations
- Participants should be fully debriefed at the earliest opportunity

Credit other relevant suggestions.

06 Outline and briefly evaluate locus of control as an explanation of resistance to social influence.

[6 marks]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Outline of locus of control as an explanation of resistance to social influence is generally detailed, clear and coherent. Evaluation is clear and effective. There is effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Outline of locus on control as an explanation of resistance to social influence is mostly clear but some detail is missing. There is some relevant evaluation and some effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Outline of locus on control as an explanation of resistance to social influence lacks detail and clarity. Evaluation is limited or absent. Terminology is either minimal, absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- General concept of locus of control – Rotter (1966)
- People are more likely to resist social influence if they have an internal locus of control
- Internal locus of control enables greater personal efficacy, self-confidence
- Credit also reference to the opposite external locus of control and the inability to resist social influence.

Possible evaluation points:
- Use of evidence for the effect of locus of control on resistance: eg Holland
- Contrast between dispositional (locus of control) explanations and other explanations.

Credit other relevant information.
Section B

Memory

07 The psychologist decides to modify the memory test so that it will produce a more normal distribution. Briefly explain how he might achieve this.

[4 marks]

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

Credit application of knowledge of normal distribution and how to achieve this through modification of test as follows:

1 mark each for any four of the following points:

- Adjust the difficulty of the test
- To make the test more demanding/harder
- So that fewer people get a very high mark
- Most people get a medium mark (a few people get a very low mark and a few people get a very high mark)
- So it will achieve a more normal distribution (credit use of diagram to illustrate)

08 From the description above, identify three factors affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. How might each factor affect Melissa’s memory of the event?

[6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

1 mark for each factor in the stem

Plus

1 mark each for stating how the factor might affect Melissa’s recall

Content:

- Anxiety/upset – Melissa’s memory may be worse because of distraction/arousal OR better because she was more alert
- Post-event discussion – Melissa’s memory may be less accurate because she confuses her original memory with what other people say to her
- Leading Questions – Melissa may incorrectly recall what the man was wearing because of Luke’s question

Other factors affecting EWT are not creditworthy because they do not appear in the stem.
Describe interference as an explanation for forgetting. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 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>Knowledge of retroactive and proactive interference as explanations for forgetting is clear and generally well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of interference as an explanation for forgetting is evident. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of interference as an explanation for forgetting is limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
- Interference where two lots of information become confused in memory
- Proactive interference is where old learning affects recall of new information
- Retroactive interference is where new learning affects recall of old information
- Newer information may overwrite earlier information
- Interference occurs more when the two lots of information are similar
- Interference is less likely to occur when there is a gap between the instances of learning

Outline and evaluate the multi-store model of memory. [8 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4, 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 the multi-store model, including reference to capacity duration and coding in the separate stores, is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Knowledge of the multi-store model is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies and some omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the multi-store 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 used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of the multi-store model is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible content:**
- Separate memory stores – sensory register, STM, LTM
- Capacity of each store
- Duration of each store
- Coding/mode within each store
- Functioning/dynamics of the model: eg role of rehearsal

**Possible evaluation points:**
- View of stores as unitary – contrast with different types of LTM
- Static view of STM contrasted with WMM
- Rehearsal – discussion of maintenance versus elaborative
- Use of evidence to support the model
- Use of evidence to contradict the model

Credit also clearly labelled diagram.

Credit other relevant information.
Section C
Attachment

11 Using an example of an attachment research study, explain what is meant by ‘institutionalisation’.

[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>Explanation of institutionalisation is clear and has some detail. The example of a research study is relevant and is used effectively to explain the term. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Explanation of institutionalisation is present but lacks detail. The example of a research study is either inappropriate or not used effectively to explain the term. 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:
- Institutionalisation – living arrangements outside the family/family home
- Results in child adopting rules and norms of the institution that can impair functioning
- Leading to loss of personal identity, deindividuation etc.
- Types of institutions relevant to attachment: eg children’s homes, hostels, hospitals etc.
- Relevant examples of research studies include: Bowlby’s study of 44 juvenile thieves; Goldfarb’s study of children brought up in homes; ERA Romanian orphan studies

Credit other relevant information/research studies.

12.1 Which research method is the psychologist using in this study? Explain your answer.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

1 mark – correlation

Plus

1 mark – she is investigating the (numerical) relationship between two co-variables

12.2 Identify the type of graphical display in Figure 2. Shade one box only.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark – scattergram
12.3 How many children took part in the study?  

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1  

1 mark – 10 children

12.4 What does the pattern of data in Figure 2 suggest about language ability and institutionalisation?  

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2  

1 mark – pattern shows a (strong) negative correlation  

Plus  

1 mark – suggesting that the more years are spent in an institution, the lower the language ability (or the fewer years spent in an institution, the better the language ability)

12.5 Calculate the range for the language scores. Show your workings.  

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2  

1 mark for correct answer 14 (or 15)  

Plus  

1 mark for correct workings $(18 - 4)$ or $(18 - 4 + 1)$
13 Use your knowledge of psychological theory and evidence to discuss the influence of early attachment on later relationships.

[12 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, 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 psychological theory and evidence in relation to the influence of early attachment on later relationships is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychological theory and evidence in relation to the influence of early attachment on later relationships is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. 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>Knowledge of psychological theory and evidence in relation to the influence of early attachment on later relationships 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 psychological theory and evidence in relation to the influence of early attachment on later relationships is 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>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Bowlby’s theory of the internal working model – primary attachment relationship as a template for later relationships
- Hazan and Shaver’s types of adult relationships and the links with Ainsworth’s secure, insecure-avoidant, insecure-resistant types
- Relationships in later childhood – stages of friendship: eg Selman’s

Possible discussion points:
- Evidence to support or challenge Bowlby’s internal working model
- Evidence to support/contradict continuity of attachment type from childhood into adulthood and across generations: eg Fonagy, Steele and Steele 1991, Main 1985, Hazan and Shaver 1987
- Implications of findings re continuity: eg determinism
- Practical implications: eg bullying in childhood, relationship stability in adulthood
- Issue of cause and effect – research that shows a link cannot establish causality
- Validity of measures of attachment – where used to discuss influence of early attachments on later relationships
- Qualitative differences between early attachments and later relationships: eg unilateral v reciprocal, sex differences

Credit other relevant information.
### 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</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 RM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memory</th>
<th></th>
<th>2 RM/Maths</th>
<th>2 RM/Maths</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM/Maths</td>
<td>2 RM/Maths</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM/Maths</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Paper Total     | 30  | 20         | 22         | 72    |

Research methods = 16 marks  
Maths = 10 marks