



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## Psychology A

### Unit PYA1

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**UNIT 1**  
**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION**

<b>2 marks</b>	The work is characterised by the <b>ACCURATE</b> and <b>CLEAR</b> expression of ideas, a <b>BROAD RANGE</b> of specialist terms and only <b>MINOR ERRORS</b> in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1 mark</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>REASONABLE</b> expression of ideas, the use of a <b>REASONABLE RANGE</b> of specialist terms and <b>FEW ERRORS</b> of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0 marks</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>POOR</b> expression of ideas, <b>LIMITED USE</b> of specialist terms and <b>POOR</b> grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO**

<b>AO1</b>	Assessment objective one = knowledge and <i>understanding</i> of psychological theories, terminology, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.
<b>AO2</b>	Assessment objective two = analysis and <i>evaluation</i> of psychological theories, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.

## COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

1

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Outline findings **and/or** conclusions of research into the capacity of short-term memory (STM)  
(6 marks)

### Marking criteria

There are a wide range of studies into the capacity of STM and these typically involve some sort test of memory span (e.g. digits), giving a measure of what is sometimes referred to as storage capacity. Miller (1956) suggested that findings of such studies could be summarised in terms of the number 7, plus or minus 2 items ( $7 \pm 2$ ). However various other studies, including Miller's, have found that the capacity of STM can be increased by grouping items together (chunking) and that this could be affected by a number of factors. There is another sense of capacity: *attentional* capacity (i.e. how many items can be worked on at any one time). This concept is most usually associated with working memory and, although unlikely, answers that examine findings/conclusions of research into this aspect of working memory are definitely appropriate.

Depth/breadth is an issue in this type of question. Answers that discuss a limited range of findings but in detail (for example studies of chunking) are as acceptable as those that examine a wider range of findings in less detail.

### Marking allocations

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline description of findings/conclusions of research into the capacity of STM is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has summarised findings of research into digit span and chunking.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline description of findings/conclusions of research into the capacity of STM is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example only the results of digit span studies are summarised.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline description of findings/conclusions of research into the capacity of STM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	The outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research findings into the capacity of LTM) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Outline **one** explanation of forgetting in long-term memory (LTM) and give **one** criticism of this explanation. (3 marks + 3 marks)

### Marking criteria

Candidates can choose from a range of explanations of forgetting in LTM, including decay, interference, retrieval failure, state/context dependent, emotional factors (repression) and so on. While some explanations (e.g. decay and interference) can occur in both STM and LTM, others (e.g. displacement) are normally considered to be STM mechanisms so would not be relevant for this question.

Criticisms will depend on the nature of the explanation, but might include the extent to which the explanation is supported by research studies, or how far the explanation has ecological validity (e.g. interference is relatively easy to demonstrate in the lab but not in real life). Note that criticisms can be positive.

The two parts must be linked. If the answer to the first part is inappropriate (e.g. an STM mechanism is described) then no marks can be awarded to the criticism.

### Marking allocations

For the outline

<b>3 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example a clear account of interference is provided together with a distinction between retro- and proactive interference and/or appropriate examples.
<b>2 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example different types of interference may not be distinguished, and/or appropriate examples are not provided.
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example an explanation is named but not elaborated.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the explanation may be of forgetting in STM or some about some other aspect of memory research) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

For the criticism:

<b>3 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one strength or limitation of the explanation (for example explaining how it is difficult to test repression experimentally).
<b>2 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>1 mark</b>	Statement of criticism of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> (e.g. stating that the explanation lacks empirical support without further explanation).
<b>0 marks</b>	Answer is <b>inappropriate</b> , i.e. not directed at the explanation outlined, or the criticism is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) into eyewitness testimony (EWT).  
(18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** could be a description of research studies into eye-witness testimony (EWT). It could also encompass explanations/theories related to EWT, for example the role of interference, or the nature of memory as a constructive process). Evaluation of findings and/or theories is appropriate **AO2**.

There have been a number of research studies on eyewitness testimony. For example, psychologists have investigated factors that affect accuracy such as the role of arousal, gender/age and the phenomenon known as ‘weapon focus’. Candidates are likely to be familiar with research by Loftus and her colleagues into the memory processes involved in EWT (e.g. post-event information, leading questions, etc). Any or all of these could be incorporated into a legitimate approach to the question.

Commentary could include methodological and other criticisms of the studies but could also encompass wider issues. For example, it would be legitimate to consider the extent to which research has suggested reasons *why* witnesses are sometimes inaccurate. Another approach would be to consider how successful knowledge and understanding gained from memory research could be used to improve the effectiveness of eyewitness testimony. For example, research into reconstructive memory and other issues has suggested ways in which interview techniques can be improved (as in the cognitive interview) or evidence assessed in trials (especially where child witnesses are concerned).

Some candidates may be tempted to give an account of Bartlett’s research. While this may be relevant to support an argument about the reconstructive nature of eyewitness testimony (i.e. as AO2) it will not in itself be sufficient since Bartlett did not actually investigate EWT.

The degree to which candidates use further studies such as Bartlett’s research, as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply *describing* alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for AO2. Candidates who offer no commentary may still be judged to have selected appropriate material and thus commentary can be described as ‘just discernible’.

### Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of research

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of research into EWT is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example a number of research studies such as those by Loftus and others are outlined or a lesser number but in more detail.
<b>3-4 marks</b>	Outline of research into EWT is limited. It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of research into EWT is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> (e.g. only a basic outline of one research study is identifiable).
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may explain an unrelated topic) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## AO2: Evaluation/assessment of research

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on EWT research and <b>reasonably thorough analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on EWT research and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>8-7 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on EWT research but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on EWT research with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner..
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on EWT research and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Commentary on EWT research is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is <b>weak</b> and <b>muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is absent or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

2

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Outline **three** differences between short-term memory (STM) and long-term memory (LTM).  
 (2 marks + 2 marks + 2 marks)

**Marking criteria**

Candidates are most likely to assume, as did Atkinson & Shiffrin (1968), that short-term and long-term memories are *structural* components of our memory system and make a distinction in terms of the characteristics of these structural components: capacity, duration and storage. However it is also acceptable to say that forgetting mechanisms differ, e.g. the MSM also suggested that displacement is the principal mechanism of forgetting in STM while interference may occur in LTM.

If a candidate describes a characteristic of one store without contrasting it with the other store, then this can not be credited.

**Marking allocations**

For each difference:

<b>2 marks</b>	Outline of the difference between STM/LTM is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . E.g. the candidate may say that there are encoding differences — acoustic (STM) vs. semantic (LTM).
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline of the difference is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . E.g. merely stating ‘There are two types of coding’ or ‘LTM has a larger capacity’.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of the difference is <b>inappropriate</b> (e.g. the candidate may offer differences that have no basis in theory or research) or the outline description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study into the role of emotional factors in forgetting.  
(6 marks)

### Marking criteria

Candidates are likely to choose the phenomenon of flashbulb memories or the role of repression in forgetting. Both of these are acceptable as emotional factors and studies based on either of these are relevant. Studies of flashbulb memories are normally linked to significant historical events, for example the Challenger disaster. Some laboratory studies have looked at possible mechanisms, e.g. by blocking emotional arousal using drugs and seeing if this affects the memory for emotionally charged information (Cahil *et al*, 1994). Studies of repression include many case studies (e.g. of recovered memories) but there are also a number of laboratory experiments (e.g. Levinger & Clarke).

Whatever study is chosen it must be identifiable as a piece of published research. This therefore excludes anecdotal accounts of reactions to the death of Princess Diana.

Research into PTSD could also be made relevant to this question, provided the effect of the disorder on forgetting is directly addressed. Some EWT research is also acceptable, e.g. the ‘weapon focus’.

State dependent forgetting could be relevant provided the state relates to mood (e.g. sadness, depression).

### Marking allocations

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of study into the role of emotional factors in forgetting is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has covered both procedures and findings of a clearly identifiable study of emotional factors.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of a study into the role of emotional factors in forgetting is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . For example a reasonable account of procedures is offered but only a very brief account of findings. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> the procedures <i>or</i> findings of the study is accurate and detailed (i.e. partial performance).
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of study of into the role of emotional factors in forgetting is <b>basic</b> , <b>lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, the study may be difficult to identify from the brief account of procedure given. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> the procedures <i>or</i> findings of the study is generally accurate but less detailed (i.e. partial performance)
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate has not described a study which was concerned with the reconstructive memory) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



- (c) Outline and evaluate **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory (e.g. working memory, levels of processing). (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

In this question **AO1** will be an outline of the alternative model. It is likely that candidates will choose either the working memory model or the levels of processing model as the alternative, though other choices such as Parallel Distributed Processing or even reconstructive memory (Bartlett) are acceptable.

Candidates could describe the WM model as an alternative view of STM that temporarily holds and manipulates information as we perform cognitive tasks (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974). They may go on to describe the three components of the working memory: phonological loop, visuospatial sketch pad and the central executive that integrates information from the previous two systems as well as from LTM.

For commentary on the WM model (**AO2**), candidates could identify some of the weaknesses in the multi-store model (MSM) view of STM that the WM model overcomes. More directly, there are two generally accessible areas of research evidence that are usually cited in support of the WM model. The unattended speech effect (retrieval of *visually* presented material such as numbers can be disrupted by the simultaneous presentation of *spoken* words) and articulatory suppression (performance on a digit span task is significantly impaired when the participant is asked to utter a stream of irrelevant sounds). There is also some physiological evidence from brain scans.

If the levels of processing model is chosen, **AO2** could involve a consideration of the extent to which this model is supported by research studies. Thus Craik & Lockhart (1972) assumed that attentional and perceptual processes operating at the time of learning influence what is stored in LTM and that their model could account for certain evidence on memory better than the MSM. This is certainly true of what we know of rehearsal (elaborative rehearsal is much more effective than maintenance rehearsal, for example) but other empirical evidence does not always support the LOP approach. While the basic idea of depth of processing is a reasonable one, the approach as a whole is regarded as being oversimplified. As a consequence, other factors such as elaboration and distinctiveness have been suggested. It could also be pointed out that it is difficult to operationalise depth processing in studies (the definition of depth is rather circular). Furthermore, it is usually suggested that the LOP approach describes rather better than it predicts.

In the event that more than one alternative is discussed, then each should be marked and the highest mark awarded for AO1 and AO2. However, examiners should be alert to the fact that further models may be introduced for evaluation. If this is the case then appropriate credit should be given. Discussion of MSM can be awarded AO2marks if it is used for evaluation of alternative model.

Discussion of memory models is generally viewed as one of the more demanding areas of the specification and examiners should remember that candidates normally have less than 18 minutes to construct and write an answer to this part.

**TURN OVER FOR THE MARK ALLOCATIONS**

### Marking allocations

#### AO1: Outline of the alternative model of memory

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of main features of alternative model of memory is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . E.g., the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of the main aspects of the model as outlined above.
<b>3-4 marks</b>	Outline of main features of model is limited. It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may mention only certain aspects of the model.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of main features of model is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> (e.g. only one aspect of the model is identifiable).
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may explain an unrelated model) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

#### AO2: Evaluation of the alternative model

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on the alternative model of memory and <b>reasonably thorough analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the model and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>8-7 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the model but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on the model with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on the model and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Commentary on the model is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is <b>weak</b> and <b>muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is absent or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

## SECTION B - DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Outline the development of attachments (e.g. Schaffer).

(6 marks)

**Marking criteria**

The two main accounts of the development of attachments have been proposed by Schaffer and by Bowlby and an account of the stages they have identified would qualify as development of attachments. There are also some specific research studies (e.g. Schaffer & Emerson, 1964). Some candidates may offer an account of individual differences in attachments (e.g. Ainsworth). This could be made acceptable as long as the focus was on the development of different types of attachment (e.g. why infants do not develop secure attachments). It would not be sufficient to enumerate the different types if there was no reference to how these may have developed.

It would also be possible to approach this question from the point of view of research studies relating to explanations of attachment (e.g. psychoanalytic). The results of Harlow's monkey studies could be relevant if these demonstrate the factors necessary for an attachment to develop (i.e. contact comfort).

There is a necessary trade-off between breadth and depth in this type of question. A description of one approach to the development of attachments, well elaborated, would be sufficient.

**Marking allocations**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of development of attachments is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> along the lines suggested in the marking criteria.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of the development of attachments is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example, a limited range of findings are presented and not sufficiently elaborated.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of the development of attachments is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, only one aspect is mentioned.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example not related the development of attachments) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Describe the procedures and findings of <b>one</b> study in which the effects of privation have been investigated. (6 marks)
--

### Marking criteria

Research focused on privation includes that of Rutter (1970) and Tizard & Hodges (1989). Describing the procedures and findings of such studies would be an appropriate answer to the question. Some studies of extreme privation are also acceptable (e.g. Genie) but here the candidate must describe procedures of the cases. However the description of the nature of Genie's privation or her disabilities might be credit worthy as findings. There are also many studies of the effects of deprivation (many concerned with maternal deprivation) which were undertaken when the distinction between privation and deprivation was not clearly made. Many of these were, it could be argued, studies of privation (e.g. Goldfarb) and so if the candidate describes one of these it would be acceptable. Thus if what was actually being studied was privation (for example lack of a caregiver) then this can be credited but not if it is the effects of *separation* (e.g. Robertson & Robertson). If Bowlby's 44 thieves is offered then a case must be made for it to be considered as a study of privation not deprivation. For example, the candidate may claim that affectionless psychopathy was the result of privation. The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow's studies are acceptable.

### Marking allocations

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of study of the effects of privation is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has covered both procedures and findings of a clearly identifiable study of privation.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of study of the effects of privation is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . For example a reasonable account of procedures is offered but only a very brief account of findings. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> the procedures <i>or</i> findings of the study is accurate and detailed (i.e. partial performance).
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of study of the effects of privation is <b>basic</b> , <b>lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, the study may be difficult to identify from the brief account of procedure given. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> the procedures <i>or</i> findings of the study is generally accurate but less detailed (i.e. partial performance)
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate has described a study which was not concerned with the effects of privation) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) “Psychologists are divided in the extent to which they see day care as beneficial to children’s development.”

To what extent does day care have a beneficial effect on cognitive **and/or** social development?  
(18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** will be a description of research findings into and/or explanations of the effects of day care, as well as the beneficial effects themselves. **AO2** will be an evaluation of this research, construction of the argument, consequences and implications and conclusions about whether day care has a beneficial effect.

There are a variety of studies that could be used as a basis for an answer to this question. The findings of some studies (e.g. Belsky, 1986, 1990) suggest the conclusion that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their development. However, others (e.g. Andersson, 1992) conclude that so long as day care is of high quality, it is not bad for children and can even make a positive contribution to their later intellectual and social development. These disagreements are difficult to resolve because research is still at a relatively early stage (most studies are by nature longitudinal) and those that have been reported are subject to important limitations (for example, only being conducted in university-based day care centres of high quality). However, tentative conclusions suggest that the intellectual development of children can actually be accelerated in adequately staffed and well-run day care centres. As far as social development is concerned, children who attend day care are often more self-sufficient and more independent of parents, have better relationships with peers and are more knowledgeable about the world and social relationships.

The debate about day care has been very much influenced by Bowlby’s views, but it would not be adequate to focus the answer solely on the effects on the child of maternal deprivation - the research must relate specifically to day care. Studies of working mothers can be relevant since it is reasonable to assume that the children of such mothers will be in some form of day care. So too could research comparing different types of day care in terms of their effects. However, studies of institutionalisation are not relevant since this is not day care.

### Marking allocations

AO1: Description of research into effects of day care

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of research into the effects of day care on children’s cognitive or social development is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> .
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of research into the effects of day care on children’s cognitive or social development is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of research into the effects of day care on children’s cognitive or social development is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research which was not directly addressing day care) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**TURN OVER FOR THE AO2 MARK ALLOCATIONS**

## AO2: evaluation/assessment of research

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development and <b>reasonably thorough analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>8-7 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner..
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Commentary on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is <b>weak</b> and <b>muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is absent or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

4

**Total for this question: 30 marks**(a) Explain what is meant by the terms secure and insecure attachments. (3+3 marks)**Marking criteria**

In order to explain the two terms candidates may refer to Ainsworth's findings. Using the Strange Situation, she found that in the case of secure attachment the infant is distressed at the mother's absence but is rapidly reassured on her return. The infant also is content to explore and copes better with the stranger when the mother is present. Insecure attachment can be of at least two types: resistant and avoidant. In the former the infant is insecure in the presence of the mother and very distressed when she leaves. In avoidant attachment, the infant does not seek contact with the mother.

A detailed and accurate explanation of one type of insecure attachment is acceptable.

**Marking allocations**

For each term:

<b>3 marks</b>	Explanation of terms secure attachment or insecure attachment is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, in the case of insecure attachment, a clear account of the meaning the term is given as indicated in the marking criteria.
<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation of terms secure attachment and insecure attachment is <b>limited</b> . It is generally <b>accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example if the different types of insecure attachment are referred to they are not explained.
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation of terms secure attachment or insecure attachment is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation is <b>inappropriate</b> or is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Outline the findings of **one** study of cross-cultural variations in attachments and give **one** criticism of this study. (3+3 marks)

### Marking criteria

Most of the relevant studies that could be used in an answer to this question have used the Strange Situation methodology. However just describing Ainsworth’s technique would not be appropriate. Meta-analyses such as Van Ijzendoorn & Kroonenberg (1988) can count as one study. This study found that there was quite marked variation between cultures but also between different studies in the same cultures. As an example of a discrete study, Sagi *et al.* (1994) demonstrated subcultural differences: between home-reared children and kibbutzim-raised children in Israel. Similarly, Tronik (1992) and his colleagues studied communal patterns of child-rearing in Zaire within a pygmy culture called the Efe.

There may be some difficulty in deciding what is meant by a cross-cultural study. While it could be argued that a study is only cross-cultural when it explicitly compares two or more cultures (e.g. the Van Ijzendoorn meta-analysis), such studies are actually quite rare in this area. A less restrictive definition of cross-cultural where another (usually non-western) culture is studied (e.g. Ainsworth’s Ganda project) is therefore allowable. However, Harlow’s studies on monkeys and studies of imprinting would not be appropriate as the term cross-cultural is not used in connection with non-human animals.

Criticisms will depend on the actual study chosen, but are likely to centre on the appropriateness of the Strange Situation methodology or on the difficulties of understanding and therefore comparing other cultures. For example, the meaning of ‘secure’ or ‘avoidant’ behaviour may not be the same in different cultures. Gross *et al.* (1995) suggested that in Germany insecure/avoidant behaviour reflects the effects of specific encouragement towards independence in the child, not indifference by mothers.) Candidates might also consider positive criticisms such as an application of the research.

### Marking allocations

For the outline

<b>3 marks</b>	Outline of findings of <b>one</b> study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> .
<b>2 marks</b>	Outline of findings of <b>one</b> study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is limited. It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline of findings of <b>one</b> study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is <b>basic</b> , <b>lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of findings <b>one</b> study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is <b>inappropriate</b> or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

For the criticism:

<b>3 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one limitation or strength of research. (E.g. as detailed in the marking criteria above.)
<b>2 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is both <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . (E.g. a generic criticism of cross-cultural research is given but not related to attachments.)
<b>1 mark</b>	Statement of criticism of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments is <b>basic</b> , <b>lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . (E.g. ‘It is difficult to understand another culture’).
<b>0 marks</b>	Answer is <b>inappropriate</b> , i.e. not directed at the study described in the first part or the criticism, if directed at an appropriate study is <b>incorrect</b> .



(c) Consider the extent to which research supports Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis. (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** could be an account of research (e.g. studies) which relates to the maternal deprivation hypothesis. **AO2** would then be an evaluation of this research. Alternatively, **AO1** could be an account of the maternal deprivation hypothesis. **AO2** would then be a consideration of the extent to which the hypothesis is supported by research.

There are many studies of the effects of deprivation and the implications for maternal deprivation theory. These include early studies of institutionalised children (e.g. Goldfarb, 1943, Spitz & Wolf, 1946 and Bowlby, 1946) However, these early studies have been extensively criticised for their lack of rigour. Even if the findings of these early studies are valid, the data are essentially *correlational*. However, animal studies by Harlow and his co-workers appeared to lend weight to Bowlby's theories but the neglect suffered by Harlow's monkeys was much more severe than just about any imaginable deprivation of children (except in very rare cases of extreme privation). Also evidence from animal studies must be interpreted very carefully when applied to humans.

There are also many studies that directly undermine the maternal deprivation hypothesis including Schaffer & Emerson (1964) whose results could be viewed as challenging a central assumption of Bowlby's theory: the idea of monotropy. Hodges & Tizard (1989, etc) showed that children can form attachments *after* 3 years of age despite early deprivation; and studies have concluded that it was lack of stimulation that had caused the poorer intellectual development, not maternal deprivation. In addition Rutter suggests that rather than separation itself being responsible for the behaviour, it is much more important to look at the *cause* of the separation.

### Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> .
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . (E.g. only one or two effects of MD are described).
<b>0 marks</b>	The outline of research is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research which was not directly addressing Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**TURN OVER FOR THE AO2 MARK ALLOCATIONS**

## AO2: Evaluation/assessment of the extent to which research supports

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis and <b>reasonably thorough analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>8-7 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner..
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Commentary on research into Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis into is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is <b>weak</b> and <b>muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is absent or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

## Assessment Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	Total
1 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
<b>Total for Q.1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
2 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
<b>Total for Q.2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
3 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
<b>Total for Q.3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
4 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
<b>Total for Q.4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
QoWC	2		2
<b>Total for unit</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>62</b>
% weighting AS	20.4	12.9	
% weighting A2	10.2	6.5	