



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Psychology 5181**

## *Specification A*

### **Unit 1 (PYA1)**

## **Cognitive and Developmental Psychology**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2007 examination - June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**UNIT 1 (PYA1)**  
**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)**

<b>2 marks</b>	The work is characterised by some or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear expression of ideas</li> <li>• a good range of specialist terms</li> <li>• few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• errors do not detract from the clarity of the material.</li> </ul>
<b>1 mark</b>	The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reasonable expression of ideas</li> <li>• the use of some specialist terms</li> <li>• errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• errors detract from the clarity of the material.</li> </ul>
<b>0 marks</b>	The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• poor expression of ideas</li> <li>• limited use of specialist terms</li> <li>• errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• errors obscure the clarity of the material.</li> </ul>

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO**

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

**SECTION A: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY**1 (a) Describe **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory.*(6 marks)*

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>For this question, candidates are likely to choose either working memory (WM) or levels of processing. However, other alternatives (for example parallel distributed processing (PDP) are of course allowable).</p> <p>Descriptions of WMM are likely to refer to the three components of WMM, phonological loop, visuospatial sketchpad, and the central executive that integrates information from the phonological loop, visuospatial sketchpad and the LTM.</p> <p>Descriptions of levels of processing model are likely to make reference to the focus on attention and perceptual processes rather than storage location and to distinguish between shallow, phonemic and semantic processing as investigated by Craik &amp; Tulving (1975). Annotated diagrams are acceptable and could potentially achieve full marks if they fulfil the relevant criteria.</p>	<b>6</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of an alternative to the multi-store model of memory (MSM), such as working memory, that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the slave systems and central executive of the working memory model are described accurately, and processes linked in to this description.</p>
	<b>5-4</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, description of an alternative to the MSM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the components of WM are described, but the processes are not.</p>
	<b>3-2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of an alternative to the MSM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, an attempt is made to describe WM but the description is confused.</p>
	<b>1-0</b>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of an alternative to the MSM. For example, only a brief statement is given such as “WM focuses on the function of STM or an alternative is named”.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that demonstrates no knowledge or understanding of an alternative to the MSM.</p>

1 (b) Outline the procedures and findings of **one** study of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony.

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Loftus and Palmer define a leading question as one ‘that either by its form or content, suggests to the witness what answer is desired or leads him to the desired answer’. Loftus and Palmer’s 1974 study is the most likely one to be used, as it is mentioned on the specification, but other studies about leading questions are allowable.</p> <p>There may be a distinction between ‘leading questions’, where witnesses are led to a particular answer by the wording of the question and ‘post-event information’ questions, where new misleading information is added into the question after the incident has occurred. Research on either or both may be considered creditworthy.</p> <p>Likely studies include: Loftus and Palmer (1974), which looked at the effects of changing the verb in a critical question after participants had seen films of a traffic accident; Loftus and Zanni’s (1975) ‘broken headlight study’; the work of Loftus <i>et al</i> (1978) on the red Datsun stopping at a stop/yield sign (and the Bekerian and Bowers 1983 replication). In contrast to much of the research, Yuille and Cutshall (1986) found that leading questions which were included in an interview more than four months after the participants originally viewed the crime did not mislead participants, who provided accurate recall. Procedures and findings are both to be included, or the PP criteria will come into play (see right). However, there is no requirement for them to be equally balanced.</p>	6	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures and findings of one study of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a reasonably detailed account of both procedures and findings (though not necessarily balanced).</p>
	5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, description of the procedures and findings of one study of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a less detailed account of procedures, with only a brief mention of findings, or a balanced account of both in less detail.</p> <p><i>Note: If only procedures or findings are given, maximum mark is 4.</i></p>
	3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and findings of one study of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony that demonstrates some relevant knowledge, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a brief account of either procedures or findings is given, or a very brief account of both.</p>
	1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge of the procedures and/or findings of one study of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony.</p>

1 (c) Outline and evaluate explanations of forgetting.

(18 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	
<p>AO1 for this question is an outline of explanations of forgetting.</p> <p>AO2 is an evaluation of these explanations. AO2 is likely to focus on experimental support (or the lack of it) for the explanations.</p> <p>Although not required by this question, given the wording of the specification and previous questions, it is likely that candidates will distinguish between explanations of forgetting in short-term memory (STM) and explanations of forgetting in long-term memory (LTM). Decay and displacement are most likely to be offered as explanations of forgetting in STM. While some explanations (eg decay) can occur in both STM and LTM, others (eg displacement) are normally considered to be STM mechanisms. There is some evidence for the idea that proactive interference can be a mechanism for forgetting in STM, and this could gain credit. There are numerous explanations of forgetting in LTM. Retrieval failure and interference are named as examples in the specification. Other explanations eg state/context-dependent and emotional factors (repression) or brain injury are also creditworthy. Some candidates may refer to levels of processing.</p>	<p>The most likely approach to evaluation may be to cite research evidence, such as the study by Peterson and Peterson. However, providing extended description of procedures is not likely to be an effective way to answer the question. A valid point that some candidates might make is that it is difficult to decide between competing explanations for STM, because of the difficulty in designing experiments to isolate the factors under investigation. The evaluation will depend on the nature of the explanation, but might include the extent to which the explanations are supported by research studies, or how far the explanations have validity. For example, in evaluation of trace decay theory, candidates might suggest that there are studies relating to decay in LTM (eg the classic work of Jenkins and Dallenbach, 1924) but there are many confounding effects with much of this work. It might be concluded that there is little direct support for trace decay theory in LTM. There is a significant amount of research relating to repression and emotional factors in forgetting. In commentary or evaluation, candidates might also include the relevance of false memory syndrome.</p> <p>There may be an issue of breadth vs. depth in answers to this question. More detailed answers, which focus on explanations of forgetting in either STM or LTM, are as acceptable as those that focus on both STM and LTM, but in less detail.</p> <p>Answers that outline and/or evaluate only one explanation will be restricted to a maximum of 4 AO1 and/or 8 AO2 marks.</p>

1 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	<b>AO1:</b> Outline of explanations of forgetting		<b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of these explanations.
<b>6</b>	<b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of more than one explanation of forgetting that demonstrates knowledge and understanding. For example, an explanation of displacement related to STM capacity, is given and an explanation of how PI and RI operate in LTM is outlined.	<b>12-10</b>	<b>Informed commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
<b>5-4</b>	<b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of more than one explanation of forgetting that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, an accurate but less detailed explanation of decay in STM and of one of PI or RI in LTM is given. <i>If only one explanation is outlined, this is accurate and reasonably detailed (max 4 marks).</i>	<b>9-7</b>	<b>Reasonable commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul> <i>If only one explanation is evaluated and commentary is informed. (Max 8 marks)</i>
<b>3-2</b>	<b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of more than one explanation of forgetting that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a vague description of decay and interference is given.	<b>6-4</b>	<b>Basic commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>1-0</b>	<b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed outline that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of more than one explanation of forgetting. For example, the explanations are named, but no outline is given or the outline is incorrect or inappropriate. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of explanations of forgetting.	<b>3-0</b>	<b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible.</li> </ul>

**2** (a) Outline the findings of **one** study of the nature of long-term memory (LTM). Outline **one** criticism of this study. (3 marks + 3 marks)

For the findings:

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>For this question, any study into the nature of LTM is acceptable, although Bahrick's study is the most likely to be used as it is cited on the specification. Bahrick et al (1975) found evidence for the existence of very long-term memories up to 57 years later, although recognition memory was better than recall. Participants who had left school within the last 15 years recognised 90% of the faces and names of classmates from their school. Those who had left 48 years previously recognised 80% of the names and 70% of the faces. Free recall was comparatively poor.</p>	3	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the findings of one study of the nature of long-term memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the findings of a study such as that of Bahrick are outlined in reasonable detail.</p>
	2	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of one study of the nature of long-term memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, Bahrick's findings are given, but lack detail about the different results from participants depending on how long ago they left school.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of the findings of one study of the nature of long-term memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate states that participants had very good long-term memory for faces after a long time.</p>
	0	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a description which is flawed or an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one study of the nature of LTM.</p>



**2 (a)**

For the criticism

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
Various criticisms may be used - for example, candidates may say that this study supports those of other researchers Shepard (1967), for example, showed VLTM for adverts. Also, the study was high in ecological validity, as it involved people's real life memories.	<b>3</b>	<b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one criticism of the study they have outlined that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding, for example, a reasonably detailed outline explaining that the study lacked control in an important way (eg had participants looked at their school year book after they left school?)
However, the study lacked some important controls (eg had participants been in contact with friends since they left school?) In addition, only visual LTM was tested.	<b>2</b>	<b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of one criticism of the study they have outlined that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate may state that the study was high in ecological validity because it involved real life memory.
Candidates must offer a criticism of the study they describe. No marks are available for criticisms of a different study. If more than one criticism is given, examiners should mark both/all and credit the better/best. Positive criticisms are equally as acceptable as negative ones.	<b>1</b>	<b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of one criticism of the study they have outlined that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate simply states that the method had high ecological validity.
	<b>0</b>	<b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline that is flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one criticism of the study they have outlined.

2 (b) Outline findings of research into emotional factors in memory.

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>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. Candidates could of course talk about research into mood-dependent forgetting or other research related to emotional factors in memory.</p> <p>Studies of flashbulb memories are normally linked to significant historical events, for example the Challenger disaster. Some laboratory studies have looked at possible mechanisms, eg by blocking emotional arousal using drugs, and seeing if this affects the memory for emotionally-charged information (Cahil <i>et al</i>, 1994). Studies of repression include many case studies (eg recovered memories) but there are also a number of laboratory experiments, for example Levinger's. Anecdotal accounts of reactions to the death of a grandparent etc are not appropriate.</p> <p>Freud's theory of repression may be offered, together with research such as that of Williams (1994) or Bradley and Baddeley (1990). Candidates may comment that the existence of post-traumatic stress disorder may in fact be evidence against repression being used to protect the ego from anxiety. Alternatively, research into false memory syndrome or into Eyewitness Testimony may be used, as long as the link to emotion and to memory is made explicitly, for example, research on weapon focus may be appropriate in this context.</p> <p>Other research may refer to the suggestion that emotional factors may improve memory eg Wagenaar's research into personal memories (1986). Candidates may also refer to mood congruity (Bower 1981) or the effects of anxiety on memory eg MacLeod and Matthews (1988). Candidates must focus on the findings of research to achieve credit. Potentially, the findings of just one study could attract full marks, although they would have to fulfil the top band criteria to achieve the full 6 marks.</p>	6	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the findings of research into emotional factors in memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, a reasonably detailed description of findings of research such as that of Conway into the nature of flashbulb memories and of Freud into repression is given.</p>
	5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of the findings of research into emotional factors in memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate outlines findings of research into flashbulb memories and/or repression, but in less detail.</p>
	3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of the findings of research into emotional factors in memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a brief account of findings of research into flashbulb memories is given.</p>
	1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of the findings of research into emotional factors in memory. For example, repression is mentioned but not explained.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of findings of research into emotional factors in memory.</p>

2 (c) Describe and evaluate the multi-store model of memory.

(18 marks)

### Marking Criteria

For this question, **AO1** will be a brief account of the multi-store model (MSM). This should include a brief account of the main stores and some indication of how they are related. Candidates do not have to mention all processes and all features of the stores in order to achieve the full 6 marks. A labelled diagram could usefully supplement such an account. Potentially, a carefully annotated diagram could achieve the full 6 AO1 marks.

**AO2** will be a consideration of the strengths/limitations of the MSM, perhaps including relevant research. Candidates can focus on specific empirical criticisms of the MSM or adopt a more discursive approach by reference to alternative conceptualisations (or even combine the two approaches). If candidates introduce alternative models of memory as a form of commentary/evaluation, the degree to which candidates use this material as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply *describing* alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the AO2 credit.

In terms of strengths, the MSM explains a wide range of everyday memory phenomena, as well as less common ones such as amnesia. There are also a number of research studies that support the multi-store model, especially those into the primacy and recency effects (free-recall), as well as investigations into the nature of the two stores. (Note that the latter can be either AO1 or AO2, depending on how it is used.)

In terms of limitations, it is often said that the model is too simplistic and does not go far enough in breaking down the separate stores (eg as in the Working Memory Model). From the opposite point of view, the Levels of Processing (LOP) approach has criticised the rather compartmentalised view of memory that the multi-store model encourages. The LOP approach also challenges the role of rehearsal, in particular that this is the only means of transfer between STM and LTM.

## 2 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	<b>AO1:</b> Description of the multi-store model		<b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of the multi-store model
<b>6</b>	<b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the multi-store model that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, reasonably detailed description of both the processes and stores of the MSM is given.	<b>12-10</b>	<b>Informed commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
<b>5-4</b>	<b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, description of the multi-store model of memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, an accurate but less detailed description is given of the stores of the MSM, but little mention is made of the processes.	<b>9-7</b>	<b>Reasonable commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
<b>3-2</b>	<b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of the multi-store model that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the stores of the MSM are named and/or a basic attempt to describe the processes may be made.	<b>6-4</b>	<b>Basic commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>1-0</b>	<b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the multi-store model. For example, they may just mention the fact that it has stores. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the MSM.	<b>3-0</b>	<b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul>

**SECTION B: DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY**

3 (a) Describe Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis.

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Candidates must specifically describe the maternal deprivation hypothesis (MDH) to achieve marks on this question. Better answers are likely to include the effects of deprivation as well as the causes.</p> <p>Bowlby believed that if a separation occurs between mother and infant within the first few years of the child's life (critical period), the bond would be irreversibly broken, leading to severe emotional consequences for the infant in later life. He referred to this breaking of the bond as maternal deprivation. Bowlby claimed that maternal deprivation had some or all of the following consequences: aggressiveness, depression, delinquency, dependency anxiety, dwarfism, affectionless psychopathy, intellectual retardation and social maladjustment.</p> <p>Some candidates may give an outline of Bowlby's theory of attachment. This is only creditworthy to the extent that it provides further detail of the MD hypothesis. Criticisms of the MDH are not required.</p> <p>If candidates give details of the 44 juvenile thieves study, then this study may be credited to the extent to which it provides further detail of the MDH.</p>	6	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of Bowlby's MDH that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the causes and effects of deprivation, according to Bowlby, are described, accurately and in reasonable detail.</p>
	5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, description of Bowlby's MDH that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the causes and effects of deprivation are described accurately, but in less detail.</p>
	3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic explanation/outline description of Bowlby's MDH that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only the effects of deprivation are described.</p>
	1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the MDH. For example, he/she simply names one or two effects.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the MDH.</p>

**3 (b)** Outline findings **and/or** conclusions of research into effects of day care on children's cognitive **and/or** social development. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Belsky (1996) and Andersson (1992) are the studies most likely to be used. However, other studies focused on the effects of day care on cognitive/social development are equally acceptable. Amongst the more widely known studies, some findings (eg Belsky, 1986, 1990) suggest the conclusion that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their development. However, others (eg 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 cognitive development. These disagreements are difficult to resolve because research is still at a relatively early stage. However, tentative conclusions suggest that the intellectual development of children can actually be accelerated in adequately staffed and well-run day care centres.</p> <p>Candidates may focus on a relatively restricted range of studies, or even just one. However, this must be compensated by the level of detail of findings and/or conclusions in the account.</p> <p>Although generic conclusions may be allowable, they should be firmly rooted in research (even if the candidate does not specifically identify the research) to be creditworthy. Anecdotal accounts are unlikely to attract much credit.</p>	6	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of findings of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive and/or social development that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a reasonably detailed account of findings/conclusions of one or a range of studies into the effects of day care on cognitive and/or social development.</p>
	5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of findings of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive and/or social development that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate provides a less detailed account of the findings and/or conclusions of a study.</p>
	3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of findings of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive and/or social development that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the answer is mainly anecdotal, or only a brief account of findings is given.</p>
	1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed outline that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of findings of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive and/or social development. For example, the candidate states that quality of day care is important.</p> <p>For 0 marks, an inappropriate outline is given which fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research into effects of day care on children's cognitive and/or social development.</p>

3 (c) Describe and evaluate **one or more** explanations of attachment (eg Bowlby's theory, learning theory).

(18 marks)

### Marking Criteria

For this question, **AO1** criteria could be satisfied by a description of one or more explanations of attachment such as learning theory and Bowlby's theory. The **AO2** criteria would be satisfied by an evaluation of the explanation(s) of attachment. The examples given in the question are only examples and other theories of attachment are equally acceptable, such as Freud's theory or Social Learning theory of attachment. Work on features such as caregiver sensitivity may also be used as long as the focus of the answer is on explanations of attachment.

Freud's theory of attachment may be used. However, a general description of Freudian theory (such as a detailed account of the psychosexual stages without reference to attachment) is not creditworthy unless it is explicitly linked to attachment.

Learning theories of attachment focus on the processes of operant and classical conditioning in attachment. Again, generic descriptions of these processes which are not rooted in the context of attachment will not attract credit unless they are explicitly linked to attachment.

Bowlby's theory of attachment focusses on attachment being an innate and adaptive process, and the role of social releasers is emphasised. Again, candidates who focus on other aspects of Bowlby's work such as his MDH, without linking it to his theory of attachment, will find that their work does not attract much credit.

AO2 marks may be gained by using the explanations effectively to contrast with each other, for example, Freud's theory and learning theory may be contrasted. Equally, research such as that of Harlow (eg 1959) or Schaffer and Emerson on multiple attachments may be used effectively to gain AO2 credit. Detailed descriptions of Lorenz' imprinting work must be related to explanations of attachment in order to attract credit.

There may be an issue of breadth vs. depth in answers to this question. Answers which focus on one explanation or a limited range of explanations in depth are as acceptable as those which examine a wider range of explanations, but in less detail.

## 3 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	<b>AO1:</b> Description of one or more explanations of attachment.		<b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of one or more explanations of attachment.
<b>6</b>	<b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of one or more explanations of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, there is a reasonably detailed and accurate account of Bowlby's theory of attachment and a learning theory explanation of attachment.	<b>12-10</b>	<b>Informed commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
<b>5-4</b>	<b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, description of one or more explanations of attachment that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, there is an account of Bowlby's explanation of attachment, which is generally accurate but less detailed.	<b>9-7</b>	<b>Reasonable commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
<b>3-2</b>	<b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of one or more explanations of attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a description of Bowlby's work is given which is not clearly related throughout to an explanation of attachment, or a description of learning theory which is not made completely relevant to attachment is given.	<b>6-4</b>	<b>Basic commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>1-0</b>	<b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of one or more explanations of attachment. For example, Bowlby's idea about a sensitive period might be mentioned. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one or more explanations of attachment.	<b>3-0</b>	<b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul>



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

For the findings:

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Candidates are most likely to offer a study such as one that has studied infant attachment styles in various cultures using the Strange Situation, for example, the meta-analysis of studies by Van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988), who found a clear pattern of cross-cultural differences.</p> <p>For this question, a broad definition of 'cross-cultural' is intended, so research findings from cultures other than a western culture may be included as cross cultural (eg the Ganda study).</p> <p>An account of the Strange Situation's findings (eg definition of types A, B and C) with no reference to more than one culture or another culture would not be creditworthy.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the findings of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the findings of a study such as that of Van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg are outlined.</p>
	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of the findings of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the fact that western and non-western countries may be shown to demonstrate different patterns of attachment is stated, but limited detail is given.</p>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of the findings of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the fact that children in Germany may be more anxious avoidant than children in the US may be stated.</p>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a description which is flawed or an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments.</p>

For the criticism:

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Various criticisms may be used - for example, the Strange Situation may not be an appropriate measure of attachment in all cultures. Also, the meaning of the 'secure' or 'avoidant' behaviour may not be the same in different cultures. Grossmann <i>et al</i> (1995) suggested that, in Germany, insecure/avoidant behaviour reflects the effects of specific encouragement towards independence in the child, not indifference by mothers.</p> <p>Candidates may mention that the study was unrealistic, and that the classification may thus be an artefact of the situation, or that the classification created was of American infants and hence the classification and conclusion of the study cannot necessarily be applied to other cultures. However, the differences could be explained in a number of ways. For example, the meaning of the 'secure' or 'avoidant' behaviour may not be the same in different cultures.</p> <p>Candidates must offer a criticism of the study they describe. No marks are available for criticisms of a different study.</p> <p>If more than one criticism is given, examiners should mark both/all and credit the better/best.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one criticism of the study they have outlined that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, a reasonably detailed outline of why the strange situation may not be appropriate to use in all cultures may be offered.</p>
	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of one criticism of the study they have outlined that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate may suggest that the procedures are unethical as the infant may be distressed, without really showing an in-depth understanding of the ethical issues involved in the strange situation.</p>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of one criticism of the study they have outlined that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate simply states that the method may not be appropriate to all cultures.</p>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline that is flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one criticism of the study they have outlined.</p>

## 4 (b) Outline stages in the formation of attachments (eg Schaffer).

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>This question is focused on the stages of attachment and not explanations of attachment or individual differences in attachment. If candidates use this kind of material in answer to the question, then it can be credited inasmuch as it relates to stages in the formation of attachments.</p> <p>Although the question mentions Schaffer, this is only as an example, and other researchers' work on the stages of attachment is equally acceptable (eg Bowlby).</p> <p>Schaffer (1996) identifies four stages in the development of attachments – the asocial stages (0-6 weeks), indiscriminate attachments (6 weeks–7 months), specific attachments (7-11 months) and the stages of multiple attachments (9 months+). Bowlby's original work identified four (later five) stages – indiscriminate orienting and signalling; preferential orienting (5-7 months); discriminated attachment (7-9 months, identified by proximity seeking behaviour, stranger anxiety and separation protest); goal corrected partnership (child accommodating to mother's needs (3 yrs +) and a fifth stage in older children – lessening of attachment as measured by proximity, but the relationship being based on more abstract considerations.</p>	6	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a reasonably detailed account of Schaffer's stages, including the ages and key features of each stage.</p>
	5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, description of stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a less detailed account of the key features of each stage, without mentioning ages.</p>
	3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates some relevant knowledge, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a brief account of the names and ages of each of Schaffer's stages is given.</p>
	1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge of stages in the formation of attachments. For example, a very brief idea about discriminated attachment is given, but not other details.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of stages in the formation of attachments.</p>

## 4 (c) 'The effects of privation are long-lasting and difficult to reverse.'

Outline and evaluate research into the effects of privation.

(18 marks)

**Marking Criteria**

**AO1** credit should be given for an outline of relevant research (theories and/or studies) into the effects of privation. **AO2** credit should be given for analysis and evaluation of relevant research.

Candidates are most likely to use the work of Tizard and Hodges (1989) as this study is mentioned specifically on the specification, and describing the procedures/findings of this study would be an appropriate answer to the question. Studies of extreme privation are acceptable (eg Genie) but the candidate must focus on the procedures and outcomes, not the circumstances of the privation itself.

There are also many studies of the effects of deprivation which were undertaken when the distinction between privation and deprivation was not clearly made. If the candidate describes one of these, it should be judged on its merits. Thus, if what is being studied is actually privation (for example, lack of caregiver) then this can be credited, but not if the effects of separation are being investigated (eg Robertson and Robertson).

The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow's studies are acceptable.

For commentary (**AO2**), candidates might consider some of the obvious methodological and/or ethical flaws in early research.

They could also consider the argument about the reversibility of effects, and the sometimes-contradictory nature of research findings. Many studies of adoption and of the effects of extreme early privation have tended to show that, given adequate care, the effects can be mitigated or even reversed. However, some research does not suggest this - for example, Tizard and Hodges claim that adopted children had more difficulties with their peers.

Candidates do not have to refer to the quotation for their answers to attract full credit.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
	<b>AO1:</b> Outline of research into the effects of privation.		<b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of research into the effects of privation.
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research into the effects of privation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, there is an account of the procedures and/or findings of one research study such as that of Hodges and Tizard in reasonable detail, or a number of research studies in less detail.</p>	<b>12-10</b>	<p><b>Informed commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
<b>5-4</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate, outline of research into the effects of privation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, there is an account of one research study/theory in less detail, or a number of research studies in basic detail.</p>	<b>9-7</b>	<p><b>Reasonable commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
<b>3-2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of research into the effects of privation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, one or more research studies/theories (eg Hodges and Tizard) are identifiable, but the findings may be slightly muddled or lacking in detail.</p>	<b>6-4</b>	<p><b>Basic commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>1-0</b>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed outline that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the effects of privation. For example, one effect is mentioned.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate gives an inappropriate outline which demonstrates no knowledge or understanding of research into the effects of privation.</p>	<b>3-0</b>	<p><b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul>

**Assessment Grid**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>Total</b>
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	