



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181

Specification A

Unit 1 (PYA1) Cognitive and Developmental Psychology

Mark Scheme

2008 examination - January 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

Copyright © 2008 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)

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

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO

| | |
|------------|--|
| AO1 | <p>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.</p> |
| AO2 | <p>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.</p> |

SECTION A: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

1 (a) Describe findings and/or conclusions of research into the nature of short-term memory (STM). (6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-------|--|
| <p>STM is thought to encode mainly acoustically (Baddeley, 1966) although there is evidence that other modalities are also used. STM is generally assumed to have limited capacity (7 +/-2 items or chunks). The duration of STM is normally assumed to be up to about 20 seconds (eg Peterson and Peterson, 1959), although this depends on the paradigm used.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to focus on encoding, duration and capacity but answers that are focused on other aspects of STM such as forgetting, or on a model or conceptualisation of STM, such as Working memory (Baddeley and Hitch, 1974) are potentially equally creditworthy.</p> <p>Breadth vs. depth may be an issue here; it is just as acceptable to describe the findings /conclusions of research into one aspect of STM in detail as it is to refer more broadly to a number of findings/conclusions.</p> | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the findings/conclusions of research into the nature of STM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, detailed findings of research into the nature of encoding and capacity in STM are accurately cited.</p> |
| | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline description of the findings/conclusions of research into the nature of STM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate describes the findings and conclusion of a relevant study, but detail is missing.</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the findings/conclusions of research into the nature of STM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding. but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a basic outline of the nature of STM is given eg 'STM has limited capacity and duration'.</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of findings/conclusions of research into the nature of STM.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of findings/conclusions of research into the nature of STM.</p> |

1 (b) Describe the findings and conclusions of **one** study of the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony (EWT). (6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-------|---|
| <p>Loftus's empirical studies are most likely to be cited here, although other studies may also be used. Loftus & Palmer (1974) found that the mean speed estimates for 5 groups shown a film of a traffic accident changed depending on the verb used in a 'critical' question ('smashed' elicited average estimates of 40.8 mph whereas for 'contacted' the average speed estimated was 31.8 mph). A follow up study found that participants in the 'smashed' condition were more likely to give higher speeds and also more likely to think they had seen broken glass when in fact there was not broken glass. The original and follow up study may be treated as one study. However if findings and conclusions of two or more clearly distinct studies are given, the study that attracts most marks should be credited.</p> <p>Loftus & Zanni (1975) found that when participants were asked the question 'did you see the broken headlight?' they were more likely to answer 'yes' than when they were asked 'did you see a broken headlight?'</p> <p>Conclusions should refer to how the wording of questions can result in inaccurate accounts by eye witnesses through the addition of detail and distortion of recall.</p> | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the findings and conclusions of one study into the role of leading questions in EWT that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, detailed description of the results and the main conclusions drawn from Loftus and Palmer's study are reported.</p> |
| | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the findings and conclusions of one study into the role of leading questions in EWT that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, accurate findings and/or conclusions are reported, but they are in less detail than would be required for 6 marks or detailed description of findings or conclusions are reported Max 4 marks</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the findings and/or conclusions of one study into the role of leading questions in EWT that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the findings and conclusions of the study are reported briefly with some inaccuracy.</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of findings/conclusions of one study into the role of leading questions in EWT.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of findings/conclusions of one study into the role of leading questions in EWT.</p> |

1 (c) Outline and evaluate research into the role of emotional factors in memory.

(18 marks)

| <p>Marking Criteria</p> | |
|--|---|
| <p>Other research may refer to the suggestion that emotional factors may improve memory, eg Wagenaar’s research into personal memoirs (1986). Candidates may also refer to mood congruity (Bower 1981) or the effects of anxiety on memory eg MacLeod and Matthews (1988).</p> <p>Commentary may include consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the studies and/or theories described, evaluation of the reliability and validity of the research, as well as the ethics and ethical problems inherent in conducting research in this area.</p> <p>For both AO1 and AO2 candidates may focus on a relatively restricted range of research in detail or a broader range in less detail.</p> | <p>AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of theories and/or studies of the role of emotional factors in memory.</p> <p>AO2 criteria are satisfied by an evaluation of the procedures, findings or conclusions of studies and/or an evaluation of theories cited.</p> <p>Examiners are reminded that the specification refers to memory in general. Answers which focus on either the enhancement of memory and/or on forgetting as a result of emotional factors are equally acceptable.</p> <p>There is a considerable amount of research which suggests that emotional factors have a role in memory. This could be research into repression - Freud’s theory of repression may be offered, together with research such as that of Levinger and Clark (1961) and Williams (1994). Candidates may comment that the existence of posttraumatic stress disorder may in fact be evidence against repression being used to protect the ego from anxiety. An explanation of flashback memories, and/or a description of empirical research relating to FBMs, is likely also to be used to explain about the role of emotional factors in memory. 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> |

1 (c)

| Marks | Performance Descriptions | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| | <p>AO1: Outline of research into the role of emotional factors in memory.</p> | | <p>AO2: Evaluation of research into the role of emotional factors in memory.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research into the role of emotional factors in memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, a detailed description of the role of repression in forgetting is given or empirical research into flashbulb memories is described.</p> | 12-10 | <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into the role of emotional factors in memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, a generally accurate description of FBMs is given, which lacks some detail, or an overview of empirical research into repression is provided.</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic description of research into the role of emotional factors in memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a basic outline of only one study is provided.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of research into the role of emotional factors in memory. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research into the role of emotional factors in memory.</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent. |

2 (a) Describe **one** explanation of forgetting in long-term memory (LTM).

(6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-------|--|
| <p>In this question candidates might describe, for example, retrieval failure or interference as an explanation of forgetting in LTM. Other possibilities include decay, state/context dependent, and emotional factors (repression). While some explanations (eg decay and interference) can occur in both STM and LTM, others (eg displacement) are normally considered to be STM mechanisms, so would not be relevant for this question.</p> <p>In the event that two or more clearly different explanations are described, then each should be marked and the highest mark awarded. However if the explanations described could be regarded as examples of a higher level explanation then they can be credited as one explanation.</p> <p>Elaboration of the description by reference to relevant research studies, eg retrieval failure – Tuiving & Pearlstone - should be credited.</p> | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, retrieval failure is described accurately, perhaps with an illustrating example.</p> |
| | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of an explanation of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate provides a generally accurate description of interference, but no reference is made to different types of interference.</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of one explanation of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the description lacks detail and/or clarity (eg a basic outline of retrieval failure is provided, with no detail).</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate just names one explanation or provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of an explanation of forgetting in LTM.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one explanation of forgetting.</p> |

2 (b) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study of reconstructive memory.

(6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|---|-------------------|---|
| <p>Reconstructive memory refers to a process whereby all the available information about the event is used to reconstruct the details of the event, on the basis of what 'must' have been true.</p> <p>It is important to note that the research must be into reconstructive memory and that therefore not all EWT research will be acceptable. Acceptable research includes that of Bartlett (1932) and the repeated reproduction technique used with the 'War of the Ghosts' story. Alternatively, the work of Sulin and Dooling (1974) may be offered; they presented their participants either with a story about the dictator "Gerald Martin" or Adolf Hitler; those who read the Hitler version were more likely than the other participants to believe that they had read a sentence about the dictator hating and persecuting Jews. The 'stereotyping' study by Allport and Postman (1947) may also be creditworthy as a study of reconstructive memory.</p> <p>Wynn and Logie (1998) tested memory in a more real-life situation. Students' recall of events in their first week at university at intervals ranging from 2 weeks to six months. Initial accuracy was sustained throughout the period with not much change over time, suggesting limited use of reconstructive memory.</p> <p>Other studies which refer to leading questions or post-event information may also be allowable as long as the reconstructive nature of the research is clear, eg Loftus & Palmer.</p> <p>Breadth/depth may be an issue in answers to this question. Answers that describe procedures in detail but findings in less detail are as acceptable as those which are more balanced.</p> <p>If candidates offer only procedures or only findings, then this constitutes partial performance and a maximum of four marks is allowable, as shown in the performance descriptions.</p> | <p>6</p> | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, both the procedures and findings of Bartlett's study are described in reasonable detail.</p> |
| | <p>5-4</p> | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, Bartlett's study is described, but in less detail, so the procedure is glossed over but the findings are reasonably accurate.</p> <p>If only procedures or only findings are described, this is accurate and reasonably detailed. (Maximum 4 marks)</p> |
| | <p>3-2</p> | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the gist of Bartlett's study is given but the details are not there or are inaccurate.</p> |
| | <p>1-0</p> | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge of the procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory.</p> |

2 (c) Describe and evaluate **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory, (eg levels of processing, working memory). (18 marks)

| <p>Marking Criteria</p> | |
|--|--|
| <p>AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of an alternative to the multi-store model of memory (MSM). AO2 criteria are satisfied by an evaluation of this model.</p> <p>Candidates might describe, for example, the working memory (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 sketchpad, and the central executive that integrates information from the previous two systems as well as from LTM.</p> <p>Description of LOP model would make reference to how information is encoded and processed; the model assumes that attentional and perceptual processes operating at the time of learning, rather than storage location, influence what is stored in the LTM. Information is processed at different levels from shallow to deep. They also emphasised the difference between maintenance and elaborative rehearsal.</p> <p>In terms of evaluation of the WM model, candidates could focus on research evidence. Examples of such research supporting the WM model are: the unattended speech effect and articulatory suppression. There is also some physiological evidence from brain scan studies.</p> | <p>If the levels of processing model (LOP) is chosen, AO2 could also involve contrasting the model with the MSM. In terms of negative criticisms of the model, while the basic idea of depth of processing is a reasonable one, the approach as a whole is regarded as being oversimplified. It could also be pointed out that it is difficult to operationalise depth of processing in studies, principally because the definition of depth is rather circular. Furthermore, it is usually suggested that the LOP approach describes rather better than it predicts.</p> <p>In the event that more than one alternative is discussed, then each should be marked and the highest mark awarded for the combined 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 AO2 credit should be given. For this reason, discussion of MSM can be awarded marks but only if it is used for evaluation of the alternative model (ie AO2).</p> |

2 (c)

| Marks | Performance Descriptions | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|-------|---|-------|--|
| 6 | <p>AO1: Description of an alternative to the MSM.</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of one alternative to the MSM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the components of the WM model are described accurately, including some detail of the relationship between the components.</p> | 12-10 | <p>AO2: Evaluation of the alternative model to MSM.</p> <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of one alternative to the MSM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, a description of the levels of processing approach, which is accurate if not extremely detailed, is given.</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of one alternative to the MSM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a basic outline of the WM model is given, but there may be some confusion over the components.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</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.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of an alternative to MSM.</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent. |

SECTION B: DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

3 (a) Describe the findings and conclusions of **one** study into the effects of privation. (6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|---|-------------------|---|
| <p>Research focused on privation includes that of Hodges & Tizard (1989).</p> <p>Studies of extreme privation are also acceptable, though candidates must be careful when describing the findings of the cases, since certain memorable aspects of the cases, such as being tied to a potty chair, are clearly not findings. However, the description of the nature of Genie's disabilities would be creditworthy as findings.</p> <p>There are also many studies of the effects of (maternal) deprivation which were undertaken when the distinction between privation and deprivation was not clearly made. Many of these were, it could be argued, actually studies of privation (eg Goldfarb) and so could be credited. However where it is clear that it is the effects of separation that are being investigated (eg Robertson & Robertson) then this is not acceptable.</p> <p>If Bowlby's 44 thieves is offered then it is NOT necessary for a case to be made for it to be considered as a study of privation.</p> <p>The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow's studies of privation are acceptable.</p> <p>If candidates describe the findings of more than one study then both should be marked and credit given for the study which attracts the higher number of marks.</p> <p>There should be some reference to the actual results of the study to justify awarding marks for findings.</p> | <p>6</p> | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the findings and conclusions of one study of the effects of privation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, in the Hodges and Tizard study details of the effects of different patterns of privation at different ages are given and effects such as desire for adult attention, difficulty in forming peer relationships are described.</p> |
| | <p>5-4</p> | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the findings and conclusions of one study of the effects of privation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, accurate findings and/or conclusions are reported, but they are in less detail than would be required for 6 marks or detailed description of findings or conclusions are reported Max 4 marks.</p> |
| | <p>3-2</p> | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the findings and/or conclusions of one study of the effects of privation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, there is only a basic description of the findings or the findings are muddled.</p> |
| | <p>1-0</p> | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the findings and/or conclusions of one study of the effects of privation.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the findings or conclusions of one study into the effects of privation.</p> |

3 (b) Outline findings of research into the effects of day care on children's social development.

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|---|--------------|--|
| <p>Research into the effects of day care often deals with the effects on both cognitive and social development. This question requires candidates to directly address the effects on social development. Some research has shown that day care is related to social development. Clarke-Stewart et al (1991) found that children in day care had more advanced peer relationships. Shea's (1981) study of playground behaviour found that sociability of 3&4 year olds increased over the first 10 weeks at nursery school, as measured by factors such as aggression and frequency of peer interaction. Roggman et al (1994) found no ill-effects from early day care on behaviour in the Strange Situation when they compared those who attended day care before the age of one and those cared for at home. Both groups were securely attached. However not all studies report these positive findings. Vandell & Corasaniti (1990) found children with extensive child care experiences from infancy were rated by parents as having poorer peer relationships.</p> | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of findings of research into the effects of day care on social development that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example the findings of one study are described in detail making reference to the quality of day care and the aspect of social development focused on in the study, or a range of findings from more than one study are reported in less detail.</p> |
| | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of findings of research into the effects of day care on social development that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, an accurate but less detailed outline of the findings of one or more studies is given.</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of findings of research into the effects of day care on social development that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the outline provides only limited detail of the findings failing to make reference to the aspect of social development or the nature of the day care.</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of findings of research into the effects of day care on social development.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of findings of research into the effects of day care on social development.</p> |

3 (c) Outline and evaluate research into individual differences in attachment (eg Ainsworth) (18 marks)

| <p>Marking Criteria</p> | |
|--|---|
| <p>For this question the AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of research into individual differences in attachment.</p> <p>AO2 criteria are satisfied by an evaluation of the studies and/or theories.</p> <p>It is likely that most candidates will chose to write about Ainsworth's Strange Situation research and other research developed from her original work. However, other relevant research may also be creditworthy. For example, work which takes the lifespan approach to individual differences in attachment, such as research using the Adult Attachment Interview, may also be creditworthy, as may work on cross-cultural variations in attachment as long as the focus is on individual differences.</p> <p>Ainsworth used a structured situation and controlled observation to see how an infant behaves in a number of situations. Stranger anxiety, separation anxiety and reunion behaviour were measured, although not all measures were used in all of her studies.</p> <p>Three main types of children, and a number of subgroups, were identified.</p> <p>AO2 points about Ainsworth's work include the fact that the research would appear to be generally valid and reliable (Main <i>et al</i> 1985). It has been suggested that changes which are seen in attachment types over time are often associated with changes in the form of care which children experience (such as parental separation; Melhuish, 1993). A number of measures are taken, and these may usefully be used across a number of cultures to give a measure of attachment types in children.</p> | <p>The Strange Situation has been criticised for being unethical, and some researchers have suggested that the unrealistic situation affects the results – attachment types may appear stronger in the Strange Situation than at home. Some of the early work using the strange situation used very small samples, although the Strange Situation has been used extensively in a wide variety of settings. In addition, it has been suggested that it is the relationship and not the child which is being tested, as different attachment types are observed when the father is the 'known' adult in the Strange Situation. Some psychologists have suggested that an (unacceptable) value judgement of 'B is best' is accepted by some researchers.</p> <p>Work on attachment in animals (such as Harlow's monkeys) can be credited provided that it addresses individual differences.</p> <p>For both AO1 and AO2 candidates may focus on a relatively restricted range of research in detail or a broader range in less detail.</p> |

3 (c)

| Marks | Performance Descriptions | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--------------|--|--------------|---|
| 6 | <p>AO1: Outline of research evidence.</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research into individual differences in attachment that demonstrates knowledge and understanding. For example, accurate detail of the procedures and findings of one or more relevant studies is described and the link to individual differences is made explicit.</p> | 12-10 | <p>AO2: Evaluation/assessment of research.</p> <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of research into individual differences in attachment that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, Ainsworth's attachment types are given and her research is described accurately, but in less detail.</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of research into individual differences in attachment that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a basic outline of Ainsworth's research method is given, but no clear link to individual differences is set out.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed outline that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of research into individual differences in attachment.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research into individual differences in attachment.</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible. |

4 (a) Describe stages in the formation of attachments (eg Schaffer).

(6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-------|---|
| <p>Although the question mentions Schaffer, this is only as an example, and other researchers' work on the stages of attachment, such as that of Bowlby, is equally as acceptable.</p> <p>Schaffer (1996) identifies four stages in the development of attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the asocial stage (0-6 weeks) smiling, crying not directed at special individuals. • indiscriminate attachments (6 weeks –7 months) attention sought from different individuals. • specific attachments (7-11 months) strong attachment to one individual. • the stage of multiple attachments (9 months +). good attachment to others. | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, key features of Schaffer's, or Bowlby's, stages are described accurately and in correct sequence.</p> |
| <p>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 the fifth stages in older children – lessening of attachment as measured by proximity, but the relationship being based on more abstract considerations.</p> | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, for 4 marks, Schaffer's stages are listed with ages.</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, Description of Schaffer's stages is incomplete or stages are not in the correct order.</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the stages in the formation of attachments.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the stages in the formation of attachments.</p> |

4 (b) Outline findings and/or conclusions of research into cross-cultural variations in attachment. (6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|---|-------|---|
| <p>Candidates may refer to research studies that have studied infant attachment styles in various cultures using the Strange Situation. For example, in a meta-analysis of studies using this test, Van Ijzendoorn & Kroonenberg (1988) found a clear pattern of cross-cultural differences. Type Bs (secure attachment) were the most common overall, but Type As (avoidant) are relatively more common in Western European countries, and Type Cs (ambivalent) are relatively more frequent in Israel and Japan.</p> <p>Despite problems of interpretation, most candidates may probably conclude that there is evidence for significant cross-cultural variations. However, some informed answers may also point out that differences within cultures are usually more significant than those between cultures. It would also be appropriate to mention sub-cultural differences. Sagi <i>et al.</i> (1994) have demonstrated differences between home-reared children and kibbutzim-raised children in Israel. Secure attachments were less common in the latter. However, there is little to suggest that, even in a kibbutzim type upbringing, attachment itself is anything other than a universal phenomenon.</p> <p>Procedures are not required in this question. Breadth vs. depth may be an issue. If candidates outline the findings of two or more studies, but in less detail then potentially this is as creditworthy as candidates who describe just one study, but in more detail.</p> | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the findings and/or conclusions of research into cross cultural variations in attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, a range of findings/conclusions is summarised, or the findings from one piece of research outlined in detail.</p> |
| | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the findings and/or conclusions of research into cross cultural variations in attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the results of a meta -analysis are described accurately but with less than full detail.</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the findings and/or conclusions of research into cross cultural variations in attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled.</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the findings and/or conclusions of research into cross cultural variations in attachment.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the findings and/or conclusions of research into cross cultural variations in attachment.</p> |

- 4 (c) 'Some children seem to recover from the effect of privation, but others do not.'
 Outline research into the effects of privation and consider the extent to which the effects of privation can be reversed. (18 marks)

| <p>Marking Criteria</p> | |
|---|---|
| <p>For this question, the AO1 criteria are satisfied by an outline of research into the effects of privation.</p> <p>AO2 criteria are satisfied by a consideration of the extent to which the effects are reversible.</p> <p>For AO1, the studies most likely to be used are case studies of children raised in extreme isolation such as Isabelle, the Czech twins and Genie, or longitudinal studies of children in institutional care, such as the study of Hodges and Tizard (1989) or Rutter's study of Romanian orphans. The earlier studies of Skodak and Skeels (1949) or Spitz and Wolf (1946) may also be cited.</p> <p>Studies generally show either that some children never really recover from their early experiences or that other children show remarkable recovery, and that there are many variables that affect the final outcome.</p> <p>Animal studies, such as that of Harlow's monkeys, may be creditworthy.</p> | <p>For AO2, candidates may make the point that whether or not children recover from the effects of privation may depend on a number of complex and often interacting factors. In relation to case studies, candidates may mention the amount of time spent in isolation, some unique differences in the individual or the quality of the care subsequent to the initial privation. Candidates may also refer to the lack of reliability of the case history approach. In relation to longitudinal studies, candidates may refer to the quality of care, individual differences within the group studies, to sample attrition and the hypothesized reasons for dropout. Candidates may also mention the fact that total privation is rarely experienced in longitudinal studies, and that children may have received peer support (eg the study of Freud and Dann, 1951). Of course, institutional care may involve more than emotional deprivation, and physical or cognitive underdevelopment may be an issue. Another issue which is likely to be mentioned is that of the quality of care subsequent to the privation experience.</p> <p>Candidates may point out that the issues are complex ones and that there may be interactions going on, and that it is not possible to say either that total recovery always does or always does not take place.</p> <p>A general evaluation of research into privation is likely to attract only limited credit as basic commentary.</p> <p>As is evident from the above, research into privation may be credited as AO1 or AO2, depending on the way in which the material is used.</p> |

4 (c)

| Marks | Performance Descriptions | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| | AO1: Outline of research into the effects of privation | | AO2: Consideration of the extent to which the effects are reversible |
| 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into the effects of privation that demonstrates knowledge and understanding. For example, a detailed description of research which reflects the variation in responses to privation.</p> | 12-10 | <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into the effects of privation that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, an accurate outline of one or more studies is given but the findings/conclusions are not developed in detail.</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of research into the effects of privation that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a basic outline of the study of Tizard and Hodges is identifiable.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of research into the effects of privation.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research into the effects of privation.</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible. |

Assessment Grid

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