



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Psychology 5181**

## *Specification A*

### **Unit 1 (PYA1R)**

### **Cognitive and Developmental Psychology**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2008 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 © 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)**

<b>2 marks</b>	<p>The work is characterised by some or all of the following:</p> <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>	<p>The work is characterised by:</p> <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>	<p>The work is characterised by:</p> <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>	<p>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.</p>
<b>AO2</b>	<p>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.</p>

**SECTION A: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY**

**1** (a) Describe **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory.

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Candidates are most likely to choose either working memory (WM) or levels of processing (LOP). Other alternatives, such as parallel distributed processing, are acceptable.</p> <p>Descriptions of WM are likely to refer to a central executive, the controlling component which acts as an attentional system, supervising and co-ordinating subsidiary systems called slave systems. The visuo-spatial scratchpad deals with visual information. The phonological loop deals with auditory information and is sub-divided into the phonological store and articulatory control system.</p> <p>Descriptions of LOP are likely to focus on the processing of information rather than on where it is stored. The model distinguishes between shallow (structural) deeper (acoustic) and deepest (semantic) processing. Deeper levels of analysis produce more durable and longer-lasting traces than shallower traces. Reference to research findings, such as Craik and Tulving (1975) may be credit-worthy.</p> <p>Elaboration, distinctiveness and organisation may also be mentioned.</p> <p>Annotated diagrams are acceptable and could potentially achieve full marks if they fulfil the relevant criteria.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> 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>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> 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>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> 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, or several components are named.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><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 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. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that demonstrates no knowledge or understanding of an alternative to the MSM.</p>

1 (b) (i) Explain what is meant by the term *reconstructive memory*.

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Reconstructive memory is usually associated with Bartlett's research. He referred to the way in which memory is distorted or modified (reconstructed) by experience. Instead of storing an exact replica of an episode, we combine the initial stimulus with elements of our existing knowledge and experience (schema) to form a reconstructed memory.</p> <p>Candidates need not make explicit reference to Bartlett.</p>	3	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of what is meant by reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate explains how memories can be distorted by experience – new memories are combined with existing schema.</p>
	2	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate explanation of what is meant by reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate might state that the term was used by Bartlett, and occurs when memory is modified by previous experience.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of what is meant by reconstructive memory that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example the candidate may simply state that reconstructive memories are distorted or changed.</p>
	0	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation which fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding.</p>

1 (b) (ii) Outline the procedures of **one** study of reconstructive memory. (3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Most candidates will choose Bartlett's War of the Ghosts investigation of reconstructive memory which used the method of repeated reproductions to test recall.</p> <p>Other research studies relating to reconstructive memory include Allport and Postman, and Loftus and Palmer.</p> <p>Studies which do not relate to reconstructive memory, eg weapon focus, should not be credited.</p>	3	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, an account of Bartlett's study is given, briefly outlining the type of stimulus material used, how it was presented and how results were obtained.</p>
	2	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate outline of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, as above, but the candidate might not mention how recall was assessed.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example the candidate may identify the story used as War of the Ghosts.</p>
	0	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline of the procedures which is flawed or procedures of an inappropriate study.</p>

**1 (c) Discuss one or more explanations of forgetting in long-term memory.**

**(18 marks)**

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	
<p>AO1 for this question is an outline of <b>one or more</b> explanations of forgetting in long-term.</p> <p>AO2 is a commentary on this explanation/these explanations. AO2 is likely to focus on experimental support for the explanation(s).</p> <p>There are numerous explanations of forgetting in LTM. Retrieval failure and interference are named as examples in the specification. Decay, state/context forgetting and repression are also likely choices. While some explanations (eg decay and interference) can occur in both STM and LTM, displacement is normally considered to be a STM mechanism, so would not be relevant for this question.</p> <p>Discussion will depend on the nature of the explanations, but might include the extent to which the explanations are supported by research studies. For example, in evaluation of trace decay, candidates might refer to the classic work of Jenkins and Dallenbach (1924). Simple description of relevant studies will not receive much credit. The candidate must make the relevance of the material explicit, otherwise it will not be effective.</p> <p>Comparison with other explanations and how explanations link with models of memory would also be relevant.</p>	<p>There is a significant amount of research relating to repression. In commentary or evaluation candidates might include the relevance of false memory syndrome.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the fact that laboratory experiments lack external validity. However, if the same criticism is repeated for several studies this would be an example of basic commentary.</p> <p>Examiners should be aware of the issue of breadth versus depth in this question. Answers which focus on one explanation in detail are as credit-worthy as those that address more explanations in less detail.</p>

1 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	<p><b>AO1:</b> Outline of one or more explanation of forgetting in LTM.</p>		<p><b>AO2:</b> Commentary on these explanations.</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one or more explanations of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides an accurate outline of trace decay and repression.</p>	<p><b>12-10</b></p>	<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 the 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>
<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of one or more explanations of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies two explanations, but provides only a brief outline of them.</p>	<p><b>9-7</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of one or more explanations of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, two explanations are identified but are not elaborated. Or the elaboration of one or both of the explanations is muddled.</p>	<p><b>6-4</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<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 one or more explanations of forgetting in LTM. For example, one or more explanations are named, but no outline is given, or the outline is incorrect.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one or more explanations of forgetting.</p>	<p><b>3-0</b></p>	<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>



**2 (a) (i)** What is meant by the term *repression*?

(3 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Repression is a form of motivated forgetting without conscious awareness. It is the term used to explain the process by which certain memories become inaccessible and very difficult or impossible to retrieve. These memories are pushed out of consciousness into the unconscious. This is an unconscious process which keeps anxiety-provoking or distressing memories from conscious awareness, hence protecting the ego. Candidates might include examples such as the laboratory experiment by Levinger and Clark (1961) using emotional or neutral words, or Williams (1992) who interviewed women who had been treated for sexual abuse as children, although this is not essential for 3 marks.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of the term repression that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, a description of repression is given which clearly states that it is an unconscious process that may protect the ego from anxiety.</p>
	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate explanation of what is meant by the term repression that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, repression is described as when a memory cannot be retrieved because it has been placed in the unconscious.</p>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of what is meant by the term repression that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example repression is described as when someone forgets something because it is upsetting.</p>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline which fails to demonstrate any knowledge of repression.</p>

**2 (a) (ii)** What is meant by the term *flashbulb memory*?

(3 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Flashbulb memories are vivid and detailed memories that are associated with hearing about, or otherwise experiencing, significant, emotionally charged events. This may include the memory for the event itself and/or the recollection of what the individual was doing at the time. For example, older people can usually recall what they were doing when they heard of President Kennedy's assassination in 1963. A more recent example would be memories associated with hearing the news of the events of September 11th. Candidates may refer to research findings such as Margaret Thatcher's resignation studied by Conway (1994), although specific examples are not essential for 3 marks.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of flashbulb memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate states that flashbulb memories are clear and detailed memories associated with an emotionally charged event, and mentions an example.</p>
	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate explanation of flashbulb memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, flashbulb memories are described as being a vivid memory of an emotional event such as the death of Princess Diana.</p>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of flashbulb memory that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example the candidate states that a flashbulb memory is an exceptionally clear and vivid memory.</p>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of flashbulb memory.</p>

2 (b) Outline the procedures and findings of **one** study into the nature of short-term memory.

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>The most likely study is Peterson and Peterson (1959) as this is given as an eg in the specification. However, any study into the nature of STM is credit-worthy</p> <p>Peterson and Peterson (1959) investigated the duration of STM. They used what has come to be known as the Brown-Peterson technique to demonstrate that information declines very rapidly if rehearsal is prevented.</p> <p>Although Miller did not report directly on any experimental work into the capacity of STM, based on his idea of the “magic number 7 +/- 2”, derivative work would be allowable. Studies of chunking in STM, eg Simon (1974) would also be relevant.</p> <p>Studies into acoustic encoding could include Conrad (1964) and Baddeley (1966).</p> <p>The answer does not have to be equally balanced in terms of both procedures and findings. Answers that describe procedures in detail, but findings in less detail are as acceptable as those which are more balanced. However, if only procedures or findings are offered, then this is partial performance and can attract a maximum of 4 marks.</p> <p>If more than one study is offered, credit the best.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures and findings of one study into the nature of short-term memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate refers to trigram recall after different intervals and the counting backwards task, as well as the decline in performance over time.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures and findings of one study into the nature of short-term memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate correctly identifies an appropriate study, but provides only a brief account of the procedures and findings. If only procedures or findings are described, they are accurate and reasonably detailed. (Max 4 marks)</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and/or findings of one study into the nature of short-term memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the account of the procedures and/or findings of an appropriate study is muddled.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> 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 into the nature of short-term memory. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the procedures and findings the of one study into the nature of short-term memory.</p>

**2 (c)** “Psychologists have suggested that the accuracy of eyewitness testimony can be affected by the way questions are asked.”  
 Discuss research into the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony. (18 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	
<p><b>AO1</b> Description of research into leading questions.  <b>AO2</b> Evaluation of research into leading questions.</p> <p>Leading questions are phrased in such a way that witnesses are prompted to give a particular answer. The study by Loftus and Palmer (1974) (the smashed/bumped study) showed that the way a question is presented can affect the way in which participants remember an incident. Other research by Loftus may also be quoted and will attract credit as long as it relates specifically to leading questions and not just to eyewitness testimony (EWT) in general. For example, work which investigates situations in which witnesses may resist leading questions (eg the Loftus 1979 red/brown wallet study) is relevant. Work by researchers other than Loftus is also acceptable, such as that of Yuille and Cutshall (1986). The research must be specifically related to leading questions, so for example, research into weapon focus would not be creditworthy.                      An accurate and reasonably detailed description of one study into leading questions can potentially attract full AO1 marks.</p>	<p>In evaluation of research into leading questions, candidates should be credited for the quality of their commentary. Eg where candidates have effectively contrasted the situations in which leading questions are influential and those where they are not. They are likely to focus on the validity of the studies cited in relation to real life. Ethics may also be cited, as may sampling bias. Candidates may also suggest that many of these studies focus on memory for peripheral details. They may also note that Loftus’s studies were well controlled. The potential applications of such research, in relation to police procedures (eg Geiselman et al 1985 and the cognitive interview) may also be used as effective evaluation. Research into schemas may be relevant as long as it is linked to leading questions. Candidates who repeat the same basic criticisms for more than one study, are likely to be restricted to basic commentary.</p>

2 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Description of research into the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony.</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into the role of leading questions that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the theoretical basis behind leading questions may be described, and/or the procedures/findings/conclusions of a study or studies into leading questions may be accurately described.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of research into the role of leading questions in eyewitness testimony.</p> <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 the 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>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into the role of leading questions that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the procedures/ findings/ conclusions of one or more studies into leading questions may be described accurately but in less detail.</p>	9-7	<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>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of research into leading questions that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a basic outline of the findings of one study into leading questions is provided.</p>	6-4	<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>
1-0	<p><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 research into leading questions. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research into leading questions. For example, the candidate has described research into an unrelated topic or the description is incorrect.</p>	3-0	<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>

**SECTION B: DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**3** (a) Briefly outline **two** explanations of attachment (eg learning theory, Bowlby's theory).

(3 marks +3 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions for each explanation</b>
<p>The examples given in the question are only examples and other explanations of attachment are equally acceptable, such as Freud's theory or social learning theory of attachment. However, a general description of a theory is not creditworthy unless explicitly linked to attachment. Work on caregiver sensitivity may also be used as long as the focus of the answer is on an explanation of attachment. Candidates may legitimately present cupboard love as one explanation of attachment. Learning theories of attachment focus on the processes of classical and operant conditioning in attachment. Bowlby's theory of attachment focuses on attachment being an innate and adaptive process, and the role of social releasers is emphasised. A description of the stages of attachment (eg Schaffer) is not credit-worthy.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one explanation of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the outline of Bowlby's explanation makes reference to survival value, monotropy and a critical period.</p>
	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed, but generally accurate outline of one explanation of attachment. For example, the candidate refers to attachment as behaviour which has evolved because it is adaptive.</p>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of one explanation of attachment that demonstrates some knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example the candidate simply states that attachment is learned through classical and/or operant conditioning.</p>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation which fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding.</p>

**3 (b)** Describe stages in the formation of attachments (eg Schaffer).

(6 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Schaffer is given as an example in the question, but other researchers' work on stages in the development of attachments is equally relevant.</p> <p>Schaffer identified four stages in the development of attachments – the asocial stage (0 – 6 weeks), indiscriminate attachments (6 weeks – 7 months), specific attachment (7 – 11 months) and multiple attachments (9 months+).</p> <p>Bowlby identified four stages – pre-attachments (0 – 2 months), attachment in the making (2 – 6 months), specific attachment (around 6 months) and goal-corrected partnership (2 years onwards).</p> <p>In both cases, the exact ages are less important than the sequence of development.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to refer to key features of the stages such as separation protest and stranger anxiety.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of stages in the formation of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of Schaffer's stages, including the ages and key features of each stage.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate provides a less detailed account of the key features of each stage, without mentioning ages.</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of stages in the formation of attachments that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding 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>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><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 stages in the formation of attachments. For example, a very brief mention of specific attachments is made. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of stages in the formation of attachments.</p>

**3 (c)** “Research has shown that there are both positive and negative outcomes of day care.” (18 marks)

Outline and evaluate research into the effects of day care on children’s cognitive **and/or** social development.

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	
<p>AO1 for this question is an outline of research into the effects of day care on children’s cognitive and/or social development.</p> <p>AO2 is evaluation of this research. This includes implications and conclusions about the circumstances in which day care has beneficial, or detrimental effects.</p> <p>There are a variety of studies that could be used as a basis for an answer to this question. However, as the question asks for research, more theoretical work, eg relating to attachment, could be made relevant.</p> <p>The findings of some studies (eg Belsky, 1986, 1990) suggest that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their development.</p> <p>Other studies (eg Andersson 1992) conclude that so long as day care is of a high quality, it is not bad for children and can make a positive contribution to their later cognitive and social development.</p>	<p>For social development the NICHD study found children who attend day care are often more self-sufficient and more independent of parents, have better relationships with peers and are more knowledgeable about the world and social relationships.</p> <p>In an attempt to resolve these differences answers may refer to a number of factors such as quality of care provided at home or in day care or length of time spent in day care. Methodological difficulties, such as measuring social development, would also be relevant.</p> <p>Research studies using animals to investigate the effects of enriched environments could be made relevant.</p> <p>Studies focusing on the effects of institutional care are not relevant and should not be credited.</p> <p>The question asks for the effects on cognitive and/or social development. Answers which focus on just social or cognitive effects are just as acceptable as those which do both.</p>



3 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	<p><b>AO1:</b> Description of research relating to the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development.</p>		<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of relevant research.</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research relating to the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the findings and/or conclusions of a study into the effects of day care are described accurately and in reasonable detail, or a number of studies in less detail</p>	<p><b>12-10</b></p>	<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 the 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>
<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research relating to the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the findings and/or conclusions of a study into the effects of day care are described accurately, but in less detail.</p>	<p><b>9-7</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of research into the effects of day care that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, one or more research studies/theories are identifiable, but the findings may be slightly muddled.</p>	<p><b>6-4</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><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 effects of day care. For example, a very brief mention of possible effects is made. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the effects of day care.</p>	<p><b>3-0</b></p>	<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>

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

For the findings:

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>The most likely study to be described is Hodges and Tizard, as this is mentioned in the specification. Other studies such as Rutter are also acceptable. Case studies of extreme privation, such as Genie, may be selected. These are acceptable, but candidates must focus on procedures and/or findings rather than memorable details of the cases, such as being strapped to a potty chair. However, descriptions of the testing carried out on Genie, or her disabilities might be credit worthy.</p> <p>If it is clear that the effects of separation were being studied, eg Robertson and Robertson, then this is not acceptable.</p> <p>Answers need not be confined to human research, so Harlow's studies are acceptable if procedures and findings relate to privation.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures and findings of one study into the effects of privation that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed account of both procedures and findings of Hodges and Tizard's study.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures and findings of one study into the effects of privation that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate correctly identifies an appropriate study, but provides only a brief account of the procedures and findings. Only procedures or findings are described, but they are accurate and reasonably detailed. (Max 4 marks)</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and findings of one study into the effects of privation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the account of the procedures and findings of Hodges and Tizard's study are muddled.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge of the procedures and findings of one study into the effects of privation For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the procedures and findings of one study into the effects of privation.</p>

4 (b) Outline 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 the mother and infant within the first few years of the child's life (the 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. Candidates may also refer to failure to form an attachment. Bowlby claimed that maternal deprivation had some or all of the following consequences : aggression, depression, delinquency, affectionless psychopathy, dwarfism,intellectual retardation and social maladjustment.</p> <p>Candidates may give an outline of Bowlby's theory of attachment. This is creditworthy only if it provides further detail of the MDH. Criticisms of the MDH are not required.</p> <p>If candidates give details of the 44 juvenile thieves study, this can be credited to the extent to which it provides further details of the MDH.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> 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>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> 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, according to Bowlby, are described accurately but in less detail.</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic/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>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><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 MDH. For example, a very brief mention of one or two effects is made. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the MDH.</p>

4 (c) Outline and evaluate research into individual differences in attachment.

(18 marks)

<p><b>Marking Criteria</b></p>	
<p>AO1 credit should be given for a description of research into individual differences in attachment.</p> <p>AO2 credit should be given for analysis and evaluation of relevant research.</p> <p>It is likely that most candidates will focus on Ainsworth's Strange Situation, and other research developed from this.</p> <p>Ainsworth used a structured situation and controlled observation to see how an infant behaves in a number of different situations. Stranger fear, separation anxiety and reunion behaviour were all measured. Three main types of children were identified – securely attached, avoidant-insecure and resistant insecure. An association was found between a mother's behaviour and an infant's attachment type suggesting the mother's behaviour may be important in determining attachment type.</p> <p>Research into cross-cultural variations in attachment is also relevant. Takahashi's study with Japanese infants, and Van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg's meta-analysis are most likely to be cited.</p> <p>Research into individual differences in adult attachment may also be creditworthy.</p>	<p>AO2 might focus on criticisms of the strange situation. This could include criticisms that the unrealistic situation affects the results, or that measured attachment types can be affected by the child's experiences of separation, including day care. Ethical criticisms might also be mentioned, although the episodes were shortened if the infants were distressed, so this should not be over-stated. It would be unreasonable to make generalisations about all infant behaviour on the basis of middle-class American infants and their mothers. Ainsworth's work, therefore, lacks population validity. Van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988) found evidence of considerable consistency across different cultures in terms of attachment. However, seeing independence as a sign of secure attachment may not apply to collectivist cultures.</p>

4 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Outline of research into individual differences in attachment.</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into individual differences in attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a reasonably detailed account of the findings of Ainsworth's Strange Situation and also refers to cross cultural research.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of research into individual differences in attachment.</p> <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 the 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>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into individual differences in attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate provides a less detailed account of the findings of the strange situation, with only a brief reference to cross-cultural research.</p>	9-7	<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>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of research into individual differences in attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a brief account of secure and insecure attachments is given.</p>	6-4	<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>
1-0	<p><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 individual differences in attachment. For example, a very brief mention of the Strange Situation is made. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of individual differences in attachments.</p>	3-0	<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)			
	(b)			
	(c)			
<b>Total for Q.1</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
2	(a)			
	(b)			
	(c)			
<b>Total for Q.2</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
3	(a)			
	(b)			
	(c)			
<b>Total for Q.3</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
4	(a)			
	(b)			
	(c)			
<b>Total for Q.4</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
QoWC				
<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	