



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2003

---

## GCE

### Psychology A

### Unit PYA

---

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

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334  
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ  
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

## Unit 1: Cognitive and Developmental Psychology

### Quality of Written Communication (QoWC)

<b>2 marks</b>	The work is characterised by the <b>accurate</b> and <b>clear</b> expression of ideas, a <b>broad range</b> of specialist terms and only <b>minor errors</b> in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1 mark</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>reasonable</b> expression of ideas, the use of a <b>reasonable range</b> of specialist terms and <b>few errors</b> of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0 marks</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>poor</b> expression of ideas, <b>limited use</b> of specialist terms and <b>poor</b> grammar, punctuation and spelling.

### Assessment Objectives One and Two

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

**Section A: Cognitive Psychology**

1

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

<b>(a)</b>	<b>(i)</b>	<b>Explain what is mean by the term repression.</b>	<b>(3 marks)</b>
	<b>(ii)</b>	<b>Explain what is meant by the term reconstructive memory.</b>	<b>(3 marks)</b>

**Marking criteria**

Freud emphasised the emotional basis of forgetting through the concept of **repression**. He suggested that forgetting is a motivated process rather than a failure of learning or retrieval. Repression is a defence mechanism through which threatening material (e.g. memories likely to induce guilt, embarrassment or shame) can be kept from consciousness - sometimes referred to as motivated forgetting.

**Reconstructive memory** has a technical meaning, usually associated with Bartlett's research. He referred to the extent to which memory is distorted or otherwise 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 (or schema) to form a reconstructed memory.

**Marking allocations**

For each term:

<b>3 marks</b>	Explanation of the terms repression or reconstructive memory is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> (e.g. as in the marking criteria above).
<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation of the terms repression or reconstructive memory is <b>limited</b> . It is generally <b>accurate and/or less detailed</b> . (e.g. repression is attributed to Freud as a defence mechanism without further elaboration).
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation of the terms repression or reconstructive memory is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . (e.g. 'reconstructive memories are inaccurate representations of an event').
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation of the term is <b>inappropriate</b> or is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Outline two explanations of forgetting in short-term memory.	(3 marks + 3 marks)
--	---------------------

### Marking criteria

Decay theory and displacement are referred to in the specification so either of these could figure in answers. Decay suggests that memory fades with time, possibly because of structural changes in the brain (Hebb). Displacement theory suggests that items stored in STM are *replaced* by more recent information. This is not the same as interference, which is normally regarded as an explanation of forgetting in LTM. However the textbooks are not consistent on this and candidate who offer interference can receive credit provided they explain it appropriately within the STM context.

For example, in the Brown-Peterson paradigm, forgetting of later trigrams may be forgotten because of interference from earlier ones (pro-active interference).

### Marking allocations

For the each explanation:

<b>3 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in STM is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . (e.g. trace decay is explained with an appropriate example).
<b>2 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in STM is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . (e.g. ‘displacement is where new material interferes with old material because of limited capacity’).
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in STM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> (for example, the mechanism is correctly named but only very briefly explained: ‘decay with time’).
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of explanation of forgetting in STM is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the explanation may be of forgetting in LTM or about some other aspect of memory research) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) “In their working memory (WM) model, Baddeley & Hitch’s rejected the multi-store model’s view of short-term memory (STM) as a unitary store.”

Outline and evaluate the working memory model.

(18 marks)

### Marking criteria

In this question **AO1** will be an outline of the working memory (WM) model. Candidates may be aware that, according to Baddeley’s original WM model, working memory is a three-part system that temporarily holds and manipulates information as we perform cognitive tasks (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974). They may go on to describe the three components of the working memory: phonological loop, visuospatial sketch pad and the central executive that integrates information from the previous two systems as well as from LTM.

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

Candidates may introduce alternative models of memory as a form of commentary/evaluation as indicated above. However, the degree to which candidates use this material as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply *describing* alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for AO2. Candidates who offer no commentary may still be judged to have selected appropriate material and thus commentary can be described as ‘just discernible’.

### Marking allocations

#### AO1: Outline of the WM model

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

#### AO2: Evaluation of the WM model

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

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Explain, using an example of each, what is meant by the terms encoding, capacity and duration in relation to memory. (2 marks + 2 marks + 2 marks)

### Marking criteria

Encoding refers to the form in which information is stored in memory (e.g. acoustic in STM or semantic in LTM). Capacity is the amount of material that can be stored or worked on in memory (e.g.  $7\pm 2$  chunks or unlimited in LTM), while duration is the time that material can be retained in memory (e.g. less than 30 seconds in STM, potentially a lifetime in LTM).

### Marking allocations

For each term:

<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may explain that encoding involves transformation of material and give an appropriate example: 'Capacity is how much it can hold, i.e. in STM $7\pm 2$ .'
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation is <b>basic</b> , <b>lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . (E.g. stating 'there are two types of coding: acoustic and semantic' or 'LTM holds more than STM.' or 'The capacity of STM is $7\pm 2$ items'.)
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may offer an explanation that has no basis in theory or research) or the outline description is <b>incorrect</b> .

<b>(b) Outline findings of Loftus’s research into eye-witness testimony.</b>	<b>(6 marks)</b>
--	------------------

**Marking criteria**

Loftus’s research shows that memory is not simply a ‘tape-recording’ of past events. According to Loftus, one way of adding information after the event is by the questions asked by interviewers.

A leading question is one that is phrased in such a way that it suggests a particular answer to the witness. In an extensive series of investigations, Loftus and her colleagues showed how quite subtle changes of wording during questioning may distort recall (Loftus & Palmer, 1974 and Loftus & Zani, 1975). The findings of such studies would constitute an appropriate answer to this question.

In questions such as these it is normally necessary to cover more than one study, however some of Loftus’s studies involve a number of different experimental interventions within the same study and so could count as a reasonable range of findings.

The research findings must be attributable to Loftus. As this is an AO1 question, evaluation of the research is not required.

**Marking allocations**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of Loftus’s research into eye-witness memory is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> along the lines suggested in the marking criteria.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of Loftus’s research into eye-witness memory is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, only one finding is referred to and in limited detail.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of Loftus’s research into eye-witness memory is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, only one basic finding is mentioned (‘leading questions affect the accuracy of memories’).
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example Bartlett’s findings are described) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) “Emotional factors can enhance recall in some circumstances but make memories less likely to be retrieved in other circumstances.”

Consider what psychological research (theories and/or studies) has told us about role of emotional factors in forgetting. (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

**AO1** for this question would be an account of research into emotional factors (such as how repression affects memory), but could also include an account of the mechanism itself (i.e. what is repression). The quotation implies that emotional factors can affect retrieval in two different ways, but candidates need not cover both aspects. For example, they may just consider the nature of flashbulb memories (FMs). These are memories that occur in connection with highly emotional or otherwise significant events. Although similar to other memories in many respects one significant difference is the amount of detail that they hold. Most people believe that it is the highly charged emotional content of the memories that gives them their vivid and seemingly accurate character. Brown & Kulik (1977) suggested that FMs are the result of a special memory mechanism triggered by emotionally charged events.

Commentary on the research (**AO2**) could be along the lines of pointing out that the evidence does not suggest that emotion and memory recall are linked in any significant way. While there is a slight advantage for emotionally charged memories (in particular pleasant ones) over one or two years, after two years the effect disappears. Appropriate commentary could also involve a criticism of the research studies themselves (e.g. difficulties in assessing what was learned in the first place).

Freud emphasised the emotional basis of forgetting and through the concept of repression suggests a means by which threatening material can be kept from consciousness - motivated forgetting. This account of forgetting is highly controversial. For ethical and other reasons testing the concept of repression in the laboratory has proved difficult, but there has been no shortage of claims from clinical studies for the existence of recovered memories. However, an obvious problem with establishing the accuracy of repressed memories is that there is almost always no concrete evidence to support the claims. Sometimes evidence is discovered, for example there may be photographs or videos or it might be possible that close relatives may confirm memories not related to abuse. But there is also evidence that memories of past traumatic events can be highly inaccurate.

Research into PTSD could also be made relevant to this question (i.e. amnesia resulting from a traumatic experience).

### Marking allocations

AO1: Description of research into emotional factors in forgetting

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of research into emotional factors in forgetting is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> .
<b>3-4 marks</b>	Description of research into emotional factors in forgetting is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> .
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of research into emotional factors in forgetting is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> (e.g. only one research study is identifiable).
<b>0 marks</b>	Description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may explain an unrelated topic) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



## AO2: Evaluation/assessment of research into emotional factors in forgetting

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

**Section B: Developmental Psychology**

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

**(a) Describe the findings and conclusions of one study of cross-cultural variations in attachments. (6 marks)**

**Marking criteria**

Most of the relevant studies that could be used in an answer to this question have used the strange situation methodology, but just describing Ainsworth's findings on individual differences would not be appropriate. Meta-analyses such as Van Ijzendoorn & Kroonenberg (1988) can count as one study. This surveyed 32 studies that had used the strange situation methodology and which had been conducted around the world and found that there was quite marked variation between studies in the same cultures.

Candidates may take different views on what is meant by a cross-cultural study and this must be allowed for in marking. For example, it could be argued that a study is only cross-cultural when it explicitly compares two or more cultures (e.g. the Van Ijzendoorn meta-analysis). However such studies are rare in the area of attachment. So a less restrictive definition of cross-cultural where another (usually non-western) culture is studied (e.g. Ainsworth's Ganda project) is allowable.

Another, and entirely acceptable, approach would be to describe the findings of research into the effect of cross-cultural variations in child-rearing styles on attachment. For example Tronik (1992) and his colleagues studies communal patterns of child-rearing in Zaire within a pygmy culture called the Efe. Sagi *et al.* (1994) have also demonstrated sub-cultural differences between home-reared children and kibbutzim-raised children in Israel.

Harlow's studies on monkeys and studies of imprinting would not be appropriate as the term cross-cultural can not be used in connection with non-human animals.

**Marking allocations**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of the findings <i>and</i> conclusions of a cross cultural study that has investigated attachments is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has covered both findings <i>and</i> conclusions of a clearly identifiable cross cultural study.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of the findings <i>and</i> conclusions of a cross cultural study that has investigated attachments is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example, a reasonable account of findings is offered but only a very brief account of conclusions. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> findings <i>or</i> conclusions of the study is accurate and detailed (i.e. partial performance).
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of the findings <i>and</i> conclusions of a cross cultural study that has investigated attachments is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . Description of <i>either</i> the findings <i>or</i> conclusions of the study is generally accurate and/or less detailed (i.e. partial performance)
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described the procedures of a study) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**(b) Give two criticisms of research into cross-cultural variations in attachments. (3 + 3 marks)**

### Marking criteria

One approach to this question would be to give two criticisms of the study described in (a). Criticisms will naturally depend on the study offered but could include methodological issues (including lack of controls and ethical issues) as well as the legitimacy of any conclusions drawn from the study (for example if the findings have not been replicated).

More general criticisms that relate to all studies based on the strange situation the following points could be that:

- The strange situation may not be an appropriate measure of attachment in all cultures. For example, Japanese children may be more affected by separation as they are rarely separated from their mothers in the first year of life.
- The meaning of ‘secure’ or ‘avoidant’ behaviour may not be the same in different cultures. Gross *et al.* (1995) suggested that in Germany insecure/avoidant behaviour reflects the effects of specific encouragement towards independence in the child, not indifference by mothers.

Candidates might also consider positive criticisms such as the application of research.

### Marking allocations

For each criticism:

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

**(c) Outline and evaluate Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis.**

**(18 marks)**

### Marking criteria

**AO1** in this question would be an account of the MD hypothesis. Bowlby believed that the maternal care was as necessary for the emotional development of children as vitamins were to physical development. He suggested that there was a critical period for attachment formation and that if a separation occurs between mother and infant within the first few years of the child's life, the bond would be irreversibly broken, leading to severe emotional consequences for the infant in later life.

He referred to this as maternal deprivation. It has been claimed that maternal deprivation has some or all of the following consequences: aggressiveness, depression, delinquency, dependency anxiety, dwarfism, affectionless psychopathy, intellectual retardation and social maladjustment.

**AO2** involves evaluation of the MD hypothesis, for example using appropriate research studies. There are many studies of the effects of deprivation and their implications for maternal deprivation theory. These studies include: Goldfarb, Spitz & Wolf, and by Bowlby himself. However, these early studies have been extensively criticised in terms of their findings, methods and sometimes lack of basic controls. Animal studies by the ethologists and by the Harlows appeared to lend weight to Bowlby's theories.

While Bowlby saw that separation experiences in infancy and early childhood were the cause of affectionless psychopathy and delinquency, Rutter has argued that these are more likely to result from privation – *failure* to establish an attachment.

Bowlby may not just have been unclear about the effects of deprivation on personality and social development. His suggestion that intellectual retardation could result from maternal deprivation has also been questioned. Early studies of institutionalisation failed to separate this factor from the generally unstimulating environment provided by orphanages. As Skeels & Dye's study subsequently showed, it is the amount of intellectual stimulation that is the crucial variable in cognitive development.

### Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis

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

## AO2: Evaluation of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis

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

(a) Outline conclusions of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive development. (6 marks)

### Marking criteria

The answer must address the conclusions of research into cognitive (i.e. intellectual/linguistic) development and not social development (i.e. relations with family/peers/etc). It is recognised that conclusions are sometimes difficult to distinguish from findings and allowance should be made for this in marking. (Detailed scores or percentages would clearly be findings and not creditable but saying that the researchers found - or concluded - that there was no difference in scores between two groups could count as a conclusion.) There are a variety of studies that could be used as a basis for an answer to this question. The findings of some studies (e.g. Belsky, 1986, 1990) suggest the conclusion that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their development. However, others (e.g. Andersson, 1992) conclude that so long as day care is of high quality, it is not bad for children and can even make a positive contribution to their later intellectual development. Some candidates may summarise Bowlby's research and this could be relevant so long as it is confined to cognitive effects of day care. Extreme cases of privation (e.g. Genie) will not be relevant since these are clearly not investigations into day care.

There is a necessary trade off between breadth and depth in this question and one basic conclusion, well elaborated would be sufficient.

### Marking allocations

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of conclusions of research into the effects of day care on childrens cognitive development is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> along the lines suggested in the marking criteria.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of conclusions of research into the effects of day care on childrens cognitive development is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, a limited range of findings are presented and not sufficiently elaborated.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of conclusions of research into the effects of day care on childrens cognitive development is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, only one effect is mentioned.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example not related to Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**(b) Describe the procedures of one study in which the effects of privation have been investigated and give one criticism of this study. (3 + 3 marks)**

### Marking criteria

Research focused on privation includes that of Rutter (1970) and Tizard & Hodges (1989) and describing the procedures of such studies would be an appropriate answer to the question. Studies of extreme privation are also acceptable (e.g. Genie) but the candidate must describe procedures not the outcome of the cases. There are also many studies of the effects of deprivation (many of these are concerned with maternal deprivation) which were undertaken when the distinction between privation and deprivation was not clearly made. If the candidate describes one of these it should be judged on its merits. Thus if what is being studied is actually privation (for example lack of a caregiver) then this can be credited but not if the effects of separation are being investigated (e.g. Robertson & Robertson). As is normal practice, if more than one study is offered then the best one should be credited. The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow's studies are acceptable.

The study and criticisms must be linked.

### Marking allocations

For the procedures:

<b>3 marks</b>	Description of the procedures of study of privation is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has covered procedures of a clearly identifiable study of long-term effects of privation.
<b>2 marks</b>	Description of the procedures of a study of privation is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example it may not be clear how effects were assessed in the study.
<b>1 marks</b>	Description of the procedures of study of privation is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, the study may be difficult to identify from the very brief account of procedure given.
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> or <b>incorrect</b> .

For the criticism:

<b>3 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of study of a study of privation is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one criticism of the study.
<b>2 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of a study of privation is generally <b>accurate and/or less detailed</b> .
<b>1 mark</b>	Statement of criticism of a study of privation is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> (e.g. stating that the study lacks ecological validity without further explanation).
<b>0 marks</b>	Answer is <b>inappropriate</b> , i.e. not directed at the study for which the procedures have been described, or the criticism, if directed at an appropriate study is <b>incorrect</b> .

**(c) Outline and evaluate psychological research (theories and/or studies) into individual differences in attachments. (18 marks)**

**Marking criteria**

**AO1** will be a description of research (theories and/or studies) on individual differences in attachment. For example, the development of attachment has been measured experimentally by Ainsworth, who observed babies' reactions to being separated from their mothers and placed in a 'strange situation'. It seems that during the first three months of life, babies respond in a similar way to everyone. They are unattached and show no fear of strangers. At around four months they begin to stare at unfamiliar people, suggesting a recognition of the unusual. By six or eight months infants will show fear when a stranger approaches, and will become distressed when separated from their primary care-giver. Stranger fear and separation distress are measures of attachment. But Ainsworth also found quite marked differences in the behaviour of infants, depending on whether their attachments were weak or strong, secure or insecure.

For commentary (**AO2**) candidates might point out that the basic findings of the Ainsworth et al's study have been confirmed by numerous studies. Infants do seem to fall into one of these categories (although there is also evidence for a fourth type: insecure-disorganised/disorientated) and the patterns remain constant (at least up to five years). However there have been some criticisms of the study. Because it is generally carried out in the lab, it can be criticised as lacking ecological validity. The laboratory situation could induce a degree of stress in the infant that it would not normally experience at home.

Candidates may also consider theoretical issues relating to individual differences in attachment. For example, interpreting the findings from the Strange Situation has proved less easy than establishing that there are differences in attachment behaviour. There are two opposing viewpoints: the care-giving hypothesis (Ainsworth) and Kagan's temperament hypothesis.

Although most candidates will focus on attachments of infants, discussion of other types of attachments (e.g. parent's) is conceivable.

**Marking allocations**

AO1: Description of research into individual differences in attachments

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of research into individual differences in attachments is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> .
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of research into individual differences in attachments is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> .
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of research into individual differences in attachments is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . (E.g. only one study is referred to with little elaboration.)
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research which was not directly addressing individual differences in attachments) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



AO2: evaluation/assessment of research into individual differences in attachments

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

**Assessment grid**

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>Total</b>
1 (a)	6		<b>6</b>
(b)	6		<b>6</b>
(c)	6	12	<b>18</b>
<b>Total for Q1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
2 (a)	6		<b>6</b>
(b)	6		<b>6</b>
(c)	6	12	<b>18</b>
<b>Total for Q2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
3 (a)	6		<b>6</b>
(b)	6		<b>6</b>
(c)	6	12	<b>18</b>
<b>Total for Q3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
4 (a)	6		<b>6</b>
(b)	6		<b>6</b>
(c)	6	12	<b>18</b>
<b>Total for Q4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>
QoWC	2		<b>2</b>
<b>Total for unit</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>64</b>
% weighting AS	20.4	12.9	
% weighting A2	10.2	6.5	