



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

---

# Mark scheme January 2004

## GCE

### Psychology A

### Unit PYA1

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**UNIT 1****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 <i>understanding</i> of psychological theories, terminology, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.
<b>AO2</b>	Assessment objective two = analysis and <i>evaluation</i> of psychological theories, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.

**SECTION A - COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY****1****Total for this question: 30 marks**

- (a) In relation to short-term memory (STM), what is meant by the terms encoding, capacity and duration? (2 marks + 2 marks + 2 marks)

**Marking Criteria**

Encoding refers to the means by which a sensory input is transformed into a representation that can be placed in STM. Capacity refers to the amount of information that can be held at any one time in the STM, and duration to the length of time that such information can be stored in STM. Credit should be given when candidates identify the type of code (e.g. acoustic), capacity limit (i.e.  $7 \pm 2$  chunks) and duration (i.e. less than 30 seconds). The explanation must be appropriate to STM to obtain marks. Some candidates may explain the differences between STM & LTM, but this is acceptable as long as the characteristics of encoding, capacity and duration in relation to STM are identifiable.

**Marking allocations**

For each term:

2 marks	Explanation of term is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the candidate might state that the capacity is the amount of information that can be stored and this is limited to a small number of items ( $7 \pm 2$ ).
1 mark	Explanation of term is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate simply states that the capacity of STM is small <i>or</i> state that capacity is how much can be stored.
0 marks	Explanation of term is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may describe a research study rather than defining the term) or the explanation is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Describe the procedures and findings of <b>one</b> study of reconstructive memory. (6 marks)
--

**Marking criteria**

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). 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.

Most candidates will probably choose Bartlett's investigation of reconstructive memory. Using the method of serial reproduction to test recall, Bartlett's findings included that reproduction became shorter, more coherent and more conventional. His participants assimilated the stories to their cultural backgrounds, leaving out peculiar or individual meanings. He found evidence that they had reconstructed the story using schemas. This tendency increased with more reproductions of the story. However, a wide range of other studies are potentially appropriate to this question, including those of Allport & Postman and Elizabeth Loftus and her colleagues, providing the reconstructive element of the study is made clear.

**Marking allocations**

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

(c) Outline and evaluate **two or more** explanations of forgetting in long-term memory. (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question, **AO1** is an outline of explanations of forgetting in LTM, while **AO2** is an evaluation of these explanations.

So-called availability explanations (decay and interference) suggest that forgetting occurs because memories are lost or replaced in some way. However, other explanations of forgetting in LTM emphasise lack of accessibility rather than loss. Examples of these are retrieval failure (which may be cue or state dependent) and motivated forgetting. Gestalt explanations are also relevant along with various causes of amnesia. In relation to **AO2**, candidates are likely to assess the value of the explanations by looking at research studies and possibly criticising the methodology of studies. They might also consider usefulness (i.e. applications). Explanations could also be contrasted with each other and comparisons made between them.

The two explanations need not be discussed to the same depth. However, because two or more explanations are required, a candidate who considers only one explanation can receive a maximum mark of  $4 + 8 = 12$  (see marking allocations). Discussing more than two explanations will inevitably mean that less depth is possible. However, this can achieve a top band mark providing there is evidence that the answer is reasonably thorough and effective.

### Marking allocations

AO1: Description of two or more explanations of forgetting

6-5 marks	Description of two explanations of forgetting is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example the candidate might, during the course of the essay, give an accurate account of decay and interference explanations including detail such as reference to mechanisms of decay and different types of interference.
3-4 marks	Description of two explanations of forgetting is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example there may be an account of decay theory but the idea of disuse is not clearly elucidated. <i>If only one explanation is described (i.e. partial performance) this is accurate and well-detailed</i>
2-1 marks	Description of two explanations of forgetting is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate does little more than identify two explanations. <i>If only one explanation is described (i.e. partial performance) this is limited, generally accurate and/or less-detailed</i>
0 marks	Description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may explain an unrelated topic such as forgetting in STM) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

AO2: Evaluation/assessment of two or more explanations of forgetting

12-11 marks	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on two explanations of 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.
10-9 marks	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on two explanations of forgetting and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner
8-7 marks	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on two explanations of forgetting but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. <i>If only one explanation is evaluated (i.e. partial performance) this is informed and reasonably thorough. Material has been used in an effective manner.</i>
6-5 marks	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> of two explanations of forgetting with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. <i>Partial performance is reasonable but slightly limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner.</i>
4-3 marks	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on the explanations of forgetting and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used. <i>Partial performance is basic with limited analysis. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner.</i>
2-1 marks	Commentary on explanations of forgetting is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). <b>Analysis is weak and muddled.</b> The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses. <i>Partial performance is superficial and rudimentary. There is minimal interpretation.</i>
0 marks	Commentary is absent or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

2

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) (i) Explain what is meant by the term repression.	(3 marks)
(ii) Explain what is meant by the term flashbulb memory.	(3 marks)

**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.

Flashbulb memories are vivid and detailed memories that are associated with hearing about or otherwise experiencing significant, emotionally charged events. 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 death of Princess Diana. Even more recent would be the World Trade Centre.

**Marking criteria**

For each term:

3 marks	Explanation of the terms repression or flashbulb memory is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example the candidate explains how, according to Freud, repression is a defence mechanism that can result in events that cause anxiety being kept from consciousness.
2 marks	Explanation of the terms repression or flashbulb memory is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example the candidate states that Freud said that repression is a defence mechanism to deal with stress.
1 mark	Explanation of the terms repression or flashbulb memory is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> (e.g. 'flashbulb memories are a vivid representation of an emotional event').
0 marks	Explanation of the term is <b>inappropriate</b> or is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Outline findings of Loftus’s research into eye-witness testimony.

(6 marks)

### 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 & Zanni, 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.

An acceptable answer could focus on an overview of Loftus’s findings or deal with one or two research studies.

As this is an **AO1** question, evaluation of the research is not required.

### Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Outline of Loftus’s findings (one or more studies) into EWT is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the findings of a number of studies are summarised accurately. Alternatively, findings of one study are described in detail.
4-3 marks	Description of Loftus’s findings into EWT is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example findings of a one or two Loftus’s studies are described but in less detail.
2-1 marks	Description of Loftus’s findings into EWT is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> For example, only a rudimentary outline of findings of one research study is given.
0 marks	Explanation is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may explain Bartlett’s research findings or Loftus’s procedures) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



(c) “The multi-store model of Atkinson & Shiffrin has been criticised in a number of ways, both positive and negative.”

Give a brief account of the multi-store model of memory and consider its strengths and weaknesses. (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** will be an account of the multi-store model (MSM). This should include a brief account of the main stores and some indication of how they are related. A labelled diagram could usefully supplement such an account.

**AO2** will be a consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the MSM. Candidates can focus on specific empirical criticisms of the MSM or adopt a more discursive approach by a reference to alternative conceptualisations (or even combine the two approaches). Thus, there are a number of research studies that support the multistore model, especially those into the primacy and recency effects (free-recall) as well as clinical studies of amnesic individuals. General criticisms are that it is too simplistic and doesn't go far enough in breaking down the separate stores (e.g. as in the Working Memory model). From the opposite point of view, the Levels of Processing approach has criticised the rather compartmentalised view of memory that the multi-store model encourages. The LOP approach also challenges the role of rehearsal, in particular that this is the only means of transfer between STM and LTM.

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'.

Commentary should address at least one each of the strengths and weaknesses otherwise there will be partial performance. However the balance between strengths and limitations need not be equal.

**Marking allocations**

## AO1: Outline of multi-store model

6-5 marks	Outline of multi-store model is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . E.g. the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of the main aspects of the model as outlined above.
3-4 marks	Outline of main features of the MSM is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may give an account of the stores but not mention rehearsal.
2-1 marks	Outline of main features of the MSM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> (e.g. only one aspect of the model is identifiable or only a diagram of the model is provided).
0 marks	Outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may explain an unrelated model) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## AO2: Assessment of the multi-store model

12-11 marks	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on the multi-store model 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
10-9 marks	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the multi-store model and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
8-7 marks	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the multi-store model but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. <i>If only one of strengths or weaknesses is given (i.e. partial performance) this is informed and reasonably thorough. Material has been used in an effective manner.</i>
6-5 marks	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on the multi-store model with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. <i>Partial performance is reasonable but slightly limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner.</i>
4-3 marks	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on the multi-store model and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is a <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used. <i>Partial performance is basic with limited analysis. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner.</i>
2-1 marks	Commentary on the multi-store model is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). <b>Analysis is weak and muddled</b> . The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses. <i>Partial performance is superficial and rudimentary. There is minimal interpretation.</i>
0 marks	Commentary is absent or wholly <b>irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

**SECTION B – DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY****3****Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Outline findings of research into cross-cultural variations in attachments. (6 marks)

**Marking criteria**

Most cross-cultural studies of attachments have used a variation of the strange situation methodology, such as Ainsworth's own research in Uganda and Baltimore, US. Candidates may also be familiar with the findings of the Van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988) survey. This meta-analysis found that there was 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. However, they also found that there was quite marked variation between studies in the same cultures. For example, one Japanese study showed similar proportions to that found in the original Ainsworth study (A: 15%; B: 70%; C: 15 %), while two others showed an almost complete absence of Type As but a higher proportion of Type Cs. In fact over all 32 studies, differences within cultures (*intra-cultural*) were 1.5 times as large as differences between different cultures (*inter-cultural*).

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

The question requires that more than one finding is discussed. However, these could result from one study.

**Marking allocations**

6-5 marks	Outline description of findings of research into cross-cultural variations in attachments is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the pattern of differences in attachment types in different cultures are described with reference to appropriate research.
4-3 marks	Outline description of findings of research into cross-cultural variations in attachments is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the findings of only one cross-cultural comparison, such as Ainsworth's Ganda project is provided.
2-1 marks	Outline description of findings into cross-cultural variations in attachments is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> .
0 marks	Outline description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may describe the procedures of the Strange Situation methodology) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Describe **one** effect of day care on children's:

(i) cognitive development;

(3 marks)

(ii) social development.

(3 marks)

### Marking criteria

A wide variety of studies have investigated the effects of day care. The findings of some studies (e.g. Belsky, 1986, 1990) show that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their developments. However, others (e.g. Andersson, 1992) found that so long as day care is of high quality, it is not bad for children and can even make a positive contribution to their later intellectual and social development. As far as social development is concerned, studies have shown that 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.

### Marking allocations

For each part (i) and (ii):

3 marks	Description of effect on social/cognitive development is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example the candidate might explain that quality day care can have a positive effect on cognitive development because infants may receive additional stimulation.
2 marks	Description of effect on social/cognitive development is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> (For example the candidate might state: 'Day care can cause <u>cognitive/social</u> problems because of maternal deprivation').
1 marks	Description of effect on social/cognitive development is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example the candidate may identify relationships with peers as an effect without further elaboration.
0 marks	Description of effect on social/cognitive development is <b>inappropriate</b> or is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) Outline and evaluate **one or more** explanation(s) of attachment (e.g. learning theories, Bowlby's theory). (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** will be an outline of explanation(s) of attachment. **AO2** will be an evaluation of this/these explanations. This could be achieved by, for example, comparing and contrasting explanations, considering the extent to which they are supported by evidence or discussing practical implications.

The ethologists offer an influential explanation of attachment. They suggest that it is vital for the survival of young animals to stay close to their parents and that this is something that is too important to be left to chance learning. The phenomenon of imprinting is difficult to account for by learning theory mainly because the imprinting infant attaches itself to the mother-figure prior to any rewards (reinforcements) being obtained. Human infants do not show clear signs of social selectivity until the latter part of the first year when a preference for the caregiver and wariness of strangers is demonstrated. Ethologists suggest that this is the result of an imprinting-like process.

Many candidates will be familiar with 'cupboard love' explanations. Freud believed that a baby's primary need for food became associated with the mother, who then becomes desired in her own right. Although usually opposed to each other, both psychoanalytic and behaviourist theories are agreed on this primary source of attachments. Behaviourists also see infants as becoming attached to those who satisfy their needs, for example, for food. However, the classic experiments of Harry Harlow on rhesus monkeys demonstrated that this theory was inadequate. Studies with humans also provide evidence that infants can become attached to people who do not perform caregiving activities (for example, Schaffer & Emerson, 1964).

Bowlby combined ethological and psychodynamic elements in his theory. Other recent theories have emphasised cognitive factors, in particular the interaction between mothers and infants.

As well as these theories it would also be permissible to evaluate theories that try to explain individual differences in attachment (e.g. Ainsworth's care giving sensitivity hypothesis and Kagan's temperament hypothesis).

Answers that consider more than one approach (breadth) will necessarily do so with less depth. Note that however many explanations are outlined, there is a maximum of 6 marks for description (**AO1**). Candidates may introduce alternative explanations of attachment as a form of commentary/ evaluation for example by comparing and contrasting strengths and weaknesses. 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 psychological explanation(s) of attachment

6-5 marks	Outline of psychological explanation(s) of attachment is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example the candidate may outline Bowlby' theory of attachment in detail or 'cupboard love' (learning plus Freud) in less detail.
4-3 marks	Outline of psychological explanation(s) of attachment is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example the idea of cupboard love theory is clearly outlined but without reference to specific explanations.
2-1 marks	Outline of psychological explanation(s) of attachment is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example two explanations are identified.
0 marks	The outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research which is addressing maternal deprivation) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## AO2: Evaluation of explanation(s)

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

4

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Outline Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis.

*(6 marks)***Marking criteria**

Bowlby believed that there was a critical period for attachment formation. 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 breaking of the bond as maternal deprivation. Bowlby claimed that maternal deprivation had some or all of the following consequences: aggressiveness, depression, delinquency, dependency anxiety, dwarfism affectionless psychopathy, intellectual retardation and social maladjustment.

Research evidence such as the 44 thieves study could be used to elaborate on the explanation of the MD hypothesis. However an outline of Bowlby's theory of attachment is only creditworthy to the extent that it is related to the MD hypothesis (e.g. monotropy explains the importance of the mother in the attachment process and therefore the serious consequences of bond disruption).

**Marking allocations**

6-5 marks	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example the candidate explains the consequences of bond disruption according to Bowlby and some of the short/long term effects.
4-3 marks	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the answer might be limited to outlining some of the effects of MD <u>or explaining the critical period</u> .
2-1 marks	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, only one effect is identified or a definition of deprivation offered.
0 marks	The outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example the explanation may be of the development of attachments) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

- (b) Describe the procedures of **one** study of secure and insecure attachments in children and give **one** criticism of this study. (3 marks + 3 marks)

### Marking criteria

The development of attachment has been measured experimentally by Ainsworth and Bell (1970), who observed babies' reactions to being separated from their mothers and placed in a 'strange situation'. This assessed separation and stranger anxiety; infant's willingness to explore and reunion behaviour. The situation has been used in a range of different cultures.

There have been a number of positive criticisms of the strange situation method, for example it provides a reliable measure of attachment behaviour. However, it has been criticised on the grounds of ecological validity (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Also, interaction between caregivers and infants is very much a two-way process, and this is not adequately addressed. In other words, attachment is lodged in the relationship between caregivers and infant and not in the temperament of the child alone. Note that the criticism need not relate to methodology of study but could involve the way in which the findings had been interpreted. If an inappropriate study is chosen (e.g. Harlow), credit can not be given for criticisms.

### Marking allocations

For the procedures:

3 marks	Outline of the procedures in one study that has investigated individual differences in attachments is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> . For example a clear account of the strange situation test is given.
2 marks	Outline of the procedures in one study that has investigated individual differences in attachments is <b>generally accurate but less detailed</b> . For example the candidate may give an account of the stages in the strange situation but not make clear that it is conducted in a standardised setting.
1 mark	Outline of the procedures in one study that has investigated individual differences in attachments is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example the candidate might state that it involves separation.
0 marks	Outline of the procedures in one study is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may offer description of findings) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

For the criticism:

3 marks	Statement of one criticism of the study that has investigated individual differences in attachments is <b>both accurate and detailed</b> , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one limitation or strength of the study. For example, the candidate has identified an appropriate criticism and explained in what way it is an issue in the context of the study.
2 marks	Statement of one criticism of the study that has investigated individual differences in attachments is <b>generally accurate but less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may fail to be clear about how the criticism is a problem in this study.
1 mark	Statement of one criticism of the study that has investigated individual differences in attachment is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate may simply identify the criticism <u>by saying that it was unethical</u> .
0 marks	Answer is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may offer criticism of study that is not relevant) or the criticism, if directed at an appropriate study is <b>incorrect</b> .



- (c) Outline research (theories **and/or** studies) into privation and consider how this research helps us to understand the effects of privation. (18 marks)

**Marking criteria**

**AO1** will be an outline of research (theories and/or studies) on the effects of privation. 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. Case studies of extreme privation are also acceptable (e.g. Genie). 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 caregiver) then this can be credited but not if the effects of separation are being investigated (e.g. Robertson & Robertson). The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow's studies are acceptable.

For commentary (**AO2**) candidates might point out that one of the main areas of concern has been the extent to which the effects of deprivation are reversible. Studies of adoption and of the effects of extreme early privation have tended to show that, given adequate care, the effects can be mitigated or even reversed and normal development achieved. The most recent research is more equivocal, however, with Tizard and Hodges, for example, claiming that adopted children had more difficulties with their peers.

Alternatively, candidates may focus on the problems of conducting research into privation, for example the difficulties in interpreting case studies. The implication here would be that flawed studies do not help us understand the problem. It would be difficult to make ethical concerns relevant in this way, however.

Research does not need to be confined to social development.

**Marking allocations**

## AO1: Description of research into privation

6-5 marks	Description of research into privation is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example a range of studies are summarised or a more restricted range but in some detail.
4-3 marks	Description of research into privation is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example a restricted range of studies is summarised.
2-1 marks	Description of research into privation is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example only one study is referred to with little elaboration.
0 marks	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research which was not directly addressing the effects of privation) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## AO2: evaluation/assessment of research into privation

12-11 marks	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on research into privation 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.
10-9 marks	There us a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into privation and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
8-7 marks	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into the effects of privation but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
6-5 marks	There is <b>basic commentary</b> on research into privation with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
4-3 marks	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on research into privation and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of relevant psychological material. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on research into privation is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). <b>Analysis is weak and muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
0 marks	Commentary is absent or wholly <b>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 question 1</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 question 2</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 question 3</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 question 4</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>62</b>