

GCE 2005  
*January Series*



# Mark Scheme

## Psychology A Specification

### PYA1 Cognitive and Developmental Psychology

---

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 © 2005 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.

*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 AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.*

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General.

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

<b>2 marks</b>	The work is characterised by <b>clear</b> expression of ideas, a <b>good</b> range of specialist terms and <b>only few errors</b> in grammar punctuation and spelling that detract from the clarity of the material.
<b>1 mark</b>	The work is characterised by <b>reasonable</b> expression of ideas, the use of <b>some</b> specialist terms and <b>errors</b> of grammar, punctuation and spelling that detract from the clarity of the material.
<b>0 marks</b>	The work is characterised by <b>poor</b> expression of ideas, <b>limited</b> use of specialist terms, <b>errors and poor</b> grammar, punctuation and spelling and legibility which obscures the clarity of the material.

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO**

<b>AO1</b>	Assessment objective one = knowledge and <b><i>understanding</i></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><i>evaluation</i></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**

(a) Outline findings **and/or** conclusions of research into the duration of short-term memory (STM).  
(6 marks)

**Marking criteria**

There is a wide range of studies into the duration of STM, but the most widely known is probably that of Peterson & Peterson (1959) – ‘trigrams’. The findings of this study were that fewer than 10% of trigrams were recalled after 18 secs and therefore that information decays rapidly from STM if rehearsal is prevented. Other studies have shown factors that affect duration include, whether participants make a deliberate effort to recall, and also whether the type of information can be chunked (as in digit span).

Depth/breadth is an issue in this type of question. Answers that discuss a limited range of findings/conclusions but in detail (i.e. the Peterson & Peterson study) are as acceptable as those that examine a wider range in less detail. Research such as Murdock’s into the recency effect may be credit worthy in as much as it relates clearly.

As this is an AO1 question, evaluation of the research is not required. However, in certain circumstances evaluation may inform the explanation of conclusions (for example, pointing out that limitations of the stimulus material make conclusions difficult to draw).

**Marking allocations**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline description of findings/conclusions of research into the duration of STM is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has summarised findings/conclusions of research study/studies in good detail (e.g. Peterson & Peterson).
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline description of findings/conclusions of research into the duration of STM is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example the findings/conclusions of one study are given, but in reasonable detail.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline description of findings/conclusions of research into the duration of STM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example the findings/conclusions of one study are only briefly mentioned (“The duration was found to be less than 18 secs”).
<b>0 marks</b>	The outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (e.g. the candidate has described research findings/conclusions into the capacity of LTM) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(b) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study of emotional factors in forgetting (e.g. flashbulb memories, repression). (6 marks)

### Marking criteria

Candidates are likely to choose the phenomenon of flashbulb memories or the role of repression in forgetting. Both of these are acceptable as emotional factors and studies based on either of these are relevant. Studies of flashbulb memories are normally linked to significant historical events, for example the Challenger disaster. Some laboratory studies have looked at possible mechanisms e.g. by blocking emotional arousal using drugs and seeing if this affects the memory for emotionally charged information (Cahil *et al*, 1994). Studies of repression include many case studies (e.g. recovered memories) but there are also a number of laboratory experiments, for example Levinger's.

Whatever study is chosen, it must be identifiable as a piece of published research. This therefore excludes anecdotal accounts of reactions to the death of Princess Diana.

In addition to the examples in the question, there are other areas of research into emotion and memory that are acceptable, for example research on weapon focus (in EWT). Research into PTSD could also be made relevant to this question, if the effect on forgetting is directly addressed.

### Marking allocations

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of the procedures and findings of one study of emotional factors in forgetting is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has covered both procedures and findings of a clearly identifiable study in good detail.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of the procedures and findings of one study of emotional factors in forgetting is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but less detailed</b> . For example, a reasonable account of procedures is offered but only a very brief account of findings. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> the procedures <i>or</i> findings of the study is accurate and detailed (i.e. partial performance).
<b>2-1 mark</b>	Description of the procedures and findings of one study of emotional factors in forgetting 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 <i>either</i> the procedures <i>or</i> findings of the study is generally accurate but less detailed (i.e. partial performance).
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described a study which was not directly addressing a study of emotional factors in forgetting) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) Outline and evaluate Loftus’s research (theories **and/or** studies) into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. (18 marks)

**Marking criteria**

For this question, **AO1** is description of research. Loftus’s empirical studies have shown 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 research **must** be attributable to Loftus.

Evaluation of studies, analysis of findings and the overall structure of the answer (argument) would be appropriate ways of obtaining marks for **AO2**. It is also possible to evaluate theories, i.e. the extent to which Loftus has been successful in suggesting reasons why witnesses are sometimes inaccurate (e.g. interference, reconstructive memory). In addition other studies could be used in evaluation, for example if they offer contradictory conclusions or support other explanations. Another approach would be to consider how knowledge and understanding gained from Loftus’s research could be used to improve the effectiveness of eyewitness testimony. For example, ways in which interview techniques can be improved (as in the cognitive interview) or evidence assessed in trials (especially where child witnesses are concerned).

The degree to which candidates use further studies such as Bartlett’s research, 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’.

In questions such as these candidates may gain maximum marks by covering a range of studies in reasonable detail or just one study in good detail. 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 studies.

**Marking allocations**

**AO1:** Outline of Loftus’s research into EWT

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of Loftus’s research (one or more studies) into EWT is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the findings of a number of studies are summarised accurately and/or there is a detailed account of explanations. Alternatively, one study is described in detail.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of Loftus’s research into EWT is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, procedures of a number of studies are described but there is little on findings.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of Loftus’s research 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may outline an unrelated topic) or the outline is <b>incorrect</b> .

**AO2: Evaluation of Loftus's research into EWT**

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on Loftus's research 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 Loftus's research 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 Loftus's research 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 Loftus's research 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 Loftus's research 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 Loftus's research 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is <b>absent or wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

2

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) (i) Explain what is meant by reconstructive memory.	(3 marks)
(ii) Describe the procedures of <b>one</b> study of reconstructive memory.	(3 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) 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.

Most candidates will probably choose Bartlett's investigation of reconstructive memory which used the method *serial reproduction* to test recall. However, a wide range of other studies are potentially appropriate to this question, including those of Allport & Postman and Elizabeth Loftus and her colleagues.

**Marking allocations****Part (i)**

<b>3 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by reconstructive memory is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the candidate explains how according to Bartlett, memories can be distorted by experience – new memories are combined with existing schema.
<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by reconstructive memory is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate might state that the term was used by Bartlett and occurs when the contents of memory are modified by the person.
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation of what is meant by reconstructive memory is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate may simply state that reconstructed memories are distorted or changed.
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by reconstructive memory is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the explanation may be of forgetting in LTM) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**Part (ii)**

<b>3 marks</b>	Description of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example an account of Bartlett's study is given, briefly explaining the type of stimulus material, how it was presented and how results were obtained.
<b>2 marks</b>	Description of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory is limited. It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate might not explain how recall was assessed.
<b>1 mark</b>	Description of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate may just say that the study involved the War of the Ghosts.
<b>0 marks</b>	Description of the procedures of one study of reconstructive memory is <b>inappropriate</b> or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



(b) Outline **one** explanation of forgetting in short-term memory and give **one** criticism of this explanation. (3 marks + 3 marks)

### Marking criteria

Candidates can choose from a number of explanations of forgetting in STM, however, decay and displacement are most likely to be offered. While some explanations (e.g. decay) can occur in both STM and LTM, others (e.g. retroactive interference) are normally considered to be LTM mechanisms so would not be relevant for this question. However, there is some evidence for the idea that proactive interference can be a mechanism for forgetting in STM. If candidates make this clear (e.g. through appropriate STM examples) then this could gain credit.

The most likely approach to criticisms may be to cite research evidence, such as the study by Peterson & Peterson. However, providing extended description of procedures is not an effective way to answer the question and would normally acquire little credit. A valid point that some candidates might make is that it is difficult to decide between competing explanations, because of the difficulty in designing experiments to isolate the factors under investigation.

The two parts of the question must be linked. If the answer of the first part is inappropriate (e.g. LTM) then no marks can be given for the criticism.

### Marking allocations

For the outline

<b>3 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in STM is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, a clear account of decay is given with reference to appropriate example(s).
<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> . There is an account of decay theory but the idea of disuse is not clearly elucidated.
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in STM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . E.g. the explanation is named but not elaborated.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in STM is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the explanation may be of forgetting in LTM) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

For the criticism

<b>3 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of explanation of forgetting in STM is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one strength or limitation of the explanation, e.g. explaining why a study contradicts the explanation.
<b>2 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of explanation of forgetting in STM is limited. It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate might outline the procedures and findings of one study which implicitly supports/refutes the explanation.
<b>1 mark</b>	Statement of criticism of explanation of forgetting in STM is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> (e.g. stating that the explanation lacks empirical support without further explanation).
<b>0 marks</b>	Answer is <b>inappropriate</b> , i.e. not directed at the explanation outlined, or the criticism is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) “The multi-store model has helped us to understand how memory works but may have outlived its usefulness.”

Outline the multi-store model of memory and consider its strengths **and/or** limitations. *(18 marks)*

**Marking criteria**

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

**AO2** will be a consideration of the strengths/limitations of the MSM. Candidates can focus on specific empirical criticisms of the MSM or adopt a more discursive approach by reference to alternative conceptualisations (or even combine the two approaches).

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

In terms of limitations it is often said that the model is too simplistic and 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’.

Although the question refers to strengths and/or limitations it would be unfair to impose an absolute partial performance penalty if only one strength or limitation is referred to. However, this would have to be in considerable detail to reach the highest band.

**Marking allocations**

**AO1:** Outline of the multi-store model

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of the multi-store model is both <b>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.
<b>3-4 marks</b>	Outline of the multi-store is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may give an account of the two stores but not explain rehearsal.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of the multi-store model 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).
<b>0 marks</b>	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**

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on the strengths/limitations of 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.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the strengths/limitations of the multi-store 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 strengths/limitations of the multi-store 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 strengths/limitations of the multi-store 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 strengths/limitations of the multi-store model 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 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 <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) Outline the development of attachments (e.g. the work of Schaffer).	(6 marks)
---	-----------

**Marking criteria**

The two main accounts of the development of attachments have been proposed by Schaffer and by Bowlby. (Note however, that the naming of the stages does vary from textbook to textbook.) Some candidates may offer an account of the findings of research into individual differences (e.g. Ainsworth). This could be made acceptable as long as the focus was on the development of different types of attachment (e.g. why infants do not develop secure attachments). It would not be sufficient to enumerate the different types if there was no reference to how these may have developed.

It would also be possible to approach this question from the point of view of research studies relating to explanations of attachment.

There is a necessary trade-off between breadth and depth in this type of question. A well elaborated description of one approach to the development of attachments such as Schaffer’s would be sufficient.

If candidates use explanations of attachments or research studies relating to explanations of attachment, they should only gain credit if they focus explicitly on developmental aspects (e.g. critical periods).

**Marking allocations**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of development of attachments is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, a clear account of Bowlby’s stages is given.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of the development of attachments is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, a partial account of stages is presented or a complete account is not sufficiently elaborated.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of the development of attachments is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, only one stage is mentioned.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example not related the development of attachments) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

:

(b) Describe procedures that have been used to investigate cross-cultural variations in attachment.  
(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, so describing Ainsworth's technique/procedures would be appropriate in itself without any reference to different cultural settings. However, some candidates may also explain how cross cultural comparisons are made. 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.

Meta-analysis such as Van Ijzendoorn & Kroonenberg (1988) can count as studies, in which case the candidate could describe how studies were selected and how the results were compared.

### Marking allocations

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of procedures that have been used to investigate cross-cultural variations in attachment is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the candidate gives a clear account of the way in which Ainsworth's Strange Situation methodology has been used.
<b>3-4 marks</b>	Description of procedures that have been used to investigate cross-cultural variations in attachment is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, a limited account of procedures are presented and not sufficiently elaborated.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of procedures that have been used to investigate cross-cultural variations in attachment is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, only a very brief account of the Strange Situation is given.
<b>0 marks</b>	Description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, not referring to procedures or related to attachments) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

(c) “Studies have shown that under certain circumstances children can recover from even very severe privation.”

Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) into 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. Studies of extreme privation are also acceptable (e.g Genie) but the candidate must focus on the procedures and outcomes not the circumstances of the privation itself (tied to potty, etc). 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 consider some of the obvious methodological flaws in early research (lack of controls, etc). They could also consider the argument about the reversibility of effects, and the sometimes contradictory nature of research findings. 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. However, some research is more equivocal, with for example, Tizard & Hodges, claiming that adopted children had more difficulties with their peers.

**Marking allocations**

**AO1:** Outline of research into the effects of privation

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

**AO2:** Evaluation/assessment of research into the effects of privation

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on research into the effects of 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.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on research into the effects of privation 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 the effects of privation 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 the effects of privation 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 the effects of privation 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 the effects of 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.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is <b>absent or wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses/

4

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Explain what is meant by the terms secure attachment and insecure attachment.	<i>(6 marks)</i>
---	------------------

**Marking criteria**

In order to explain the two terms candidates may refer to Ainsworth’s findings. Using the Strange Situation (SS), she found that in the case of **secure attachment** the infant is distressed at the mother’s absence but is rapidly reassured on her return. The infant also is content to explore and copes better with the stranger when the mother is present.

**Insecure attachment** can be of at least two types: resistant and avoidant. In the former the infant is insecure in the presence of the mother and very distressed when she leaves. In avoidant attachment, the infant does not seek contact with the mother. Candidates may cover both these types of insecure attachments, but full marks can still be obtained if only one is given in sufficient detail.

Weaker candidates may describe what is meant by attachment and not explicitly distinguish secure and insecure forms. Such answers may attract some credit to the extent that one or other of them is being referred to.

It is conceivable that candidates may define the terms on the basis of the consequences of secure/insecure attachment (e.g. trust in adult relationships). This is acceptable.

**Marking allocations**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by secure and insecure attachment is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has explained how the behaviour of securely and insecurely attached infants differs in the SS.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by secure and insecure attachment is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but less detailed</b> . For example, a reasonable account of one term is offered but only a very brief account of the other. Alternatively, description of either secure or insecure attachment is <b>accurate and detailed</b> ( <i>i.e. partial performance</i> ).
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by secure and insecure attachment is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . Alternatively, description of either secure or insecure attachment is <b>generally accurate but less detailed</b> ( <i>i.e. partial performance</i> ).
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation of what is meant by secure and insecure attachment is <b>inappropriate</b> or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



(b) (i)	Give a brief outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis.	(3 marks)
(ii)	Give <b>one</b> criticism of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis.	(3 marks)

### Marking criteria

Bowlby believed 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 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. Some candidates may give an outline of Bowlby's theory of attachment. This is only creditworthy to the extent that it refers to the MD hypothesis.

Criticisms of Bowlby's views include the suggestion that his concept of maternal deprivation is too vague (does not distinguish between privation & deprivation, ST & LT effects, etc) and tends to underestimate the importance of multiple attachments and individual differences. A positive criticism is that even if Bowlby was wrong in detail, psychologists are increasingly confirming the idea of links between difficulties in childhood/adulthood and early experiences. There is also research evidence, such as the 44 thieves study, that could be used to support or contradict the MD hypothesis. However, just providing an account of the *procedures* of such studies would not be sufficient.

### Marking allocations

Part (i) For the outline

<b>3 marks</b>	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, the candidate explains what Bowlby considers to be the effect(s) of breaking a bond during infancy.
<b>2 marks</b>	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, only the effects of deprivation are listed.
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate states that deprivation results from separation from the mother.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the explanation may be of the development of attachments) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

Part (ii) For the criticism

<b>3 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one strength or limitation of the hypothesis.
<b>2 marks</b>	Statement of criticism of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate might outline the findings of a study without explicitly stating why this supports/refutes Bowlby's hypothesis.
<b>1 mark</b>	Statement of criticism of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, the candidate might give the procedures of a study that supports Bowlby.
<b>0 marks</b>	Answer is <b>inappropriate</b> , i.e. not directed at Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis, or the criticism is <b>incorrect</b> .

- (c) Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) into the effects of day care on **either** cognitive **or** social development. (18 marks)

### Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** will be a description of research findings including explanations into the effects of day care. **AO2** will be an evaluation of this research: its consequences, implications and conclusions about whether day care has a beneficial effect.

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 cognitive and social development. These disagreements are difficult to resolve because research is still at a relatively early stage (most studies are by nature longitudinal) and those that have been reported are subject to important limitations (for example, only being conducted in university-based day care centres of high quality). However, tentative conclusions suggest that the intellectual development of children can actually be accelerated in adequately staffed and well-run day care centres. As far as social development is concerned, 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.

Candidates must confine themselves to either cognitive or social development. However, it is recognised that some studies and theories cover both aspects and can be credited accordingly.

The debate about day care has been very much influenced by Bowlby's views, but it would not be adequate to focus the answer solely on the effects on the child of maternal deprivation – the research must relate specifically to day care. Studies of working mothers can be relevant since it is reasonable to assume that the children of such mothers will be in some form of day care. So too could research comparing different types of day care in terms of their effects.

### Marking allocations

**AO1:** Outline of research into effects of day care

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development is both <b>accurate and detailed</b> . For example, a number of relevant research studies might be summarised or just on study in detail.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and/or less detailed</b> . For example one research study is summarised.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> and may be <b>muddled and/or flawed</b> . For example, there is only a brief reference of relevant research.
<b>0 marks</b>	The outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (the candidate has described research which was not directly addressing day care) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**AO2: Evaluation/assessment of research**

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development 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 research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> 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 research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development but <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective manner</b> .
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development with <b>limited analysis</b> of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective manner</b> .
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development 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 the effects of day care on children's cognitive or social development 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 or wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

## Assessment Grid

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