



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181

Specification A

Unit 1 (PYA1)

Cognitive Psychology and Developmental Psychology

Mark Scheme

2007 examination - January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

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

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO

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

SECTION A: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

1 (a) Describe findings and/or conclusions of research into the nature of long-term memory (LTM).

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>LTM is thought to encode mainly semantically (Baddeley, 1966) although there is evidence that other modalities are also used; LTM can be demonstrated for smells and sounds, for example. Long-term storage is generally assumed to have unlimited capacity and unlimited duration. Standing et al (1970), using a recognition paradigm, showed about 90% accuracy for picture memory after they had been presented with over 2½ thousand pictures over a number of days. Bahrick carried out a number of studies into the duration of LTM (eg Bahrick, Bahrick and Wittinger 1975) and showed a high degree of accuracy in recognition memory after over 30 years, although recall was relatively weaker.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to focus on encoding, duration and capacity but answers that are focused on other aspects of LTM such as forgetting, or on a model or conceptualisation of LTM, such as levels of processing (eg Craik and Lockhart, 1972) or the semantic/episodic distinction (eg Tulving, 1972) are potentially equally creditworthy.</p> <p>Breadth vs. depth may be an issue here; it is just as acceptable to describe the findings/conclusions of research into one aspect of LTM in detail as it is to refer more broadly to a number of findings/conclusions.</p>	6	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the findings/conclusions of research into the nature of LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, findings into the nature of encoding and capacity in LTM are accurately cited.</p>
	5-4	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline description of the findings/conclusions of research into the nature of LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate describes the findings and conclusion of a relevant study, but detail is lacking.</p>
	3-2	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the findings/conclusions of research into the nature of LTM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a basic outline of the nature of LTM is given eg ‘LTM has limitless capacity and duration’.</p>
	1-0	<p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of findings/conclusions of research into the nature of LTM.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of findings/conclusions of research into the nature of LTM.</p>

1 (b) (i) What is meant by the term *flashbulb memories*?

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
Flashbulb memories are vivid and detailed memories that are associated with hearing about, or otherwise experiencing, significant, emotionally charged events. This may include the memory for the event itself and/or the recollection of what the individual was doing at the time. For example, older people can usually recall what they were doing when they heard of President Kennedy's assassination in 1963. A more recent example would be memories associated with hearing the news of the death of Princess Diana, or the events of September 11th.	3	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of flashbulb memories that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate states that flashbulb memories are clear and detailed memories associated with an emotionally charged event, and maybe mentions an example.</p>
	2	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of flashbulb memories that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, flashbulb memories are described as being a vivid memory of an emotional event such as Princess Diana dying.</p>
	1	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of flashbulb memories that demonstrates some knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate states that a flashbulb memory is an exceptionally clear and vivid memory.</p>
	0	<p>Inaccurate/inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of flashbulb memories.</p>

1 (b) (ii) What is meant by the term *repression*?

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Repression is a form of motivated forgetting without conscious awareness. It is the term used to explain that certain memories become inaccessible and very difficult or impossible to retrieve. Certain memories are pushed out of consciousness into the unconscious. This is an unconscious process which keeps anxiety-provoking or distressing memories from conscious awareness, hence protecting the ego. Examples might include the case of 'Irene' who apparently repressed the events which led up to her mother's death.</p>	3	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of repression that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, a description of repression is given, maybe with a brief example, which clearly states that it is an unconscious process that may protect the ego.</p>
	2	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of repression that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, repression is described as when a memory cannot be retrieved because it has been placed in the unconscious.</p>
	1	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of repression that demonstrates some knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, repression is described as when someone forgets something because it was upsetting.</p>
	0	<p>Inaccurate/inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of repression.</p>

1 (c) In the context of eyewitness testimony, describe and evaluate research into leading questions.

(18 marks)

Marking Criteria

AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of research into leading questions.

AO2 criteria are likely to be satisfied by an evaluation of such research.

Leading questions are questions which direct witnesses to give a particular interpretation of an event. The study of Loftus and Palmer (1974) (the 'smashed/bumped' study) showed that the way a question is presented can affect the way in which participants remember an incident. Other research by Loftus may also be quoted and can attract credit, although examiners are reminded that the research must relate specifically to leading questions and not just to eyewitness testimony (EWT) in general. For example, work on resisting leading questions (eg the Loftus 1979 red/brown wallet study) may also be cited. Work by researchers other than Loftus is of course acceptable, such as that of Yuille and Cutshall (1986).

The research has to be specifically related to leading questions, so for example, research into weapon focus would not be creditworthy.

In evaluation of research into leading questions, candidates are likely to focus on the validity of the studies cited in relation to real life; ethics may also be cited, as may sampling bias. Candidates may also suggest that many of these studies focus on memory for peripheral details. However, it is worth noting that Loftus' studies were well controlled. The potential applications of such research, in relation to police procedures (eg Geiselman et al 1985 and the cognitive interview) may also be used as AO2.

1 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	AO1: Description of research evidence.		AO2: Evaluation of research.
6	Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into leading questions that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the theoretical basis behind leading questions may be described, or the procedures/findings/conclusions of a study or studies into leading questions may be accurately described.	12-10	Informed commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent.
5-4	Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into leading questions that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the procedures/findings/conclusions of one or more studies, which are accurate if not extremely detailed, and which relate to leading questions, are described.	9-7	Reasonable commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.
3-2	Basic The candidate provides a basic description of research into leading questions that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a basic outline of the findings of one study into leading questions is provided.	6-4	Basic commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.
1-0	Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of research into leading questions. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research into leading questions. For example, the candidate has described research into an unrelated topic or the description is incorrect.	3-0	Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.

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

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>In this question, candidates might describe, for example, the working memory (WM) model as an alternative view of short-term memory (STM) that temporarily holds and manipulates information as we perform cognitive tasks (Baddeley and Hitch 1974). They may go on to describe the three components of the working memory: phonological loop, visuospatial sketchpad, and the central executive that integrates information from the previous two systems as well as from long-term memory. Alternatively, levels of processing may be described; Craik and Lockhart (1972) proposed that it is the depth of processing that determines whether something is held in long-term memory; deeper levels of analysis produce more durable and long lasting traces than shallow levels. Elaboration, distinctiveness and organisation might also be mentioned.</p> <p>In the event that more than one alternative to the multi-store model of memory (MSM) is described, then each should be marked and the highest mark awarded.</p> <p>Although it is likely that candidates may choose either the working memory model or the levels of processing model as the alternative, other choices such as Parallel Distributed Processing are acceptable.</p>	6	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of one alternative to the multi-store model of memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the components of WM are described accurately and some indication of the processes of WM is given.</p>
	5-4	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of one alternative to the multi-store model of memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate provides a less detailed description of the components of WM, described accurately, but little reference is made to processes.</p>
	3-2	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of one alternative to the multi-store model of memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the description lacks detail and/or clarity (eg a basic outline of the components of WM only is identifiable).</p>
	1-0	<p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of an alternative to MSM. For example, the candidate just names one alternative.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of an alternative to MSM.</p>

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

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>‘Reconstructive memory’ is the term used to mean that retrieval involves a process of reconstruction, where all the available information about the event is used to reconstruct the details of the event, on the basis of what ‘must’ have been true. It is important to note that the research must be into reconstructive memory and that therefore not all eyewitness testimony (EWT) research will be acceptable. Acceptable research includes that of Bartlett (1932) and the serial/repeated reproduction technique used with the ‘War of the Ghosts’ story. The ‘stereotyping’ study by Allport and Postman (1947) may also be creditworthy as a study of reconstructive memory. Wynn and Logie (1998) tested memory in a more real-life situation – students’ recall of events in their first week at university at intervals ranging from 2 weeks to 6 months. Initial accuracy was sustained throughout the period with not much change over time, suggesting limited use of reconstructive memory.</p> <p>Other studies which refer to leading questions or post-event information may also be allowable as long as the reconstructive nature of the research is clear.</p> <p>Breadth/depth may be an issue in answers to this question. Answers that describe procedures in detail but findings in less detail are as acceptable as those which are more balanced. If candidates offer only procedures or only findings, then this constitutes partial performance and a maximum of 4 marks is allowable, as is shown in the performance descriptions (right).</p>	6	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, both the procedures and findings of Bartlett’s study are described in reasonable detail.</p>
	5-4	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures and findings of one study of reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, Bartlett’s study is described, but in less detail, so the procedure is glossed over but the findings are reasonably accurate. If only one of either the procedures or findings is given, this is accurate and detailed (max 4 marks).</p>
	3-2	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and findings of one study into reconstructive memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the gist of Bartlett’s study is given but the details are not there or are inaccurate.</p>
	1-0	<p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed description that demonstrates very little knowledge of the procedures and findings of a study of reconstructive memory.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the procedures and findings of a study of reconstructive memory.</p>

2 (c) Discuss **one or more** explanations of forgetting in short-term memory (STM).

(18 marks)

Marking Criteria

AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of explanations of forgetting in STM.

AO2 criteria are likely to be satisfied by an evaluation of and/or commentary on these explanations.

The explanations most likely to be offered are decay and displacement, but other appropriate explanations are of course acceptable.

With decay, there is an assumption that a memory trace which may be a neurophysiological trace – degrades over time. In STM, it may be considered that the ‘active trace’, which is delicate and liable to disruption, corresponds roughly to STM, and according to decay theory, forgetting from STM is due to disruption of the active trace.

Displacement (STM) refers to existing memory being displaced from STM by newer information. There is a distinction between this and retroactive interference and the two terms must not be used interchangeably. Interference is the tendency for one memory to affect (negatively) or interfere with the accurate retrieval of another memory. It may be either retroactive or proactive. RI is not likely to operate in STM, although PI may do (some researchers suggest that PI operates in the Peterson and Peterson paradigm). A generic answer on ‘interference’ will not attract credit unless its relevance to forgetting in STM is made explicit.

If a candidate names one forgetting mechanism but goes on to describe another (eg names interference but describes displacement), then the description may be credited.

In relation to AO2 candidates may evaluate the explanation(s) in terms of

- The extent to which research studies refute or support the explanation(s).
- The reliability and/or validity of the evidence including issues associated with operationalising variables, ecological validity, sampling.
- Distinguishing between displacement and decay in STM.
- Presenting alternative explanations for forgetting in STM, eg introduction of issues of brain damage or disease as a better explanation of the chronic forgetting from STM.

2 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	AO1: Description of explanations of forgetting in short-term memory.		AO2: Evaluation of explanations of forgetting in short-term memory.
6	Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of one or more explanations of forgetting in short-term memory (STM) that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, a detailed description of the physiological process involved in decay is described or 2 or more explanations are described in less detail.	12-10	Informed commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent.
5-4	Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of one or more explanations of forgetting in short-term memory (STM) that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, a generally accurate description of displacement as an explanation of forgetting in short-term memory is given, but lacks some detail.	9-7	Reasonable commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.
3-2	Basic The candidate provides a basic description of one or more explanations of forgetting in short-term memory (STM) that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate states 'decay is when material fades over time' or a basic outline of displacement is identifiable.	6-4	Basic commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.
1-0	Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of explanations of forgetting in STM. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of explanations of forgetting in STM. For example, the candidate describes research into an unrelated topic or the description is incorrect.	3-0	Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.

3 (a) What is meant by the terms *secure attachment* and *insecure attachment*?

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>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 is also content to explore and copes better with the stranger when the mother is present.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is conceivable that candidates may define the terms on the basis of the consequences of secure/insecure attachment (eg trust in adult relationships). This is acceptable.</p>	6	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of secure and insecure attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the features of a secure attachment, including proximity-seeking and exploration from a safe base, as well as describing one or both of the types of insecure attachment identified by Ainsworth.</p>
	5-4	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of secure and insecure attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, some of the features of a secure attachment are described accurately and one of the insecure types identified by Ainsworth is described. If only one of either secure or insecure attachment is given, this is accurate and detailed (max 4 marks).</p>
	3-2	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of secure and insecure attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only one feature of a secure and of an insecure attachment is given.</p>
	1-0	<p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of secure and insecure attachments.</p> <p>For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge of secure and insecure attachments.</p>

3 (b) Describe the procedures of **one** study of individual differences in attachment.

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions (for each 3 mark part)
<p>Candidates are likely to describe the procedures of the Strange Situation (Ainsworth and Bell 1970). Key features are likely to include the age of the infant, the fact that the procedures are subject to tight controls, the standardised nature of the seven episodes and the measures which are taken separation anxiety, stranger anxiety and reunion behaviour. It is not necessary to describe the features of each of the separate episodes in order to achieve maximum credit.</p> <p>Other relevant research, such as that of Takahashi, may also be used.</p> <p>If candidates describe the procedures of more than one study, then both should be marked and credit given for the study which attracts the higher number of marks.</p>	3	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures of one study of individual differences in attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the majority of the features of the procedure mentioned in the marking criteria are described.</p>
	2	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures of one study of individual differences in attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, vague procedures are outlined without giving much detail.</p>
	1	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures of one study of individual differences in attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, there is only a basic description of the procedures or the procedures are muddled.</p>
	0	<p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the procedures of one study of individual attachments. For example, the candidate does not mention the key points of the procedures of the study, or inappropriate research is cited.</p>

3 (b) Outline **one** criticism of this study.

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions (for each 3 mark part)
<p>Candidates are most likely to offer a criticism of Ainsworth's strange situation. They may mention that the study was unrealistic, and that the classification may thus be an artefact of the situation, or that the classification created was of American infants and hence the classification and conclusion of the study cannot necessarily be applied to other societies. Relevant ethical considerations may also be outlined.</p> <p>Candidates must offer a criticism of the study they have described; no marks are available for criticisms of a different study. The criticism may be positive or negative.</p>	3	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one criticism of the study they have described that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, ethical issues such as distress of the infant in the strange situation are outlined.</p>
	2	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of one criticism of the study they have described that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate states that the classification created was of American infants.</p>
	1	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of one criticism of the study they have described that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate states that the study 'lacks ecological validity' or is not 'true to life'.</p>
	0	<p>Inaccurate/inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of a criticism of this study.</p>

3 (c) Describe and evaluate research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development.

(18 marks)

Marking Criteria

AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of the research into the effects of day care on the social and/or cognitive development of children.

AO2 criteria would be satisfied by an evaluation of, or commentary on, this research.

For AO1, some research has shown that day care is related to social development. For example, Clarke-Stewart et al (1991) studied 150 children aged 2 and 3 and found that the children in daycare had more advanced peer relationships. Shea's (1981) study of playground behaviour found that the sociability of 3 and 4 year olds increased over their first 10 weeks at nursery school, as measured by factors such as aggression and frequency of peer interaction. In relation to cognitive development, some findings (eg Belsky 1986, 1990) suggest the conclusion that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their development (including cognitive development). However, others (eg 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 development. There is of course much more research which is potentially credit-worthy, including the 2001 NICHD study and the work of Pennebaker et al (1981), as well as that of Scarr and Thompson (1994) and of Melhuish et al (1990).

Candidates may focus on a relatively restricted range of studies, or even just one. However, this must be compensated by the level of detail of findings and/or conclusions in the account.

In relation to **AO2**, candidates may point out that much of the research seems to lead to contradictory findings, and that these disagreements are difficult to resolve because research is still at a relatively early stage. The effects of day care are complicated by a number of variables and it is difficult to tease out the social and cognitive effects which are a result of day care and those which are a result of other variables which may exist (eg separation or physical deprivation). In addition, if research is carried out in different social contexts (eg Chicago, Sweden), a number of cultural or sub-cultural variables may confound the results. However, tentative conclusions suggest that the intellectual and social development of children can actually be accelerated in adequately staffed and well-run day care centres.

3 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	AO1: Description of research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development.		AO2: Evaluation of research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development.
6	Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development that demonstrates knowledge and understanding. For example, a detailed description of research into both cognitive and social effects is given, giving appropriate research.	12-10	Informed commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent.
5-4	Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, an accurate outline of one or more studies is given but the findings/conclusions are not developed in detail.	9-7	Reasonable commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.
3-2	Basic The candidate provides a basic description of research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a basic outline of research is identifiable.	6-4	Basic commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.
1-0	Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed outline that demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of research into the effects of day care on children's social and/or cognitive development. For 0 marks, the candidate has described research into an inappropriate topic or the description is incorrect, for example, the effects of institutional care.	3-0	Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible.

4 (a) Outline **one** explanation of attachment (eg Bowlby's theory, learning theory).

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions (for each 3 mark part)
<p>Freud believed that a baby's primary need for food becomes associated with the mother, who then becomes desired in her own right. Behaviourists thus also see infants as becoming attached to those who satisfy their needs, for example for food.</p> <p>In contrast, ethologists suggested that it is vital for the survival of young animals to stay close to their parents. They relate attachment to the phenomenon of imprinting, suggesting that the infant attaches itself to the mother-figure prior to any rewards (reinforcements) being obtained.</p> <p>Bowlby combined both ethological and psychodynamic elements into his theory of attachment. Note, however, that candidates are unlikely to make effective use of the maternal deprivation hypothesis (MDH).</p> <p>'Cupboard love' explanations can count as one explanation for the purposes of this question. It would also be permissible to present theories that try to explain individual differences in attachment (eg Ainsworth's caregiving sensitivity hypothesis and Kagan's temperament hypothesis).</p> <p>If more than one explanation is described, then they should both/all be marked and the highest mark credited.</p>	3	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one theory of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, Bowlby's theory is described in detail, with the focus being on attachment rather than on MDH.</p>
	2	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of one theory of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, Bowlby's theory is described accurately but the detail is less than full.</p>
	1	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of one theory of attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, an outline of a behaviourist theory of attachment is attempted but the focus is more on classical and operant conditioning than on attachment per se.</p>
	0	<p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of an explanation of attachment.</p>

4 (a) Outline **one** criticism of this explanation.

(3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions (for each 3 mark part)
<p>The criticism given must relate to the explanation outlined.</p> <p>Candidates may use an alternative explanation as a criticism, or alternatively they may give a specific criticism of the explanation they have outlined in part (i).</p> <p>Positive criticisms may be given and are potentially as creditworthy as negative ones.</p>	3	<p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline criticism of the explanation given that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate states that Bowlby's theory was flawed because it does not explain <i>why</i> some children are able to form attachments after a critical period.</p>
	2	<p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline criticism of the explanation given that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate states that learning theory must be incorrect as babies often make attachments to people who do not look after them.</p>
	1	<p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline criticism of the explanation given that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate states that a learning theory explanation of attachment is 'too reductionist'.</p>
	0	<p>Inaccurate/inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides an inappropriate description/explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of a criticism of the explanation given.</p>

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

(6 marks)

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

4 (c) Discuss evidence which supports Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis.

(18 marks)

Marking Criteria

AO1 criteria are likely to be satisfied by an account of the research (either Bowlby's own or that of other researchers), which supports Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis (MDH).

AO2 criteria are likely to be satisfied by an evaluation of this research. For this question, only answers which focus on Bowlby's MDH are acceptable. Some candidates may give an outline (and evaluation) of Bowlby's theory of attachment, but this is unlikely to be creditworthy. A description of the MDH is not what is required, and will only attract credit inasmuch as it relates to evidence supporting the hypothesis.

In support, references to the '44 juvenile thieves' study (Bowlby 1944) as well as other studies may be creditworthy, for example, by identifying the possible link between affectionless psychopathy and lack of continuous maternal care at an early age. Other studies include early studies of institutionalised children (eg Goldfarb 1943, Spitz and Wolf 1946 and Bowlby 1946). These early studies have been extensively criticised. Animal studies by Harlow and his co-workers appeared to lend weight to Bowlby's theories, but the neglect suffered by Harlow's monkeys was much more severe than almost any imaginable deprivation of children. Of course, evidence from animal studies must be interpreted very carefully when applied to humans.

For **AO2**, there are also many studies that directly undermine the maternal deprivation hypothesis. Hodges and Tizard (1989 etc) showed that children can form attachments after 3 years of age despite early deprivation, and other studies have concluded that it was lack of stimulation that had caused the poorer intellectual development, not maternal deprivation. Rutter suggests that rather than separation itself being responsible for the behaviour, it is much more important to look at other factors associated with separation (discord, stress, etc.).

As far as positive evaluations are concerned, candidates could point out that, even if Bowlby was wrong in detail, psychologists are increasingly confirming the idea of links between difficulties in childhood/adulthood and early experiences.

Note that simply giving an account of the procedures of research studies is not sufficient. They must be used in evaluation to acquire credit as **AO2**.

4 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	AO1: Outline of research evidence.		AO2: Evaluation/assessment of research.
6	Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research which supports Bowlby's MDH and that demonstrates knowledge and understanding. For example, one or more relevant studies is described in detail and linked to the MDH explicitly.	12-10	Informed commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent.
5-4	Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of research which supports Bowlby's MDH and that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, relevant research is described accurately, but in less detail.	9-7	Reasonable commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.
3-2	Basic The candidate provides a basic outline of research which supports Bowlby's MDH and that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, a basic outline of the 44 juvenile thieves study is given.	6-4	Basic commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.
1-0	Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides a very brief/flawed or inappropriate outline that demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of research which supports Bowlby's MDH. For 0 marks, the candidate fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of research which supports Bowlby's MDH.	3-0	Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible.

Assessment Grid

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