

GCE 2004

June Series



Mark Scheme

Psychology A (PYA1)

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 from:

Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

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*

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)

2 marks	The work is characterised by the ACCURATE and CLEAR expression of ideas, a BROAD RANGE of specialist terms and only MINOR ERRORS in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
1 mark	The work is characterised by a REASONABLE expression of ideas, the use of a REASONABLE RANGE of specialist terms and FEW ERRORS of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
0 marks	The work is characterised by a POOR expression of ideas, LIMITED USE of specialist terms and POOR grammar, punctuation and spelling.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO

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

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

(a) Distinguish between short-term memory (STM) and long-term memory (LTM). (6 marks)

Marking criteria

STM and LTM differ in terms of encoding (the means by which a representation is stored), capacity (the amount of information that can be held), and duration (the length of time that such information can be stored). According to the MSM, the key differences are: type of code (e.g. acoustic/semantic), capacity limits (small/very large) and different durations (i.e. <30 secs/potentially a lifetime). However other differences between STM & LTM include forgetting mechanisms: displacement in STM versus interference in LTM. For full marks an explicit comparison must be made.

Full marks can be obtained in principle by candidates who cover a limited range of differences in god detail or more differences in less detail.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Explanation of differences is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate may give a number of factors (encoding, duration and capacity) and explain <i>explicitly</i> how each of these is different in STM and LTM.
3-4 marks	Explanation of differences is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example the candidate might cover only one difference in detail (duration) or a number of differences in less detail. Alternatively, the characteristics may be identified in such a way that they are <i>implicitly</i> compared ('LTM has a large capacity, STM has a small capacity, etc.')
2-1 mark	Explanation is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example the candidate might merely list the characteristics of each store.
0 marks	Explanation is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may offer an explanation that has no basis in theory or research) or the explanation is incorrect .

- (b) Describe the procedures of **one** study that has investigated flashbulb memories and give **one** criticism of this study. (3 marks + 3 marks)

Marking criteria

Flashbulb memories (FMs) are accurate and detailed memories that occur in connection with highly emotional or otherwise significant events. A recent example would be hearing the news of the attack on the World Trade Towers on September 11th, 2001, investigated by Conway *et al.* (2003). Similar significant events have formed the basis of research, such as the Challenger space-shuttle disaster, investigated by Neisser & Harsch (1992), and McLoskey *et al* (1988). The procedures of such studies normally involve giving questionnaires soon after the event, and then again some time later, comparing results to the original. Other studies of FMs have investigated possible physiological mechanisms using experimental interventions in non-human animals, e.g. Cahil & McGaugh, (1998).

The appropriateness of the criticism will naturally depend on the study, but may involve methodological issues such as the difficulty in measuring recall. However, the criticism must be a criticism of the study, and not a general criticism of the concept of FMs, or of an explanation of FMs.

No marks are available for the criticism if the study is inappropriate (i.e. not on FMs).

Marking allocations

For the outline

3 marks	Outline of procedures of one study that has investigated FMs is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate might give an account of the type of participants used, the nature of the task, how it was presented and how the results were obtained.
2 marks	Outline of one study that has investigated FMs is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, there might be important omissions, such as how recall was assessed, or there might be a lack of clarity about the description of procedures as a whole.
1 mark	Outline of one study that has investigated FMs is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate might just say that the study involved memories for a significant event such as the death of JFK and give no other details of procedure.
0 marks	Outline of one study that has investigated FMs is inappropriate (for example, the study may be a study of reconstructive memory) or the description is incorrect .

For the criticism:

3 marks	Statement of criticism of one study that has investigated FMs is both accurate and detailed , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one strength or limitation of the study. For example, the candidate might suggest that, in the case of recent studies, the follow up period was short (i.e. one year) which raises implications for the validity of the research.
2 marks	Statement of criticism of one study that has investigated FMs is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the nature of the criticism might be identified but the implications not elaborated ('The follow-up period, one year, was too short and needed to be longer.')
1 mark	Statement of criticism of one study that has investigated FMs is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate might merely identify the criticism that 'The sample was self-selected'
0 marks	Answer is inappropriate , i.e. not directed at the study outlined, or the criticism is incorrect . (e.g. the study lacked ecological validity because it was based in a lab!)

(c) “Research studies have suggested that decay and displacement are two possible mechanisms of forgetting in STM.”

Outline and evaluate explanations of forgetting in short-term memory (STM). (18 marks)

Marking criteria

In this question **AO1** is an outline description of each explanation. **AO2** is an evaluation/assessment of each explanation of forgetting in STM.

Decay theory and displacement are referred to in the specification, as well as being mentioned in the quotation, so it is likely that these will figure in most answers. Other possible explanations include trauma and/or disease. However, in such cases it must be clear that the amnesia so produced, results in STM deficits. Aging is another possibility, as there is extensive research on whether STM declines in old age.

Decay suggests that memory fades with time, possibly because of structural changes in the brain (Hebb). The most common criticism of this explanation is that there is a lack of empirical support, mainly because of the difficulty in isolating confounding variables (such as interference). Displacement theory suggests that items stored in STM are *replaced* by more recent information. This is not the same as interference, which is normally regarded as an explanation of forgetting in LTM. However the textbooks are not always consistent on this, and candidates who offer interference can receive credit provided they explain it appropriately within the STM context. For example, in the Brown-Peterson paradigm, forgetting of later trigrams may be explained through interference from earlier ones (i.e. pro-active interference). Evaluation of the explanations can be positive, so descriptions of experiments in support of explanations can be given credit as **AO2**.

In view of the question wording (explanations), if only one explanation is given then there will be a maximum of 4 marks AO1 and 8 marks AO2 (as in marking allocations for question 4(c)).

Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of explanations of forgetting in STM

6-5 marks	Outline of two explanations of forgetting in STM is both accurate and detailed . E.g., the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of the main aspects of decay (as outlined above) with reference to appropriate examples..
3-4 marks	Outline of explanations of forgetting in STM is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, there is an account of decay theory but the idea of structural changes with time is not explained.
2-1 marks	Outline of explanations of forgetting in STM is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed). For example, two explanations are named/identified but not elaborated.
0 marks	Outline is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may explain an explanation of forgetting in LTM) or the description is incorrect .

AO2: Evaluation of explanations of forgetting in STM

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

2

Total for this question: 30 marks(a) Describe **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory. (6 marks)**Marking criteria**

Candidates are most likely chose to outline either the working memory (WM) model or the levels of processing (LOP) model since these are both mentioned in the specification.

According to Baddeley's original WM model, working memory is a three-part system that temporarily holds and manipulates information as we perform cognitive tasks (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974). There are three main components of the working memory: phonological loop, visuospatial sketch pad and the central executive, which integrates information from the previous two systems as well as from LTM.

The LOP was first proposed by Craik & Lockhart in the 1970s. They suggested that memory is not three or indeed any specific number of stores, but instead varies along an infinite number of levels depending on the depth of encoding. The strength of a memory trace does not depend on the type of store within which it is located, but on how much attention is paid to the information at the time of encoding. Deep, meaningful kinds of information processing lead to more permanent retention, than shallow, sensory kinds of processing.

In the LOP model, depth is defined in terms of the amount of meaning extracted from the stimulus rather than on the number of analyses performed on it. It is claimed that straightforward rehearsal through repetition is not the best way of remembering, and that more elaborate strategies are more effective.

Candidates are not required to give research studies in support of the model. However, these might attract credit if they amplify key features of the model, as might Craik & Tulving's studies into depth of processing.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Outline of main features of WM model/LOP/other alternative is both accurate and detailed . E.g., the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of the main aspects of the model as outlined above.
3-4 marks	Outline of main features of model is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the candidate may explain the main components of WM but not explain how they are inter-related.
2-1 marks	Outline of main features of model is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, only one aspect of the model is identifiable or only a basic diagram is provided.
0 marks	Explanation is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may explain the MSM) or the description is incorrect .

(b) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study of repression.

(6 marks)

Marking criteria

Freud conducted a number of case studies that claimed to find evidence of repression. Since Freud's time there have been numerous clinical studies into recovered memories, and these could all provide appropriate examples. Note, however, that the procedures of such studies are not the case history itself, rather they are the *methods* used by Freud and others to collect data (interviews, dream analysis, etc).

Other studies have used psychometric methods, investigating individuals who score high on traits indicating repression 'repressors' (e.g. Myers & Brewin, 1994). There are also a number of laboratory experiments, such as the well known series of investigations by Levinger & Clark (1961).

Note that criticisms of studies are not required.

Marking allocations

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

- (c) Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) related to eyewitness testimony (EWT).
(18 marks)

Marking criteria

For this question, **AO1** is description of procedures/findings of research studies. There have been a number of research studies on the accuracy of eyewitness testimony (EWT). Psychologists have investigated factors such as the role of arousal, and the phenomenon known as ‘weapon focus’, as well as research by Loftus and her colleagues into the retrieval processes involved in EWT (e.g. post-event information). Alternatively, **AO1** could also be an outline of explanations of why EWT is sometimes not reliable (reconstructive memory, interference, role of stereotypes, etc).

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 such research has suggested reasons *why* witnesses are sometimes inaccurate. Another approach would be to consider how knowledge and understanding gained from memory research could be used to improve the effectiveness of eyewitness testimony. For example, research into reconstructive memory and other mechanisms has suggested ways in which interview techniques can be improved (as in the cognitive interview), or evidence assessed in trials (especially where child witnesses are concerned).

Of course, strictly speaking most memory research can be related in some way to EWT. However discussions of forgetting in STM are so removed that a candidate offering such research is unlikely to provide an effective answer. However, Bartlett’s research is directly related. For example, his studies support the idea of the reconstructive nature of eyewitness testimony, and so could be credited as **AO2**.

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’.

Marking allocations

AO1: Description of psychological research related to EWT

6-5 marks	Description of psychological research related to EWT is both accurate and detailed . For example, a number of research studies are summarised accurately and/or there is a detailed account of explanations. Alternatively, one research study or theory is described in detail.
3-4 marks	Description of psychological research related to EWT is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example the procedures of a number of studies are described in detail but there is little on findings.
2-1 marks	Description of psychological research related to EWT is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example only a rudimentary outline of findings of one research study is given.
0 marks	Explanation is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may explain research in an unrelated topic) or the description is incorrect .

AO2: Evaluation of psychological research into EWT

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

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

(a) Explain what is meant by the terms secure attachment and insecure attachment. (6 marks)

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 is also content to explore and copes better with the stranger when the mother is present.

Insecure attachment can be of at least two types: resistant (ambivalent) 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

6-5 marks	Explanation of secure attachment/insecure attachment is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has explained how the behaviour of securely and insecurely attached infants differs in the SS, supported by one example in detail or a number of examples in less detail.
4-3 marks	Explanation of what is meant by secure <i>and</i> insecure attachment is limited . It is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, a reasonable account of one term is offered but only a very brief account of the other. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> secure <i>or</i> insecure attachment is accurate and detailed (i.e. partial performance).
2-1 mark	Explanation of what is meant by secure <i>and</i> insecure attachment is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, stating that secure attachment is a strong bond with the mother, while insecure is not. Alternatively, description of <i>either</i> secure <i>or</i> insecure attachment is generally accurate but less detailed (i.e. partial performance).
0 marks	Explanation of what is meant by secure <i>and</i> insecure attachment is inappropriate or the description is incorrect .

(b) Outline the findings **and/or** conclusions of research into the effects of day care on cognitive development. (6 marks)

Marking criteria

There are numerous studies that could be used as a basis for an answer to this question. Anderson's studies in Sweden (e.g. 1992) are widely quoted. It was found that so long as day care is of high quality, it is not bad for children and can even make a positive contribution to their later intellectual (and social) development. There are also studies of enrichment programmes, such as Project Head Start. Initial results of the study were encouraging and showed that the average IQ was raised by 10 points. Later studies, including similar programmes involving nursery schooling, suggested that some gains persist even into adolescence, with better academic performance (e.g. Haskins, 1989, Schweinhart *et al*, 1993).

Studies have tended to conclude that good quality nursery provision can make a difference for disadvantaged children with poor and/or ill-educated parents. The gains are not guaranteed, however, and it is necessary to maintain programmes for longer than the initial 'head start' to consolidate children's progress.

Although evaluation is not required, candidates who qualify conclusions should be given credit.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Description of the procedures <i>and</i> findings of one study into the effects of day care on cognitive development is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has summarised findings/conclusions of a range of studies or a more restricted range in some detail.
4-3 marks	Description of the findings/conclusions of the effects of day care on cognitive development is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, a restricted range of studies is summarised.
2-1 marks	Description of findings/conclusions of the effects of day care on cognitive development is basic , lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example the findings of only one study is referred to with little elaboration.
0 marks	The description is inappropriate (e.g. the candidate has described a study of institutionalisation) or the description is incorrect .

(c) Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) into privation.

(18 marks)

Marking criteria

AO1 will be an outline of research (theories and/or studies) on privation. Research focused on privation includes that of Rutter (1970) and Tizard & Hodges (1989) and describing the procedures and findings of such studies would be an appropriate answer to the question. Studies of extreme privation are also acceptable (e.g. Genie) but the candidates who focus on the circumstances of the privation (“Genie was tied to a potty chair... etc”) are unlikely to gain much credit. There are also many studies of the effects of deprivation (many of these are concerned with maternal deprivation) which were undertaken when the distinction between privation and deprivation was not clearly made. If the candidate describes one of these it should be judged on its merits. Thus, if what is being studied is actually privation (for example lack of a caregiver) then this can be credited but not if the effects of separation are being investigated (e.g. Robertson & Robertson). The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow’s studies are acceptable.

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

Alternatively, candidates may focus on the problems of conducting research into privation, for example the difficulties in interpreting case studies. The implication here would be that flawed studies do not help us understand the problem.

Research does not need to be confined to social development.

Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of research into the effects of privation

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

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

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

4

Total for this question: 30 marks(a) Outline effects of deprivation/separation in humans. (6 marks)**Marking criteria**

The question specifically asks for effects of deprivation/separation (i.e. *loss*) not privation (i.e. *lack*). Studies of deprivation are mainly associated with Bowlby's MDH. He believed that there was a critical period for attachment formation. If a *separation* occurs between mother and infant within the first few years of the child's life, the bond would be irreversibly broken, leading to severe emotional consequences for the infant in later life. He referred to this breaking of the bond as maternal deprivation. Bowlby claimed that maternal deprivation had some or all of the following consequences: aggressiveness, depression, delinquency, dependency anxiety, dwarfism affectionless psychopathy, intellectual retardation and social maladjustment.

Some studies have focused on short-term effects (e.g. Robertson & Robertson, 1969) and a description of the PDD would therefore be acceptable. Covering both ST and LT effects will necessarily result in less depth. The answer must look at effects on humans. In any case, Harlow's studies are clearly investigating the effects of privation, and are therefore *not* acceptable even without this limitation. Because the Strange Situation involves separation, it is allowable to talk about its effects.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Outline of effects of deprivation/separation is both accurate and detailed along the lines suggested in the marking criteria. For example a number of relevant effects are identified or a more restricted range in more detail.
4-3 marks	Outline of effects of deprivation/separation is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, only one effect is mentioned but in some detail.
2-1 marks	Outline of effects of deprivation/separation is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, one or two effects are identified but not explained.
0 marks	The outline is inappropriate (for example not related to deprivation) or the description is incorrect .

- | |
|---|
| (b) Outline the procedures of one study in which individual differences in attachment have been investigated and give one criticism of this study
<i>(3 marks + 3 marks)</i> |
|---|

Marking criteria

Most candidates will be familiar with the fact that Ainsworth and Bell (1970) have measured individual differences in attachment in a controlled way. Although a number of separate studies were conducted using their ‘Strange Situation’ test, a generic account of the methodology is acceptable. The procedure involved observing babies’ reactions to being separated from their mothers and in the Strange Situation. This technique assessed separation and stranger anxiety, infant’s willingness to explore, and reunion behaviour. Other studies could be made relevant, including Schaffer & Emerson (1964), provided that the aspects of the study that identify *differences* in attachment behaviour are clearly identified. With the same proviso, it should also be possible to use cross-cultural studies and non-human animal research (such as Harlow’s monkeys).

Criticisms will depend on the study chosen, however in the case of the strange situation methodology, it has been criticised as lacking ecological validity, since it is carried out under controlled conditions and is not a naturalistic observation. The laboratory situation could induce a degree of stress in the infant that it would not normally experience at home. The procedure has also been criticised for being limited in terms of the amount of information that is gathered (in contrast to less structured observational methods) and for not taking sufficiently into account the mother’s behaviour. It has also been suggested that the pattern of response is not consistent and can vary as family circumstances change, particularly the degree of stress that mothers are subjected to.

Marking allocations

For the outline of procedures

3 marks	Outline of the procedures of one study that has investigated individual differences in attachment is both accurate and detailed . For example a clear account of the strange situation methodology is given.
2 marks	Outline of the procedures of one study that has investigated individual differences in attachment generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example important aspects of the procedures are not provided.
1 mark	Outline of the procedures of one study that has investigated individual differences in attachment is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example the strange situation is identified as the basic procedure.
0 marks	Outline of the procedures of one study that has investigated individual differences in attachment is inappropriate (for example, the study may be on deprivation or privation) or the description is incorrect .

For the criticism

3 marks	Statement of criticism is both accurate and detailed demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one limitation or strength of the study. For example, giving a clear account of why using a controlled situation might be a problem.
2 marks	Statement of criticism is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the candidate may fail to be clear about how the criticism is a problem in this study.
1 mark	Statement of criticism is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . The candidate may simply identify/state the criticism (e.g. ‘the study lacks validity’)
0 marks	Answer is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may offer criticism of a study that is not relevant) or the criticism, if directed at an appropriate study is incorrect .

(c) “In contrast to learning theories of attachment, Bowlby’s theory suggests that there may be an innate basis to attachment.”

Outline and evaluate **two** explanations of attachment.

(18 marks)

Marking criteria

For this question **AO1** will be an outline of explanations of attachment. **AO2** will be an evaluation of these explanations. This could be achieved by, for example, comparing and contrasting two explanations, considering the extent to which they are supported by evidence or discussing practical implications. The quotation is intended to help candidates focus their answers, but there is no necessity for them to refer to it directly.

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

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

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

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

Although only two explanations are required, candidates may introduce alternative explanations of attachment as a form of commentary/evaluation for example by comparing and contrasting strengths and weaknesses. However, the degree to which candidates use this material as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply *describing* alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for **AO2**. Candidates who offer no commentary may still be judged to have selected appropriate material and thus commentary can be described as ‘just discernible’.

Marking allocations**AO1:** Outline of two explanations of attachment

6-5 marks	Outline of two psychological explanations of attachment is both accurate and detailed . For example the candidate may outline Bowlby' theory of attachment and 'cupboard love' (learning/Freud) in less detail.
4-3 marks	Outline of two psychological explanations of attachment is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example the idea of cupboard love theory is clearly outlined with brief reference to specific explanations. <i>Only one explanation of attachment is given (i.e. partial performance.) but this is accurate and detailed.</i>
2-1 marks	Outline of two psychological explanations of attachment is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed For example two explanations are identified but not outlined. <i>Partial performance is generally accurate and/or less detailed.</i>
0 marks	The outline is inappropriate (the candidate has described the strange situation methodology) or the description is incorrect .

AO2: Evaluation of two explanations

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

Assessment Grid

Question	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	