



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181/6181 *Specification A*

Unit 1 PYA1

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June 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.

PYA1

UNIT 1 (PYA1)

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)

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

1**Total for this question: 30 marks**

- | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (a) Outline one explanation of forgetting in long-term memory (LTM) and give one criticism of this explanation.
<i>(3 marks + 3 marks)</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Marking criteria

There are numerous explanations of forgetting in LTM; however, decay, interference, retrieval failure, state/context dependent, and emotional factors (repression) are the most likely choices. While some explanations (e.g. decay and interference) can occur in both short-term memory (STM) and LTM, others (e.g. displacement) are normally considered to be STM mechanisms, so would not be relevant for this question.

Criticisms will depend on the nature of the explanation, but might include the extent to which the explanation is supported by research studies, or how far the explanation has validity. Interference, for example, is relatively easy to demonstrate in the laboratory, but not in real life. Note: that criticisms can be positive, for example a study that supports the explanation. If the explanation is incorrect, the criticism cannot attract credit.

Marking allocations

For the outline:

3 marks	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is both accurate and detailed . For example, a clear definition of interference is provided together with a distinction between retro-and proactive interference.
2 marks	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, different types of interference may not be distinguished, and/or appropriate examples are not provided.
1 mark	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, an explanation is named but not elaborated.
0 marks	Outline of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is inappropriate (for example, the explanation may be of forgetting in STM or about some other aspect of memory research) or the description is incorrect .

For the criticism:

3 marks	Statement of criticism of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is both accurate and detailed , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one strength or limitation of the explanation (for example explaining how it is difficult to test repression experimentally).
2 marks	Statement of criticism of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the candidate might say that studies on interference lack ecological validity because they are conducted in the laboratory.
1 mark	Statement of criticism of one explanation of forgetting in LTM is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, stating that the explanation lacks empirical support without further explanation.
0 marks	Answer is inappropriate , i.e. not directed at the explanation outlined, or the criticism is incorrect .

(b) Describe the procedures of **one** study by Loftus of eyewitness testimony and give **one** criticism of this study. (3 marks +3 marks)

Marking criteria

There are many studies of eye witness testimony (EWT), for example, Loftus showed the effect of post-event information. Other investigations have looked at factors such as the role of arousal, and the phenomenon known as ‘weapon focus’. Given the references in the specification to reconstructive memory as an example of EWT, this would make a study such as Bartlett’s War of the Ghosts study acceptable.

In most studies, procedures have involved some kind of experimental manipulation in a variety of settings, but are mostly laboratory based. This may trigger the obvious criticism that the studies could lack ecological validity. This point is acceptable, but must be explained or justified for full credit. Positive ‘criticisms’ are most welcome, especially as most of the research studies appear to be well-constructed and properly controlled.

Note that if an inappropriate study is given, then no marks can be awarded for the criticism. In other words the criticism must be linked to the study.

Marking allocations

For the outline:

3 marks	Description of procedures of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT 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	Description of procedures of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT 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.
1 mark	Description of procedures of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate might just state that the study involved presentation of a film about a car crash.
0 marks	Description of procedures of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may only cover findings/conclusions) or the description is incorrect .

For the criticism:

3 marks	Statement of criticism of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT is both accurate and detailed , demonstrating well-founded knowledge of one strength or one limitation of the study. For example, the candidate might explain how the nature of the sample was restricted and the implications this has for the validity of the research.
2 marks	Statement of criticism of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the nature of the criticism might be identified but the implications are not fully elaborated.
1 mark	Statement of criticism of one study by Loftus that has investigated EWT is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate might merely identify the criticism, stating that ‘The sample was just students’ or ‘The study took place in a laboratory and therefore lacks EV.’
0 marks	Answer is inappropriate , or the criticism is incorrect .

(c) Outline and evaluate research (theories and/or studies) into the nature of short-term memory (e.g. encoding, capacity, duration). (18 marks)

Marking criteria

For this question candidates may outline (**AO1**) and evaluate (**AO2**) any aspect of research into short-term memory (STM), including the suggestions given in the question. The approach taken could involve either breadth (a number of aspects/studies/theories) or depth (selected research in detail). However, it is unlikely that sufficient material could be drawn from just one study, particularly **AO2**. On the other hand, answers that try to cover too much ground may also lack quality in the evaluation of research.

There are a wide range of studies into the capacity of STM, such as those involving tests of digit span. Miller (1956) suggested that findings of such studies could be summarised in terms of the number 7, plus or minus 2 items (7 ± 2). However, various other studies, including those by Miller himself, have found that the capacity of STM can be increased by grouping items together (chunking), and that this could itself be affected by a number of factors.

The most widely known study into the duration of STM is probably that of Peterson & Peterson (1959): the so called ‘trigrams’ study. The findings of this study were that fewer than 10% of trigrams were recalled after 18 secs and therefore that information decays rapidly from STM if rehearsal is prevented. Other studies have investigated factors that affect duration, including whether participants make a deliberate effort to recall, and also whether the information can be chunked.

Coding has been investigated by Conrad (e.g. 1964), Baddeley (e.g. 1966) and Shulman (1970) (cited in Gross, McIlveen & Coolican, 2000). The latter study is interesting in that it suggests that the neat distinction between visual/auditory coding in STM, and semantic in LTM, may be an oversimplification. This last point should remind examiners that although candidates may sometimes have to make some reference to LTM in order to make points of contrast, the focus of the essay must be on STM.

Discussion focused on the different models of STM (e.g. working memory) is another entirely acceptable approach to the question.

Research (theories and/or studies) into forgetting – as relevant to STM- may also be creditworthy.

Marking allocations

AO1: Description of research into STM

6-5 marks	Outline description of research into STM is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has provided an account of one model of STM and explained the nature of duration/capacity/encoding processes in STM. Alternatively, the candidate has focused on one or more studies in detail.
4-3 marks	Outline description of research into STM is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, a brief outline of STM is given with an account of the procedures and findings of one study into encoding in STM.
2-1 marks	Outline description of research into STM is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, one characteristic of STM and the findings of one study are briefly mentioned ('According to Miller the capacity of STM was found to be 7 ± 2 .').
0 marks	The outline is inappropriate (e.g. the candidate has described research into LTM) or the description is incorrect .

AO2: Evaluation of research into STM

12-11 marks	There is an informed commentary on research into 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 research into 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 research into 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 research into 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 research into STM and rudimentary analysis of relevant psychological material. There is minimal interpretation of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on research into STM is just discernible . 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) (i) Explain what is meant by flashbulb memories.	(3 marks)
(ii) Describe the procedures of one study of flashbulb memories.	(3 marks)

Marking criteria

Flashbulb memories (FM) 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 or for 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.

Studies of flashbulb memories often take advantage of such significant historical events, for example the Challenger disaster (McCloskey et al., 1998), and usually involve some form of survey method. However, some laboratory studies have looked at possible mechanisms, e.g. by blocking emotional arousal using drugs and seeing if this affects the memory for emotionally charged information (Cahil et al, 1994). Whatever type of study is chosen, it must be clearly identifiable as a piece of published research; therefore excluding anecdotal accounts of personal reactions to significant events.

Marking allocations

Part (i)

3 marks	Explanation of what is meant by FM is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate explains how FMs are detailed memories associated with significant events and gives an appropriate example(s).
2 marks	Explanation of what is meant by FM is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example the candidate may only provide an example.
1 mark	Explanation of what is meant by FM is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate may simply state FM are associated with emotional events.
0 marks	Explanation of what is meant by FM is inappropriate (for example, the explanation may be of repression) or the description is incorrect .

Part (ii)

3 marks	Description of the procedures of one study of FM is both accurate and detailed . For example, an account of the Challenger study is given, briefly explaining the nature of the participants, and how results were obtained.
2 marks	Description of the procedures of one study of FM is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the candidate might not explain how recall was assessed.
1 mark	Description of the procedures of one study of FM is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate may just say that the study involved peoples' memories of the death of JFK.
0 marks	Description of the procedures of one study of FM is inappropriate or the description is incorrect .

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

(6 marks)

Marking criteria

Many of Freud’s case studies showed evidence of repression. Clinical studies into recovered memories could provide appropriate examples.

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 although criticisms of studies are not required, it would be unfair not to credit statements that qualify conclusions such as: ‘Although the findings of case studies are difficult to validate, the conclusion of the study was...’.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Description of the findings and conclusions of one study of repression is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has covered both findings and conclusions of a clearly identifiable case study or experiment study on repression.
4-3 marks	Description of the findings and conclusions 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 conclusions. Alternatively, description of either findings or conclusions of the study is accurate and detailed (<i>i.e. partial performance</i>).
2-1 marks	Description of the findings and conclusions of a study of repression is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed. Description of either the findings or conclusions of the study is generally accurate and/or less detailed (<i>i.e. partial performance</i>).
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 **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory (e.g. working memory, levels of processing). (18 marks)

Marking criteria

In this question **AO1** is an outline of the alternative model. **AO2** is an evaluation of the model. 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 & Hitch, 1974). They may go on to describe the three components of the working memory: phonological loop, visuospatial sketch pad, and the central executive that integrates information from the previous two systems as well as from long-term memory (LTM).

In terms of evaluation of the WM model, candidates might identify some of the weaknesses inherent in the multi-store model (MSM) view of STM that the WM model overcomes (i.e. using the MSM for contrast). Alternatively they could focus on research evidence. Examples of such research supporting the WM model are: the unattended speech effect (retrieval of visually presented material such as numbers can be disrupted by the simultaneous presentation of spoken words), and articulatory suppression (performance on a digit span task is significantly impaired when the participant is asked to utter a stream of irrelevant sounds). There is also some physiological evidence from brain scan studies.

If the levels of processing model (LOP) is chosen, **AO2** could also involve contrasting the model with the MSM. Thus Craik & Lockhart (1972) assumed that attentional and perceptual processes operating at the time of learning, rather than storage location, influence what is stored in LTM, and that their model could account for certain evidence on memory better than the MSM. This is certainly true of what we know of rehearsal (elaborative rehearsal is much more effective than maintenance rehearsal, for example) but other empirical evidence does not always support the LOP approach. In terms of negative criticisms of the model, while the basic idea of depth of processing is a reasonable one, the approach as a whole is regarded as being oversimplified. As a consequence, other factors such as elaboration and distinctiveness, rather than depth of processing, have had to be proposed. It could also be pointed out that it is difficult to operationalise depth of processing in studies, principally because the definition of depth is rather circular. Furthermore, it is usually suggested that the LOP approach describes rather better than it predicts.

In the event that more than one alternative is discussed, then each should be marked and the highest mark awarded for the combined **AO1** and **AO2**. However, examiners should be alert to the fact that further models may be introduced for evaluation. If this is the case then appropriate credit should be given. For this reason, discussion of MSM can be awarded marks but only if it is used for evaluation of the alternative model (i.e. **AO2**).

Although it is likely that candidates may chose either the working memory model or the levels of processing model as the alternative, other choices such as Parallel Distributed Processing are acceptable.

Discussion of memory models is generally viewed as one of the more demanding areas of the specification, and examiners should remember that candidates normally have no more than 18 minutes to construct and write an answer to this part.

Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of the alternative model of memory

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

AO2: Evaluation of the alternative model

12-11 marks	There is an informed commentary on the alternative model of memory 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 the model 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 the model 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 the model with limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a reasonably effective manner .
4-3 marks	There is superficial commentary on the model and rudimentary analysis of relevant psychological material. There is minimal interpretation of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on the model 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) (i) Explain what is meant by the term secure attachment.	(3 marks)
(ii) Explain what is meant by the term insecure attachment.	(3 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 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 of 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

For each term:

3 marks	Explanation of secure attachment or insecure attachment is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has explained the behaviour of securely or insecurely attached infants in the SS.
2 marks	Explanation of what is meant by secure or insecure attachment is limited . It is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, the candidate identifies the behaviour as being demonstrated in the SS, but only a brief description of the infant's behaviour is offered.
1 mark	Explanation of what is meant by secure or insecure attachment is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, only one aspect of secure or insecure attachment behaviour is identified.
0 marks	Explanation of what is meant by secure or insecure attachment is inappropriate or the description is incorrect .

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

Marking criteria

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. Amongst the more widely known studies, some findings (e.g. 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 (e.g. Andersson, 1992) conclude that so long as day care is of high quality, it is not bad for children and can even make a positive contribution to their later cognitive development. These disagreements are difficult to resolve because research is still at a relatively early stage. However, tentative conclusions suggest that the intellectual development of children can actually be accelerated in adequately staffed and well-run day care centres.

Many research studies focus on both social and cognitive development in children; however, in this question, the findings/conclusions must relate to cognitive development to obtain credit.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Outline of findings and/or conclusions of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive development is both accurate and detailed .
4-3 marks	Outline of findings and/or conclusions of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive development is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, a limited account of the findings of studies is presented but not sufficiently elaborated.
2-1 marks	Outline findings and/or conclusions of research into the effects of day care on children's cognitive development is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, only a very brief account of findings of single research study is given.
0 marks	Outline is inappropriate (for example referring to procedures or not related to cognitive development) or the description is incorrect .

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

(18 marks)

Marking criteria

For this question, **AO1** is an account of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis (MDH). Bowlby believed that if a separation (or failure to make an attachment) 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. Short term effects (e.g. Robertsons) or privation could also be creditworthy.

AO2 is an evaluation of the MDH. Criticisms of Bowlby's views include the suggestion that his concept of maternal deprivation is too vague (does not distinguish between privation & deprivation, short term and long term effects, etc.) and tends to underestimate the importance of multiple attachments and individual differences.

Candidates could also consider the extent to which the MDH is supported by research studies. Such studies include early studies of institutionalised children (e.g. Goldfarb, 1943, Spitz & Wolf, 1946 and Bowlby, 1946). These early studies have been extensively criticised for their lack of rigour. Even if the findings of these early studies are valid, the data are essentially correlational. 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 just about any imaginable deprivation of children (except in very rare cases of extreme privation). Also evidence from animal studies must be interpreted very carefully when applied to humans.

There are also many studies that directly undermine the maternal deprivation hypothesis. For example, Schaffer & Emerson's (1964) results could be viewed as challenging a central assumption of Bowlby's theory: the idea of monotropy. Hodges & 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. In addition 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**.

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

Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis

6-5 marks	Outline of Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate explains why Bowlby thought that deprivation was potentially damaging and summarises the consequences for the individual.
4-3 marks	Outline of Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, only the effects of deprivation are summarised, but in reasonable detail.
2-1 marks	Outline of Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, only one or two effects of MD are described.
0 marks	The outline of research is inappropriate (the candidate has described research into Bowlby’s theory of attachment with no reference to deprivation) or the description is incorrect .

AO2: Evaluation of MDH

12-11 marks	There is an informed commentary on Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis 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 Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis 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 Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis 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 Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis with limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a reasonably effective manner .
4-3 marks	There is superficial commentary on Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis and rudimentary analysis of relevant psychological material. There is minimal interpretation of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis 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.

(a) Briefly outline one explanation of attachment (e.g. learning theory, Bowlby's theory). (6 marks)

Marking criteria

There are a number of so called 'cupboard love' explanations (which can count as one explanation for the purposes of this question). Freud believed that a baby's primary need for food became associated with the mother, who then becomes desired in her own right. Although usually opposed to each other, both psychoanalytic and behaviourist theories are agreed on this primary source of attachments. Behaviourists thus also see infants as becoming attached to those who satisfy their needs, for example for food.

In contrast, ethologists suggested 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 hit-or-miss learning. 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.

Bowlby combined both ethological and psychodynamic elements into his theory of attachment. Note, however, that candidates are unlikely to make effective use of the MDH. Other recent theories have emphasised cognitive factors, in particular the interaction between mothers and infants.

It would also be permissible to present theories that try to explain individual differences in attachment (e.g. Ainsworth's care giving sensitivity hypothesis and Kagan's temperament hypothesis).

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Outline of explanation of attachment is both accurate and detailed . For example the candidate may outline Freud's or Bowlby's theory of attachment in detail, or 'cupboard love' (i.e. Behaviourist plus Freud) in less detail.
4-3 marks	Outline of explanation of attachment is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, the idea of cupboard love theory is clearly outlined but without identifying the specific explanations on which it is based (such as Freud's).
2-1 marks	Outline of explanation of attachment is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the explanation is very briefly identified.
0 marks	The outline is inappropriate (the candidate has described Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation) or the description is incorrect .

(b) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study that has investigated the effects of privation (e.g. Hodges and Tizard). (6 marks)

Marking criteria

Research focused on privation includes that of Rutter et al. (1970) and Hodges & Tizard (1989). Studies of extreme privation are also acceptable (Genie). In the latter case, candidates must be careful when describing the procedures of the cases, since certain memorable aspects of the cases, such as being tied to a potty chair, are clearly not procedures. However, the description of the nature of Genie’s privation or her disabilities might be creditworthy as findings.

There are also many studies of the effects of (maternal) deprivation which were undertaken when the distinction between privation and deprivation was not clearly made. Many of these were, it could be argued, actually studies of privation (e.g. Goldfarb) and so could be credited. However where it is clear that it is the effects of separation that are being investigated (e.g. Robertson & Robertson) then this is not acceptable. If Bowlby’s 44 thieves is offered then a case must be made for it to be considered as a study of privation not deprivation. For example, the candidate may claim that affectionless psychopathy was the result of privation. The answer need not confine itself to human research, thus Harlow’s studies of privation are acceptable.

Marking allocations

6-5 marks	Description of the procedures and findings of one study that has investigated the effects of privation is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has covered both procedures and findings of a clearly identifiable study of effects of privation.
4-3 marks	Description of the procedures and findings of one study that has investigated the effects of privation 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 either procedures or findings of the study is accurate and detailed (<i>i.e. partial performance</i>).
2-1 marks	Description of the procedures and findings of one study that has investigated the effects of privation is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . Description of either the procedures or findings of the study is generally accurate and/or less detailed (<i>i.e. partial performance</i>).
0 marks	The description is inappropriate (e.g. the candidate has described a study of short-term separation) or the description is incorrect .

(c) “The Strange Situation has been used in many different countries to investigate attachments.”

Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) into cross-cultural variations in attachment.

(18 marks)

Marking criteria

AO1 is an outline of research (studies and/or theories) into cross cultural variations in attachment, while **AO2** is an evaluation of the studies and/or theories.

Candidates who are prompted by the quotation may refer to research studies that have studied infant attachment styles in various cultures using the Strange Situation, and appropriate evaluation could involve consideration of the limitations of this procedure. For example, in a meta-analysis of studies using this test, Van Ijzendoorn & 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. On the face of it, these findings question Ainsworth’s assumptions regarding the fixed distribution of attachment types within and across cultures. However, the differences could be explained in a number of ways. For example, the Strange Situation may not be an appropriate measure of attachment in all cultures. Also, the meaning of the ‘secure’ or ‘avoidant’ behaviour may not be the same in different cultures. Grossmann et al. (1995) suggested that in Germany insecure/avoidant behaviour reflects the effects of specific encouragement towards independence in the child, not indifference by mothers.

Despite problems of interpretation, most candidates may probably conclude that there is evidence for significant cross-cultural variations. However, some informed answers may 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 otherwise than a universal phenomenon. Tronick (1992) and his colleagues studied communal patterns of child-rearing in Zaire within a pygmy culture called the Efe, finding that central attachments with the mother were still formed.

An account of the Strange Situation methodology with no reference to its use in more than one culture is not sufficient for this question.

Marking allocations

AO1: Outline of research into cross cultural variations in attachment

6-5 marks	Outline of research into cross cultural variations in attachment is both accurate and detailed . For example, a range of relevant studies are summarised or one study is presented in detail.
4-3 marks	Outline of research into cross cultural variations in attachment is limited . It is generally accurate and/or less detailed . For example, one or more studies are briefly summarised.
2-1 marks	Outline of research into cross cultural variations in attachment is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, only one study is referred to, with little or no elaboration.
0 marks	The outline of research is inappropriate (the candidate has described research which is concerned with the SS, but with no mention of cross cultural variations in attachment) or the description is incorrect .

AO2: Evaluation of research into cross cultural variations in attachment

12-11 marks	There is an informed commentary on research into cross cultural variations in 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 research into cross cultural variations in 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 research into cross cultural variations in attachment 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 cross cultural variations in attachment 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 cross cultural variations in attachment and rudimentary analysis of relevant psychological material. There is minimal interpretation of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on research into cross cultural variations in 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.
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 Q.1	18	12	30
2 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
Total for Q.2	18	12	30
3 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
Total for Q.3	18	12	30
4 (a)	6		6
(b)	6		6
(c)	6	12	18
Total for Q.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	