



## General Certificate of Education

# Psychology 5181/6181 *Specification A*

*PYA1 Cognitive and Developmental Psychology*

## Mark Scheme

*2006 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.

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

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

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO**

<b>AO1</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>AO2</b>	<p>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.</p>

**SECTION A: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY**

**1 (a)** Outline findings of memory research into eyewitness testimony (eg Loftus).

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Loftus’s empirical studies are most likely to be cited here, although other studies may also be used. Loftus &amp; Palmer (1974) found that the mean speed estimates for 5 groups shown a film of a traffic accident changed depending on the verb used in a ‘critical’ question (‘smashed’ elicited average estimates of 40.8 mph whereas for ‘contacted’ the average speed estimated was 31.8 mph). A follow up study found that participants in the ‘smashed’ condition were more likely to give higher speeds and also more likely to think they had seen broken glass when in fact there was not broken glass. Loftus &amp; Zanni (1975) found that when participants were asked the question ‘did you see the broken headlight?’ they were more likely to answer ‘yes’ than when they were asked ‘did you see a broken headlight?’</p> <p>Candidates may also cite Allport and Postman’s findings (1947) that participants shown a picture of a white and a black man arguing on a subway train usually remembered the open razor being in the black man’s hand rather than the white man’s. Other appropriate studies include Kebbel and Wagstaff (1999) into eyewitnesses’ descriptive accuracy or the work of Yuille and Cutshall (1986) on post-event information in real life.</p> <p>Bartlett’s research on the reconstructive nature of memory is unlikely to be creditworthy as it is not research into eyewitness testimony (EWT).</p> <p>Breadth/depth may be an issue in answers to this question. Answers that describe the findings of one study into EWT in detail are as acceptable as those, which describe the findings of more research, but in less detail.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the findings of memory research into EWT that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of the findings of a study such as Loftus and Palmer’s 1974 into EWT, or range of findings from more than one study.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of the findings of memory research into EWT that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly cites the findings of some research into EWT, but the outline is less detailed.</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of the findings of memory research into EWT that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, appropriate research is identified but the account of findings is less than accurate.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of the findings of research into eyewitness testimony.</p>

1 (b) Describe **one** alternative to the multi-store model of memory.

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>Candidates might describe, for example, the Working Memory model (WM) or Levels of Processing (LOP) as alternatives to the Multi-store model (MSM). Working Memory is an alternative view of short-term memory (STM) that temporarily holds and manipulates information as we perform cognitive tasks (Baddeley &amp; Hitch, 1974). According to Baddeley and Hitch, WM is not a unitary system. Candidates 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 (LTM). Candidates may offer an annotated diagram and potentially this could attract full marks.</p> <p>If the Levels of Processing model is chosen, Craik &amp; Lockhart (1972) focused on how information is encoded and processed; they assumed that attentional and perceptual processes operating at the time of learning, rather than storage location, influence what is stored in LTM. Information is processed at different levels from shallow to deep. They also emphasised the difference between maintenance and elaborative rehearsal.</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> <p>If more than one alternative is offered, examiners should mark both and credit the better/best one.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>5-4</b></p> <p><b>3-2</b></p> <p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of an alternative to the MSM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of the processes and structures of WM or the processes involved in the Levels of Processing model.</p> <p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of an alternative to the MSM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies an acceptable alternative, but provides only a brief account of its structures and/or processes.</p> <p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of an alternative to the MSM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate correctly identifies an acceptable alternative, but provides a very basic account of its structures and/or processes.</p> <p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a description which is very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of an alternative to the multi-store model of memory.</p>

**1 (c)** Describe and evaluate **two** explanations of forgetting in long-term memory (LTM).

*(18 marks)*

<p><b>Marking Criteria</b></p>	
<p><b>AO1</b> criteria are satisfied by an account of two explanations of forgetting in LTM.</p> <p><b>AO2</b> criteria are likely to be satisfied by an evaluation of the findings, studies and/or theories which relate to forgetting in LTM. Please note that for the top band of AO2 the candidate must make the relevance of material explicit (otherwise it will not be effective). If a criticism is repeated, this would be an example of basic commentary.</p> <p>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 (eg decay and interference) can occur in both STM and LTM, others (eg displacement) are normally considered to be STM mechanisms, so would not be relevant for this question. Note that two explanations are required; candidates who offer only one will fall under the partial performance criteria.</p> <p>The evaluation will depend on the nature of the explanations, but might include the extent to which the explanations are supported by research studies, or how far the explanations have validity.</p>	<p>For example, in evaluation of Trace Decay theory, candidates might suggest that there are many studies relating to decay (eg the classic work of Jenkins and Dallenbach, 1924) but there are many confounding effects with much of this work. It might be concluded that there is little direct support for Trace Decay theory.</p> <p>There is a significant amount of work on repression and emotional factors in forgetting, and in commentary or evaluation, candidates might also include its relevance to false memory syndrome, for example by referring to the work of Ceci (1995).</p> <p>Proactive and retroactive interference have both been demonstrated a number of times, but interference theory is slightly out of favour currently, perhaps because of its lack of application in everyday life where the precise conditions under which interference occurs in a lab are rarely replicated. In addition, Eysenck and Keane (2000) point out that interference theory is uninformative about the internal processes involved in forgetting.</p>

1 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
	<b>AO1:</b> Description of explanations.		<b>AO2:</b> Evaluation/assessment of explanations.
6	<b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of explanations of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides detailed explanations of forgetting such as trace decay and interference, explaining accurately how they work.	12-10	<b>Informed commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
5-4	<b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of explanations of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies two explanations, but only provides only a brief account of them. If only one explanation is given, it is accurate and reasonably detailed. (Max 4 marks)	9-7	<b>Reasonable commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul> If only one explanation is evaluated and commentary is informed. (Max 8 marks)
3-2	<b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of explanations of forgetting in LTM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, two explanations are identified but are not elaborated, or the elaboration of one or both of the explanations is muddled. If only one explanation is given, it is less detailed but generally accurate.	6-4	<b>Basic commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul> If only one explanation is evaluated and commentary is reasonable. (Max 5 marks)
1-0	<b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides a description which is very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of explanations of forgetting in LTM.	3-0	<b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul> If only one explanation is evaluated and commentary is basic. (Max 2 marks)

(6 marks)

2 (a) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study into the nature of short-term memory (STM).

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>For this question any study into the nature of STM would satisfy the criteria, for example, a study into duration, encoding or capacity.</p> <p>Candidates are less likely to offer a study into forgetting but as long as this clearly demonstrates the nature of STM then this is acceptable. Case studies, such as that of KF, or other work on the double dissociation between STM and LTM may be creditworthy as long as the relevance to the nature of STM is clear.</p> <p>Likely studies include those of: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miller (1956); although Miller did not himself report on any experimental work into the capacity of STM based on the idea of the ‘Magic number 7+/-2’, derivative work would be allowable. Studies of chunking in STM, such as that of Simon (1974) would also be allowable.</li> <li>• Peterson and Peterson (1959) into the duration of STM describing what has come to be known as the Brown-Peterson effect, where recall of information from STM is poor when rehearsal is prevented.</li> <li>• Conrad (1964) or Baddeley (1966) into the reliance of STM on acoustic encoding.</li> </ul> <p>The answer does not have to be equally balanced in term of both procedures and findings, given that 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. However, if only procedures or findings are offered, then this is partial performance and can attract a maximum of 4 marks.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the procedures and findings of one study into the nature of STM that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of the procedures and findings of an appropriate study into duration, forgetting, encoding or capacity.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures and findings of one study into the nature of STM that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate correctly identifies an appropriate study as defined in the marking criteria, but provides only a brief account of the procedures/findings.</p> <p>If only procedures or findings are described, they are accurate and reasonably detailed. (Max 4 marks)</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and findings of one study into the nature of STM that demonstrates some relevant knowledge, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the account of the procedures and findings of an appropriate study are muddled.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a description which is very brief/flawed or inappropriate description that demonstrates very little knowledge of the procedures and findings of a study into the nature of short-term memory. For example, an appropriate study is identified but the procedures and/or findings are not elaborated. If the candidate offers only procedures or findings, the account of either of these is basic.</p>

2 (b) Outline findings of research into reconstructive memory (eg Bartlett).

(6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>'Reconstructive memory' is the term used to mean that memory involves a process whereby available information about the event is used to reconstruct the details of the event on the basis of what 'must' have been true.</p> <p>Given that Loftus and Bartlett are mentioned by name on the specification, candidates are likely to describe either the work of Loftus &amp; Palmer (1974) or Bartlett's 'The War of the Ghosts' study.</p> <p>Candidates do not have to make a case for a study (such as that of Loftus and Palmer 1974) being relevant to reconstructive memory in order to attract credit.</p> <p>Other acceptable research includes the work of Sulin and Dooling (1974) or that of Allport and Postman (1947).</p> <p>Breadth as opposed to depth may be an issue in this question; answers that focus in less depth on a wider range of studies are as acceptable as those that focus on one study in more depth.</p>	6	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of findings of research into reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of the findings of Bartlett's study 'The War of the Ghosts' or of Elizabeth Loftus' work on reconstructive memory in Eye Witness Testimony.</p>
	5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of findings of research into reconstructive memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies a study or studies into reconstructive memory, together with a brief account of the findings of the study or studies.</p>
	3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of findings of research into reconstructive memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, an appropriate study is identified but the details of the findings are only described in a basic way.</p>
	1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or inappropriate outline that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of findings of research into reconstructive memory.</p>

2 (c) Outline and evaluate research into the role of emotional factors in memory.

(18 marks)

<p><b>Marking Criteria</b></p>	
<p><b>AO1</b> criteria are satisfied by a description of research into the role of emotional factors in memory. Examiners are reminded that the specification refers to memory in general. Answers which focus on either the enhancement of memory and/or on forgetting as a result of emotional factors are equally acceptable.</p> <p>There is a considerable amount of research which suggests that emotional factors have a role in memory. This could be research into repression - Freud's theory of repression may be offered, together with research such as that of Williams (1994) or Bradley and Baddeley (1990). Candidates may comment that the existence of posttraumatic stress disorder may in fact be evidence against repression being used to protect the ego from anxiety. Alternatively, research into false memory syndrome or into Eye Witness Testimony may be used as long as the link to emotion and to memory is made explicitly. For example, research on weapon focus may be appropriate in this context.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to flashbulb memory. This is acceptable.</p> <p>Other research may refer to the suggestion that emotional factors may improve memory eg Wagenaar's research into personal memories (1986). Candidates may also refer to mood congruity (Bower 1981) or the effects of anxiety on memory eg MacLeod and Matthews (1988).</p>	<p><b>AO2</b> criteria are likely to be satisfied by an evaluation of the procedures and/or findings of the studies and/or an evaluation of theories cited.</p> <p>Commentary may include evaluation of the reliability and validity of the research, as well as the ethics and ethical problems inherent in conducting research in this area.</p>

2 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Outline of research into the role of emotional factors in memory.</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research into the role of emotional factors in memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of relevant studies and/or theories such as those of Freud, or an accurate and detailed description of theoretical work on emotional factors in memory is provided.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of research into the role of emotional factors in memory.</p> <p><b>Informed commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of research into the role of emotional factors in memory that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies some research into emotional factors in memory (either theories or studies), but only provides a brief account of the methods/findings of the studies or of the theoretical work.</p>	9-7	<p><b>Reasonable commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of research into the role of emotional factors in memory that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, theoretical work on repression or similar is identified but not elaborated, or studies are identified but described in a very basic fashion.</p>	6-4	<p><b>Basic commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of research into the role of emotional factors in memory.</p>	3-0	<p><b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul>

**SECTION B: DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**3 (a)** Explain what is meant by the terms *secure attachment* and *insecure attachment*.

(6 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>In order to explain the two terms candidates may refer to Ainsworth’s findings. Using the Strange Situation, she found that in the case of secure attachment the infant actively seeks and maintains proximity with the caregiver, especially in the ‘reunion’ episodes; the infant may (or may not) be distressed at the mother’s absence during the separation episodes, but if so, is rapidly reassured on her return. The infant also is content to explore and copes better with the stranger when the mother is present.</p>	<b>6</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of the terms secure attachment and insecure attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of Ainsworth’s secure and insecure types, including behaviour on separation, on reunion and with the stranger.</p>
<p><b>Insecure attachment</b> can be of at least two types: avoidant (type A) and resistant (type C). In resistant attachment, the infant is insecure in the presence of the caregiver and very distressed when the caregiver leaves. The infant resists contact with the caregiver on reunion and is wary of the stranger. In avoidant attachment, the infant does not seek contact with the caregiver and shows little distress on separation. The infant avoids contact with the caregiver on return. The infant treats the stranger in a similar way to the caregiver, often avoiding him or her. 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>	<b>5-4</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of the terms secure attachment and insecure attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies the basic features of secure and insecure attachments, but only provides a brief account of the infant’s behaviours. If only one term is explained, this is accurate and reasonably detailed. (Max 4 marks)</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>	<b>3-2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic explanation of secure attachment and insecure attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, insecure attachments are identified but not elaborated, or the two types are confused. If only one term is explained, this is less detailed but generally accurate.</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.  It should be noted that this question does not require candidates to provide answers which are equally balanced between descriptions of secure and insecure attachments, although both must be addressed or the partial performance criteria will come into play.</p>	<b>1-0</b>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an explanation which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate explanation that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of the terms secure attachment and insecure attachment.</p>

**3 (b)** Outline **one** explanation of attachment (eg learning theory, Bowlby’s theory).

(6 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Bowlby’s theory of attachment focuses on attachment being an innate and adaptive process, and the role of social releasers is emphasised. Candidates who focus on other aspects of Bowlby’s work such as his Maternal Deprivation Hypothesis, without linking it to his theory of attachment, will find that their work does not attract much credit.</p> <p>Learning theories of attachment focus on the processes of operant and classical conditioning. Generic descriptions of these processes which are not rooted in the context of attachment will not attract much credit.</p> <p>The examples given in the question are only examples and other theories of attachment are equally as acceptable, such as Freud’s theory or social learning theory of attachment. However, it should be noted that a general description of Freudian theory (such as a detailed account of the psychosexual stages without reference to attachment) is unlikely to attract much credit. Social learning theories of attachment (eg Hay and Vespo, 1988) may be outlined, but candidates must focus on attachment, for example, by talking about modelling and direct instruction (often by parents) in relation to attachment behaviour. Some candidates may present cupboard love as one explanation of attachment.</p> <p>Work on features such as caregiver sensitivity (Ainsworth) may also be used as long as the focus of the answer is on an explanation of attachment.</p> <p>A description of the stages of attachment (for example, Schaffer) is unlikely to attract much credit unless the candidate is clearly explaining <i>why</i> they go through the stages.</p> <p>If more than one explanation is given, both/all should be marked and the better/best one credited.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one explanation of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of Bowlby’s explanation.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of one explanation of attachment that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies an appropriate explanation, but provides only a brief account of the processes involved in it.</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of one explanation of attachment that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, an outline of Bowlby’s explanation is given, but the account is basic and muddled.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of an explanation. For example, one explanation is identified but not elaborated.</p>

- 3 (c) ‘Some children recover well from privation, but others hardly recover at all.’  
 Outline research into the effects of privation and consider the extent to which the effects of privation can be reversed. (18 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	
<p><b>AO1</b> criteria are likely to be satisfied by an outline of research into the effects of privation.</p> <p><b>AO2</b> criteria are likely to be satisfied by a consideration of the extent to which the effects are reversible.</p> <p>For AO1, the studies most likely to be used are case studies of children raised in extreme isolation such as Isabelle, the Czech twins and Genie, or longitudinal studies of children in institutional care, such as the study of Tizard and Hodges, or Rutter’s study of Romanian orphans. The earlier studies of Skodak and Skeels (1949) or Spitz and Wolf (1946) may also be cited.</p> <p>Studies generally show either that some children never really recover from their early experiences or that other children show remarkable recovery, and that there are many variables that affect the final outcome.</p> <p>Animal studies, such as that of Harlow’s monkeys, may be creditworthy as long as they are clearly relevant to the question.</p>	<p>For AO2, candidates may make the point that whether or not children recover from the effects of privation may depend on a number of complex and often interacting factors. In relation to case studies, candidates may mention the amount of time spent in isolation, some unique differences in the individual or the quality of the care subsequent to the initial privation. Candidates may also refer to the lack of reliability and the retrospective nature of the case history approach as commentary on reversibility. In relation to longitudinal studies, candidates may refer to the quality of care, individual differences within the group studies, to sample attrition and the hypothesized reasons for dropout. Candidates may also mention the fact that total privation is rarely experienced in longitudinal studies, and that children may have received peer support (eg the study of Freud and Dann 1951). Of course, institutional care may involve more than emotional deprivation, and physical or cognitive underdevelopment may be an issue. Another issue which is likely to be mentioned is that of the quality of care subsequent to the privation experience.</p> <p>Candidates may point out that the issues are complex ones and that there may be interactions going on, and that it is not possible to say either that total recovery always does or always does not take place.</p> <p>A general evaluation of research into privation is likely to attract only limited credit as basic commentary.</p> <p>As is evident from the above, research into privation may be credited as AO1 or AO2, depending on the way in which the material is used.</p>

3 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Description of research evidence.</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research into the effects of privatisation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of research into institutionalised children and/or case studies.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of research evidence.</p> <p><b>Informed commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of research into the effects of privatisation that demonstrates knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies appropriate research, but provides only a brief account of the findings.</p>	9-7	<p><b>Reasonable commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of research into the effects of privatisation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, relevant research is identified but not elaborated.</p>	6-4	<p><b>Basic commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of research into the effects of privatisation.</p>	3-0	<p><b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible.</li> </ul>

(6 marks)

4 (a) Outline evidence supporting Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis.

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>For this question, evidence is likely to include the findings of studies which show that the effects of deprivation from the mother or ‘permanent mother substitute’ have severe and long-lasting effects.</p> <p>The most likely study to be included is Bowlby’s own study ‘44 Juvenile thieves’ (1944). Bowlby compared 44 juvenile thieves who had been referred to a child guidance clinic with 44 children who had emotional problems (the control group). Bowlby diagnosed 14 of the thieves as affectionless psychopaths. Information was collected about the children’s early life experiences, including early separations. Bowlby’s findings were that most of the affectionless thieves had experienced frequent early separations from their mothers, whereas only 5 out of the other 30 thieves had. Almost none of the control group had experienced frequent early separation, but 39% of all the thieves HAD experienced early separations. Bowlby concluded that there was a link between early separation from the mother/mother substitute and becoming a thief, and also suggested that early separations were a cause of affectionless psychopathy.</p> <p>Other studies may also be used; for example, Bowlby’s study (1956) on a group of children with TB, or more recent work such as that of Bohman and Sigvardsson (1979) in Sweden could be outlined. The Spitz and Wolf (1946) study of institutionalised children could also be used.</p> <p>Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis (MDH) was developed well before his attachment theory – his attachment theory came out of it – candidates who refer to his theory of attachment may only receive credit insofar as the evidence they cite is related to his maternal deprivation hypothesis.</p> <p>Breadth as opposed to depth may be an issue in this question; answers that focus in less depth on a wider range of evidence are as acceptable as those that focus on (say) only one study but in more depth.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of evidence supporting Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of research such as that of Bowlby’s on 44 juvenile thieves.</p>
	<p><b>5-4</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of evidence supporting Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies some appropriate evidence, and provides only a brief account of findings.</p>
	<p><b>3-2</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of evidence supporting Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled.</p>
	<p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the evidence supporting Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis. For example, one or more studies is identified but not elaborated.</p>

4 (b) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study of cross-cultural variations in attachments.

(6 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Most of the relevant studies that could be used in an answer to this question have used the Strange Situation methodology. For the procedures, describing Ainsworth's technique/procedures could be appropriate in itself without any reference to different cultural settings. Of course, in relation to the findings some reference to the cross-cultural nature of the research is essential.</p>	<b>6</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of cross-cultural variations in attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of the procedures and findings of one of the meta-analyses or of a study done in another culture.</p>
<p>Some candidates may also explain how cross-cultural comparisons are made. While it could be argued that a study is only cross-cultural when it explicitly compares two or more cultures (eg the Van Ijzendoorn meta-analysis), such studies are actually quite rare in this area. A less restrictive definition of cross-cultural where another (usually, but not always, non-Western) culture is studied is therefore allowable (eg Ainsworth's Ganda project, Miyake et al 1985 study in Japan or the Grossman et al 1981 study in Germany).</p>	<b>5-4</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of cross-cultural variations in attachments that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate correctly identifies a study of cross-cultural variations in attachments, but only provides a brief account of the procedures and/or findings, or only procedures or findings are described.</p>
<p>Meta-analyses such as Van Ijzendoorn &amp; Kroonenberg (1988) can count as studies, in which case the candidate could describe how studies were selected and results were compared, and what the findings were.</p>	<b>3-2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of cross-cultural variations in attachments that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the procedures and findings are identified but not elaborated.</p>
	<b>1-0</b>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides a description which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate description that demonstrates very little knowledge of the procedures and findings of a study of cross-cultural variations in attachments.</p>

4 (c) Discuss research into the effects of day care on children’s social **and/or** cognitive development.

(18 marks)

**Marking Criteria**

**AO1** criteria are satisfied by description of research findings including explanations into the effects of day care.

**AO2** criteria are satisfied by an evaluation of this research: its consequences, implications and conclusions about whether day care has a beneficial effect, or a more detrimental one. Better candidates might look at some interactions between social and cognitive effects.

There are a variety of studies that could be used as a basis for an answer to this question. However, as the question asks for research, more theoretical work, such as that derived from Bowlby’s, may also be creditworthy as long as it is made relevant to day care.

The findings of some studies (eg Belsky, 1986, 1990) suggest the conclusion that prolonged daily separation of young children from their mothers is detrimental to their development.

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

As far as social development is concerned, children who attend day care are often more self-sufficient and more independent of parents, have better relationships with peers and are more knowledgeable about the world and social relationships (eg the NICHD study).

Egeland and Hiester (1995) found an interaction effect when they looked at security/insecurity of attachment and the effects of daycare: daycare seemed to have a negative effect for insecure children and a more positive influence for secure children, perhaps because they did not require the extra attention. These effects did not seem to be long lasting, however.

Studies focusing on adoption or privation are not daycare and not creditworthy.

Examiners are reminded that the question asks for social **and/or** cognitive effects. Answers from candidates who answer just on social or cognitive effects are as acceptable as those which do both.

4 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Description of research.</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into day care that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of studies (or other research) and their findings in relation to the cognitive and/or social effects.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of research.</p> <p><b>Informed commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into day care that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate correctly identifies research, but only provides a brief account of the effects of day care on cognitive and/or social development.</p>	9-7	<p><b>Reasonable commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary.</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of research into day care that demonstrates some knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, relevant theoretical or empirical research is identified but not elaborated.</p>	6-4	<p><b>Basic commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary.</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material.</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides a description which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate description that demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding of research into day care.</p>	3-0	<p><b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation absent or just discernible.</li> </ul>

---

**Assessment Grid**

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