

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO1 = 3]

3 marks for a clear, coherent description with some detail using appropriate terminology.

2 marks for a description which lacks detail.

1 mark for a limited/muddled description.

Possible content:

- Bowlby's use of the term 'deprivation' – disruption of the attachment between infant and primary caregiver (mother) could result in long-term cognitive, social, and emotional difficulties for that infant
- effects on development – intellectual, emotional, social, eg affectionless psychopathy, delinquency, low IQ
- critical period for attachment is before two and half years (but risk up to 5 years) and if no substitute available
- irreversibility – consequences cannot be reversed
- continuity hypothesis/poor internal working model – there may be issues into childhood and adulthood relationships.

Credit other relevant material.

[3]

Q2.

[AO2 = 6]

| Level | Mark | Description |
|-------|------|--|
| 3 | 5-6 | Application of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis to Holly is clear, effective and generally well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of specialist terminology. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Application of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis to Holly lacks effectiveness in places. There is some lack of clarity. Specialist terminology is used appropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Application of Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis to Holly is limited/lacks effectiveness. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
| | 0 | No relevant content. |

Possible application:

- Holly may find it difficult to form relationships due to a lack of opportunity to develop an internal working model as she has lived in many different foster homes
- as Holly is adopted at 6 years old this is beyond the critical period for forming attachments
- Holly shows consequences of maternal deprivation 'disruptive in class' which could be due to poor emotional or intellectual development; low IQ – 'performed poorly on the end-of-year tests'; delinquency 'involved in a fight'
- if Holly received adequate substitute care from her foster parents she may be able to form successful relationships with her adoptive parents.

Credit other relevant information.

[6]

Q3.

[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]

| Level | Mark | Description |
|-------|-------|--|
| 4 | 13-16 | Knowledge of studies of Romanian orphans is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 9-12 | Knowledge of studies of Romanian orphans is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 5-8 | Limited knowledge of Romanian orphan studies is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-4 | Knowledge of Romanian orphan studies is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
| | 0 | No relevant content. |

Possible content:

- credit relevant background, eg fall of communist regime in Romania; banning of birth control; abandoned children 'warehoused' in extremely poor conditions; lack of physical and emotional care; very high child-to-staff ratio
- description of the procedures of research by Rutter and the ERA team, eg Rutter et al (2011) – progress of 165 Romanian adoptees matched against

- 52 British controls; emotional, social and physical development assessed at age 4, 6, 11 and 15 (most recent follow-up at ages 22–25)
- key findings – half were intellectually delayed at 4; at 11, recovery rates were related to age of adoption; those adopted after 6 months displayed a number of effects eg disinhibited attachment, quasi-autism, delayed language development, delayed intellectual development, poor physical growth
- credit details of other research, eg Zeanah et al (2005) – Bucharest early intervention project, randomised controlled trial, attachment assessed using Ainsworth's procedure, evidence of disinhibited and disorganised attachment.

Possible discussion points:

- implications for children in the care system, eg continuity of care, preference for adoption/foster care
- difficulty in generalising experience of Romanian institutions as conditions were so extreme
- implications of findings for theory – suggests critical period may be more of a sensitive period; lack of internal working model can be overcome with adequate aftercare
- lack of adult data so long-term conclusions difficult to draw
- importance of early adoption – before 6 months appears to mediate effects
- support from other studies, eg Tizard and Hodges, Quinton
- methodological issues in studies – confounding variable of sociability in adopted children (although this was controlled in the Zeanah et al study).

Credit other relevant material.

[16]

Q4.

[AO2 = 6]

| Level | Marks | Description |
|-------|-------|---|
| 3 | 5-6 | Explanation of the difference(s) between Katti's and Cema's development is explicit, clear, detailed and generally accurate, with clear application of knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies. The answer is generally coherent and specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 3-4 | There is some effective and explicit explanation of the difference(s) between Katti's and Cema's development with evidence of some application of knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies. The answer may lack clarity and/or detail in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Explanation of how Katti's development is likely to have differed from Cema's is either limited or implicit with limited application of knowledge of the Romanian orphan studies. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
| | 0 | No relevant content. |

Possible content:

- Katti was adopted at five years and therefore any effects may be more severe/long term/harder to overcome than the effects on Cema, who was adopted before six months
- delayed intellectual development/lower IQ/problems with concentration – Katti may struggle more at school than Cema/may not learn new behaviours, concepts as quickly
- impaired language and social skills – Katti may find it harder to learn her language/social skills than Cema
- Katti is less likely to be classified as securely attached than Cema
- Katti is more likely to show insecure/disinhibited/disorganised attachment than Cema: Katti may not know what counts as 'appropriate' behaviour towards strangers
- emotional development – Katti may experience more temper tantrums/show more attention seeking behaviour
- lack of internal working model – Katti may have more difficulty interacting with peers, forming close relationships, etc
- quasi-autism – Katti may have a problem understanding the meaning of social contexts, may display obsessional behaviour, etc.

Credit content that reverses the order, eg Cema is more likely to have a secure attachment. Credit other relevant content.

[6]

Q5.

[AO1 = 6 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 6]

| Level | Marks | Description |
|-------|-------|--|
| 4 | 13-16 | Knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is accurate and generally well detailed. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 9-12 | Knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Application and/or discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 5-8 | Limited knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion and/or application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-4 | Knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is very limited. Discussion and/or application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------|
| | 0 | No relevant content. |
|--|---|----------------------|

Possible content:

- idea that the absence of a mother figure will lead to poor psychological development
- concept of the critical period
- concept of deprivation – prolonged/accumulated separation from the mother figure
- consequences of deprivation – reduced intelligence/IQ; emotional problems; delinquency; affectionless psychopathy.

Credit reference to internal working model and monotropy if presented as part of maternal deprivation. Accept other valid points that relate to maternal deprivation

Possible application:

- it is likely that Ryan has experienced maternal deprivation/lack of a mother figure during the critical period, having spent his first five years in care
- Ryan is demonstrating some of the consequences of deprivation – emotional problems, ‘difficult relationship’ with parents and friends; reduced intelligence, ‘below average in most subjects’; delinquency – ‘anti-social behaviour’; relationship with others/delinquency may be due to lack of empathy/affectionless psychopathy.

Accept other valid application points.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the effects of deprivation, including evidence that suggests the effects are reversible/not long-term, eg Bowlby (1944), Goldfarb (1955), Romanian orphan studies, Koluchova – Czech twins
- Bowlby’s failure to distinguish between deprivation and privation (Rutter)
- wider implications of the theory, eg for institutional care
- issue of social sensitivity/gender bias
- economic implications of Bowlby’s theory.

Methodological evaluation of studies is only creditworthy if linked back to maternal deprivation

Accept other valid points.

Q6.**[AO1 = 4 AO3 = 4]**

| Level | Marks | Description |
|-------|-------|--|
| 4 | 7-8 | Knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is accurate with some detail. Discussion is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 5-6 | Knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Limited knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Knowledge of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
| | 0 | No relevant content. |

Possible content:

- Bowlby's use of the term 'deprivation' – attachment disrupted or broken
- effects on development – intellectual, emotional, social, eg affectionless psychopathy, delinquency, low IQ
- critical period – an issue if prolonged separation, if before two and half years (but risk up to five years) and if no substitute available
- Bowlby's theory of irreversibility – consequences cannot be reversed
- internal working model – this can lead to inability to be a good parent
- continuity hypothesis – if there are prolonged separations then there may be issues into adulthood.

Credit other relevant content.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to support or refute Bowlby's work, eg Schaffer's multiple attachments; studies contradicting the critical period and reversibility, eg Rutter's Romanian orphan research, eg Lewis' (1954) replication with large sample did not find separation from the mother and did not predict criminality or difficulty forming close relationships
- Rutter's criticism that there could be an overstatement of the effects of deprivation

- Bowlby's confusion over privation and deprivation
- sensitive versus critical period
- real-world application, eg the way children are cared for in hospital has changed as a result of Bowlby's theory/research
- economic implications of the theory (care, work, etc)
- validity of extrapolation from and comparison with animal studies (Harlow)
- overemphasis on mother and monotropy.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of Bowlby's work on maternal deprivation.

Credit other relevant discussion.

[8]

Q7.

[AO1 = 2]

- C** Interactional synchrony
and
- E** Multiple attachment stage

[2]