

Mark schemes

Q1.**[AO2 = 1]****D** – an unconditioned stimulus.**[1]****Q2.****[AO2 = 1]****A** – a conditioned stimulus.**[1]****Q3.****[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 6]**

Level	Mark	Description
4	10-12	Knowledge of learning theory is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	7-9	Knowledge of learning theory 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	4-6	Limited knowledge of learning theory 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	1-3	Knowledge of learning theory 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:

- learning theory emphasises the importance of food in the formation of attachment/'cupboard love'/drive reduction – children form attachments with those who feed them
- classical conditioning suggests attachments form when children develop a

- learned association between the caregiver (NS) and food (UCS) which causes conditioned response of pleasure
- operant conditioning can account for the strength of an attachment between the caregiver and the child – crying is positively reinforced by caregiver; caregiver receives negative reinforcement when crying stops
- secondary drive hypothesis explains how primary drives which are essential for survival, such as eating when hungry, become associated with emotional closeness.

Note: the explanation must be directly linked to attachment. Unrelated descriptions of classical and operant conditioning are not creditworthy.

Possible discussion:

- use of evidence to refute a learning theory explanation, eg Schaffer and Emerson – primary attachment figure not always the person who feeds the child more than half of the infants were not attached to the person primarily involved in their physical care; Harlow – rhesus monkeys attach for comfort not food
- reductionist – the focus on basic processes (S-R links, reinforcement) too simplistic to explain complex attachment behaviours
- other factors may act as reinforcers and not food – attentiveness and responsiveness (Ainsworth)
- comparison with alternative explanations, eg Bowlby
- environmentally deterministic such that early learning determines later attachment behaviours.

Credit other relevant material.

Methodological evaluation of evidence must be linked to the explanation of attachment to gain credit.

Q4.**[AO1 = 6]**

Level	Mark	Description
3	5-6	Knowledge of both concepts is clear and generally well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3-4	Knowledge of both concepts is evident. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. OR one concept at L3.
1	1-2	Knowledge of one or both concepts is limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one concept at Level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:**Critical period**

- the time period when a human/animal infant is maximally ready to form an attachment
- if no attachment has been formed within this time, the child will find it difficult to form an attachment thereafter
- Lorenz's work – several hours in geese; approximately up to 3 years in humans according to Bowlby
- Not forming an attachment in the critical period would present irreversible consequences e.g. emotional difficulties.

Internal working model

- the first attachment forms a blueprint for future relationships
- a form of schema/mental representation of what relationships are like
- a child whose first attachment is loving and secure will go on to form successful relationships with peers, romantic partners, their own children, etc
- a child whose first relationship involves poor treatment will expect such treatment from others/will carry this forward to future relationships
- the quality of the IWM can be influenced by the consistency and/or responsiveness of the caregiver.

Credit other valid content.

[6]

Q5.**[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Explanation of the internal working model in Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1-2	Explanation of the internal working model in Bowlby's monotropic theory of attachment is evident but lacks clarity and/or detail. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- attachment to primary caregiver provides a child with a schema/understanding of relationships (Bowlby)
- the model represents/gives a mental view/template of the relationship with the primary figure and acts as a template for future relationships (continuity hypothesis)
- someone with a positive internal working model will become a consistent/sensitive/responsive caregiver; someone with a negative internal working model will become inconsistent in caregiving or neglectful
- credit knowledge and research into the consequence of the internal working model on later childhood/adult relationships/bullying behaviour/parenting styles, eg McCarthy 1999; Myron-Wilson & Smith 1989; Hazan & Shaver 1987; Bailey et al., 2007.

Credit other relevant content.

[4]

Q6.**[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Knowledge of the learning theory of attachment is clear and detailed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Knowledge of the learning theory of attachment is limited or muddled. There may be limited reference to how it accounts for attachment. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately or is absent.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- emphasises the importance of food in attachment – ‘cupboard love’
- the role of classical conditioning – the caregiver (eg mother) starts as a neutral stimulus (NS), over time becomes associated with ‘food’ and produces the conditioned response (CR) of pleasure
- role of operant conditioning – crying leads to a response from the caregiver (eg feeding), the caregiver receives negative reinforcement when the crying stops
- hunger is a primary drive, attachment is a secondary drive – learned by an association between the caregiver and satisfaction
- credit reference to stimulus generalisation (eg. multiple attachments) if used to help explain learning theory of attachment.
- credit reference to other learning theories, eg SLT.

Credit other valid points.

Note

- Response can gain full credit for just outlining classical OR operant theory of attachment.
- Learning theory per se is **not creditworthy**, answers must be shaped towards explaining attachment.

[4]