

## Mark schemes

## Q1.

[AO1 = 1]

Correct answer = C.

[1]

## Q2.

[AO2 = 2]

**1 mark** for a correctly named type of insecure attachment variation with a country/culture

**Plus**

**1 mark** for either an approximate percentage OR an explanation of the reason for the variation within the named country/culture OR an explicit comparison between types of insecure in different countries/cultures

**Possible content:**

**Dave's comments about insecure attachment could be referring to:**

- higher rates of anxious/insecure-avoidant attachments among German infants (35%) / as mothers encourage independence
- higher rates of anxious/insecure-resistant attachments in collectivist cultures, eg Japan (27%) / as infants are rarely separated (Van IJzendoorn and Kroonenberg, 1988)
- higher rates of anxious/insecure-avoidant attachments in Italian study (36%) / attributed to long working hours (Simonelli, 2014)
- higher rates of anxious/insecure-resistant attachments in Israeli children (29%) / reflects difference in childrearing practices (Sagi et al, 1995)

Credit other relevant material.

**Note:** Students can only get credit for types of insecure attachment variations

[2]

**Q3.****[AO3 = 1]****Possible limitations:**

- a limited number of studies were conducted in some countries (therefore the findings cannot be generalised to whole culture)
- research may not represent all attachment types (because children are raised differently in different cultures)
- ethnocentric/culture biased standards used (US then applied to other cultures)
- studies only measured attachment to mother (which may be biased as she may not be main attachment figure).

Credit other relevant material.

**Note:** Accept limitations of meta-analysis eg lack of standardised methodology.

**Note:** Apart from the issue of social sensitivity, ethical limitations are not creditworthy.

**[1]****Q4.****[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Knowledge of Van Ijzendoorn's investigation of cultural variations is clear and generally detailed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Knowledge of Van Ijzendoorn's investigation of cultural variations is limited or muddled. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately or is absent.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- meta-analysis of 32 studies of attachment across 8 countries
- use of Strange Situation data to classify infants as either secure, insecure-avoidant, insecure-resistant
- secure attachment was the most common (50% in China to 75% in the UK)
- in collectivist cultures (China, Japan, Israel) rates of insecure-resistant attachments were higher (over 25%) (than findings in the US)
- in Germany, rates of insecure-avoidant were higher (than findings in the US)
- variations between results of studies within the same country were (1.5 times/150%) greater than those between countries.

Credit other valid points.

Note

- To achieve full marks students need to address more than one element of the investigation ie. aim / methods / findings / conclusions

[4]

**Q5.**

[AO1 = 2]

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent outline.

**1 mark** for a limited/muddled outline.

**Possible differences:**

- level of separation anxiety – low (avoidant) vs high (resistant)
- level of stranger anxiety – low (avoidant) vs high (resistant)
- response on reunion – indifference (avoidant) vs ambivalence (resistant)
- proximity seeking – low/independent behaviour (avoidant) vs high/clingy (resistant).

Accept other relevant differences.

If more than one difference is outlined, the best one should be credited.

**1 mark** can be awarded for correct identification of a possible difference in attachment behaviour that is not linked to the correct attachment styles.

[2]

**Q6.**(a) **[AO2 = 1]**

Insecure-resistant/anxious-resistant/insecure-ambivalent/resistant/ambivalent/Type C.

Do **not** credit 'insecure'.

1

(b) **[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Distinction between two types of attachment is mostly clear and accurate, with evidence of either breadth or detail. The answer is mostly coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1-2	There is limited/partial distinction between two types of attachment. The answer may lack coherence. Use of terminology may be either absent or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- secure attachment/Type B shows moderate levels of stranger anxiety whereas insecure-avoidant/Type A shows low levels
- Type B shows moderate levels of separation anxiety whereas Type A shows low levels
- Type B shows joy on reunion whereas Type A shows little response
- Type B shows use of attachment figure as a safe base whereas Type A shows high levels of independent behaviour
- credit distinctions based on other types of attachment, eg disorganised; disinhibited.

**No marks** for simply naming two (other) types of attachment.

Full marks can be awarded if two types in (b) are different from an incorrect answer in (a).

Credit other relevant distinction points.

4

**[5]**

**Q7.****[AO3 = 4]**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Explanation of two ways the Strange Situation technique might be modified to be more realistic are explicit, clear and have some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1-2	Explanation of two ways the Strange Situation technique might be modified to be more realistic lack clarity and/or detail. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Only one modification max 2.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible modifications:**

- measure attachment type in the home/a more familiar environment: to improve the ecological validity of the measure of attachment type
- use different caregivers: to get a wider measure of baby's attachment as most babies in real life have multiple attachments
- make the observations covert: to ensure mother's behaviours towards infant are more natural (improve internal validity)
- make multiple observations over time as a more realistic assessment of usual attachment type would be achieved.

Cultural modifications can only be credited if focused on how this improves the realism of the technique.

Credit other relevant content.

**[4]**

**Q8.**

**[AO1 = 2]**

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent outline with some elaboration.

**1 mark** for a limited or muddled outline.

**Possible content:**

- higher rates of anxious/insecure-avoidant attachments among German infants (mothers encourage independence)
- higher rates of anxious/insecure-resistant attachments in collectivist cultures, eg Japan (Van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg, 1988)
- lower rates of secure attachment and higher rates of anxious/insecure-avoidant in Italian study attributed to long working hours (Simonelli, 2014)
- details of comparison between US and Korean children (Kyoung, 2005)
- high rates of anxious/insecure-resistant attachments in Israeli children reflects difference in childrearing practices (Sagi et al, 1995).

Credit other valid content eg sub-cultural variation (class, regional etc).

There are various other routes to elaboration e.g. names of countries, detail of percentages, reference to studies.

A statement that secure attachment is most common in most countries is not creditworthy.

**[2]**

**Q9.****[AO3 = 5]**

Level	Mark	Description
3	4-5	The evaluation of the strange situation procedure is clear and detailed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.
2	2-3	The evaluation of the strange situation procedure lacks some detail/accuracy. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately or is absent.
1	1	The evaluation of the strange situation procedure is very limited/muddled. Specialist terminology is absent.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible evaluation:**

- controlled observation lacks ecological validity
- standardised procedure allows for replication
- sole focus on the mother-child relationship
- evidence, eg Bick et al, suggests inter-rater reliability is high
- culture-bound test/imposed etic
- original study used only three attachment types
- procedure may measure something other than attachment type, eg temperament
- discussion of the ethics of the study.

Accept other valid points.

**[5]**