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Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student’s answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student’s answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. Answers in the standardising materials will correspond with the different levels of the mark scheme. These answers will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student’s answer with the standardised examples to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner’s mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.
Section A - Social Influence

0 1
Outline what is meant by ‘agentic state’ as an explanation for obedience.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

2 marks for a clear and coherent outline.

1 mark for limited/muddled outline.

Possible content:

- when a person acts on behalf of an authority figure/person of higher status
- the actor feels no personal responsibility/does not feel guilty for their actions
- the opposite of an autonomous state in which people act according to their own principles

Points above may be presented in the context of an example/study.

0 2
Using your knowledge of minority influence, explain how Jenny might be able to persuade the rest of the department to accept her view

[6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Knowledge of minority influence is clear and generally well detailed. Application to Jenny’s situation is mostly clear and effective. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Knowledge of minority influence is evident. There is some effective application to Jenny’s situation. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Knowledge of minority influence is limited. Application to Jenny’s situation is either absent or inappropriate. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:

- Jenny should demonstrate consistency by not deviating from her view that not grading work is a good idea despite social pressure – she could point out that this is a view that she has held throughout her teaching career
- Jenny should demonstrate commitment by placing herself at some risk/inconvenience – she may volunteer to field criticisms from students, parents, other departments, etc. This will draw more attention to her ‘cause’ (augmentation principle)
- Jenny should demonstrate flexibility by adapting her view/accepting other valid counterarguments. Perhaps some pieces of work could be ungraded but not all – for instance, grading mock exams but not homework
- over time, the rest of the department may become ‘converted’ (snowball effect) – for example, if Jenny’s students start to perform particularly well
Discuss what psychological research has told us about why people conform.

[16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Knowledge of reasons why we conform 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Knowledge of why we conform 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of why we conform is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion that is present is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of why we conform is very limited. Any 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:

Knowledge of reasons why we conform.

- normative social influence – going along with the majority through fear of rejection/being seen as an outcast; a desire to be liked; leads to compliance; conforming for emotional reasons – a temporary change in view/behaviour
- informational social influence – going along with the majority through acceptance of new information; a desire to be right; leads to internalisation; conforming for cognitive reasons – a permanent change in view/behaviour
- conformity to social roles
- accept types of conformity: identification – wanting to have affinity with a group that we value; internalisation – private acceptance of the majority view; compliance – public acceptance despite private disagreement
- accept variables affecting conformity as reasons – group size; unanimity; task difficulty
- accept dispositional explanations such as having an external locus of control
Possible discussion points:

Discussion of reasons why we conform.

- use of evidence to discuss the reasons (e.g. Sherif (1935), Asch (1951), Anderson et al (1992), Baron, Vandello & Brunsman (1996), Zimbardo (1973))
- normative social influence can explain the results of conformity studies in unambiguous situations (e.g. Asch)
- informational influence can explain conformity in ambiguous situations in which both public and private agreement occurs, e.g. Sherif, Jenness
- analysis of Asch variations when linked to discussion of reasons
- discussion of difficulty measuring and/or distinguishing between reasons why conformity occurs
- discussion of individual differences in reasons for conformity, e.g. gender, culture, locus of control, level of expertise, nAffiliators

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to the discussion of the reasons.
Section B - Memory

Name the two components of working memory that would be involved in the performance of the tasks in Condition A.

- Mentally counting backwards from 100 =
- Tracking coloured shapes on a computer screen =

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

1 mark for each:

Mentally counting backwards from 100 – Articulatory loop or store; phonological loop or store; articulatory control processes.

Tracking coloured shapes on a computer screen – Visuo-spatial scratchpad/sketchpad/Inner scribe/Visual cache.

Accept central executive/episodic buffer for either component, but not the same answer for both.

If more than one component is named for either task, only the first should be marked.

Briefly explain two ways in which the working memory experiment described above could be improved.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

For each way:

2 marks for a clear and coherent way
1 mark for a limited/muddled way
0 marks for simply stating a way

Possible improvements: how the experiment could be improved (this might include why this would be an improvement).

- improving the sample/sampling method/target population – details of alternative method, eg stratified
- changing the design – use of an alternative design (repeated measures, matched pairs) and brief details of how this would be implemented
- changing the nature of the tasks – suggestions for tasks that are more reflective of real-life behaviour, eg reading e-mails whilst talking on the phone, etc
- changing the type of experiment – suggestions for alternative, eg field study – carry out the research in a more natural setting, eg an office environment or a classroom
- participants should be randomly allocated to each experimental condition; brief explanation of how this would be done

Credit other valid improvements.
Discuss one strength of the working memory model.

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Discussion of strength is clear and coherent. For 3 marks, some detail/expansion may be lacking. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Discussion of strength is limited/muddled or briefly stated/outlined only. Specialist terminology may be used inappropriately or is absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible strengths:

- evidence supports the existence of separate stores in STM, eg KF; brain scanning evidence, eg Paulesu; dual-task performance, eg Baddeley et al. Evidence may be used to support general principles of model or specific stores/sub-components
- suggests STM is an active processor rather than the unitary ‘stopping-off station’ version presented by the multi-store model
- practical application, eg phonological deficits observed in dyslexia linked to articulatory loop

Credit counterargument as part of the discussion, eg supporting studies tend to involve artificial tasks.

Accept other valid strengths.

If more than one strength is presented, all should be marked and the best one credited.
Describe the cognitive interview. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Knowledge of the cognitive interview is accurate and generally well detailed. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Some knowledge of the cognitive interview is present but there may be some detail missing/lack of clarity. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of the cognitive interview. The answer as a whole lacks clarity/accuracy. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:

Knowledge of the cognitive interview.

- reinstating the context – interviewee mentally reinstates the environmental and personal context of the incident, eg sights, sounds, weather etc; (based on the principle of retrieval failure/cue-dependent forgetting that cues may trigger recall)
- report everything – interviewer encourages the reporting of every single detail of the event, even though it may seem irrelevant; (such detail may trigger other memories)
- changing order – interviewer tries alternative ways through the timeline of the incident; (reduces possibility that recall may be influenced by schema/expectations)
- changing perspective – interviewee recalls from different perspectives, eg how it would have appeared to other witnesses; (reduces influence of schema)
- features of enhanced cognitive interview to facilitate recall – focus on social interaction, reducing anxiety/distractions, slow speech, use of open-ended questions

Simply listing aspects of the cognitive interview, maximum 2 marks.
Outline one explanation of forgetting. How might this explanation account for Aaron’s poor performance in the Spanish exam?

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Knowledge is clear and accurate. Application is effective. The answer is coherent, with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Knowledge is limited/muddled. There is some appropriate application. The answer lacks clarity. OR either knowledge or application at Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrieval failure (focus here must be on forgetting)

- Forgetting is due to the absence of cues
- Lack of external contextual cues – where environment for learning and recall is different (eg different room)
- Lack of internal contextual cues – where physical state for learning and recall is different (eg mood)

Possible applications:
- Aaron is not in the same context as when he learnt the material for his Spanish exam – ‘an unfamiliar room’
- Aaron is not in the same physical, emotional state as when he learnt the material – ‘full of nerves’

Full application marks can be awarded for one of the above in detail.

OR

Interference

- when two memories conflict/confuse/become mixed up with each other
- more likely when material is similar (creates response competition)
- proactive interference – when an older memory disrupts a newer memory
- retroactive interference – when a newer memory disrupts an older memory

Possible applications:
- Aaron has mixed up/confused words from another subject which has caused him to forget
- interference is likely in this case because French and Spanish are similar
Briefly evaluate the explanation of forgetting you have outlined in your answer to Question 08. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Evaluation is relevant, generally well-explained and focused on the chosen explanation of forgetting. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Evaluation is relevant although there is limited explanation and/or limited focus on the chosen explanation of forgetting. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately or is absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrieval failure

Possible evaluation points:
- use of evidence, eg Godden and Baddeley suggests that retrieval failure/absence of cues is a valid explanation of forgetting
- application of explanation, eg improving memory using mnemonics, category headings
- context has to be very different in real-life to have any effect
- context effect only occurs when memory is tested in particular ways – free recall vs recognition

Accept other valid points.

OR

Interference

Possible evaluation points:
- use of evidence from lab studies, eg McGeoch and McDonald and real-life, eg Schmidt supports the effects of interference
- application of explanation, eg avoiding similar material when revising for exams
- use of artificial materials in lab studies, eg recall of word lists
- deliberate attempt to induce interference in lab studies, eg by limiting time between learning and recall
- evidence suggests interference can be overcome using cued recall
- interference tends not to occur with experts

Accept other valid points.

Note: If the explanation evaluated is NOT the explanation outlined in Q08, no credit. If Q08 is blank, but an explanation is clearly identified in Q09, Q09 can be marked across the scale.
State two effects of institutionalisation. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

1 mark each for any 2 of the following:
- mental retardation/low IQ
- delayed language development
- quasi-autism
- disinhibited attachment
- disorganised attachment
- delayed physical development, eg restricted growth
- impaired adult relationships

Credit other valid effects.
If more than two effects are stated, only the first two should be marked.
Note: specialist terminology/recognised effects of institutionalisation are expected.
Outline how Lorenz and Harlow studied attachment using animals. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Knowledge of how Lorenz and Harlow studied attachment using animals is accurate and generally well detailed and includes measurement of dependent variable. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Some knowledge of how Lorenz and Harlow studied attachment using animals is present but there may be some detail missing/lack of clarity. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. OR one researcher at Level 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>There is limited knowledge of how Lorenz and Harlow studied attachment using animals. The answer as a whole lacks clarity/accuracy. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one researcher at Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:

Lorenz
- goose eggs were randomly divided
- half were hatched with the mother present (in natural environment)
- half were hatched in an incubator with Lorenz present
- the behaviour of all goslings was recorded

Harlow
- in a controlled environment, infant monkeys reared with two mother surrogates
- plain wire mother dispensing food, cloth-covered mother with no food
- time spent with each mother was recorded
- details of fear conditions
- long-term effects recorded: sociability, relationship to offspring, etc

Credit other relevant procedural details in each case.
Credit procedures from other relevant studies by Lorenz and Harlow.
Discuss the learning theory of attachment and Bowlby’s monotropic theory of attachment. Refer to the conversation above in your answer.

[16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO2 = 4, AO3 = 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Knowledge of learning theory and monotropic theory 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Knowledge of learning theory and monotropic theory 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of learning theory and monotropic theory 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. OR one theory only at Level 3/4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of learning theory and monotropic theory 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. OR one theory only at Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
Learning theory
- emphasises the importance of food in the formation of attachment/cupboard love/drive reduction – children love those who feed them
- classical conditioning creates attachment – association of caregiver (NS) with food (UCS) causes conditioned response of pleasure
- operant conditioning strengthens attachment – crying is positively reinforced by caregiver; caregiver receives negative reinforcement when crying stops

Monotropic theory
- importance of primary attachment figure – bond with mother-figure is unique
- the more time spent with the mother-figure, the better – law of continuity; law of accumulated separation
- internal working model – first attachment is a blueprint for future relationships; child forms mental representation
- importance of critical period
- the role of social releasers

Accept other valid points.

Possible application:
Learning theory
- the first mother's view is consistent with the principles of learning theory – her bond with her daughter is based on breastfeeding/food
- the husband’s bond with Millie is not as strong as she has not formed an association with her father and pleasure

Monotropic theory
- the second mother’s view is consistent with monotropic theory – that the bond with the mother (the ‘mother’s love’) is unique and special
- she also suggests that the maternal bond is ‘important for future development’ which is consistent with Bowlby’s view of the internal working model

Possible discussion points:
Learning theory
- plausible and scientific as founded in established theory
- reductionist – the focus on basic processes (S-R links, reinforcement) too simplistic to explain complex attachment behaviours
- use of evidence, eg Schaffer and Emerson - primary attachment figure not always the person who feeds the child
- environmentally deterministic such that early learning determines later attachment behaviours

Monotropic theory
- use of evidence, eg Schaffer and Emerson - multiple and not monotropic attachments are the norm
- the concept of monotropy is social sensitive – places pressure on mothers and underestimates the role of the father
- use of evidence, eg Bailey et al - concept of the internal working model
- studies of deprivationprivation may only be credited if explicitly linked to monotropic theory

Accept other valid points.

For marks in levels 3 and 4 there should be a reasonable but not necessarily perfect balance between learning theory and monotropic theory.
Section D - Psychopathology

1 3

Is negative schema score best described as measuring a cognitive, emotional or
behavioural characteristic of depression? Shade one box only.

Cognitive
Emotional
Behavioural

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark for:
A Cognitive
Draw a suitable graphical display to represent the data in Table 1. Label your graph appropriately

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

1 mark for each of the following:
- a title that includes both co-variables and reference to correlation/relationship
- appropriately labelled X axis
- appropriately labelled Y axis
- accurately plotted points

Note: co-variables should be operationalised (‘score’) either in the title or on the axes.

Accept: line of best fit. Do not accept: points connected by lines (e.g., frequency polygon); this is an inappropriate graphical display, so maximum 1 mark for Title (bullet 1 above).

If maximum 1 for Title, Title does not need to include ‘score’. Must include both co-variables and reference to correlation/relationship.
The relationship between self-esteem score and negative schema score
With reference to level of measurement, explain why Spearman's rho is an appropriate statistical test for this data. 

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

1 mark for stating that the level of measurement is ordinal data.

PLUS

1 mark for an explanation:

Possible content:
- the co-variables (self-esteem and negative schema) have been measured using an 'unsafe' non-standardised scale/the researcher constructed the scales herself
- the co-variables cannot be measured objectively/mathematically/may not be 'real things'
- because units of measurement are not of equal size/of unknown size

Accept alternative wording.

Estimate the correlation coefficient likely to result from analysis of the data in Table 1. Tick one box only. 

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

+0.70.
Discuss the cognitive approach to treating depression.  

[16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Knowledge of the cognitive approach to treating depression 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Knowledge of the cognitive approach to treating depression 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of the cognitive approach to treating depression is present. Focus is mainly on description. Some discussion is present but it is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the cognitive approach to treating depression 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:

- general rationale of cognitive therapies – to change/modify negative schema/irrational thoughts and so alleviate the depression
- Beck’s cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) – steps involved: identification of irrational thoughts/negative triad (‘thought-catching’); ‘patient as scientist’ – generate hypotheses to test validity of irrational thoughts; homework tasks; reinforcement of positive thoughts; cognitive restructuring
- Ellis’ rational emotive behaviour therapy (REBT) – ABCDE model; rational confrontation/dispute; empirical and logical arguments; challenging automatic negative thoughts; behavioural activation; shame-attacking exercises

Accept other valid points.

Possible discussion points:

- use of evidence to support or contradict the effectiveness of cognitive therapies, eg March et al.
- therapy attempts to address cause – assuming root cause is irrational thought processes
- success may depend more on the quality of the patient-therapist relationship
- cognitive therapies require commitment and motivation which may be a problem for depressed patients
- over-focus on the patient’s present circumstances – some patients may want to explore their past
- cognitive therapies may minimise the importance of person’s social circumstances
- relies on patient self-reporting their thoughts – unreliable and difficult to verify
- credit critical comparison with alternative treatments, eg antidepressants

Accept other valid points.
## Assessment Objective Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychopathology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>