Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students’ responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students’ scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students’ 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.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk
Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into two or four levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are two or four 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, ie 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. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student’s answer with the example 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 does not contain anything of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Examiners are required to assign each of the students’ responses to the most appropriate level according to its overall quality, then allocate a single mark within the level. When deciding upon a mark in a level examiners should bear in mind the relative weightings of the assessment objectives (included for each question and summarised on page 18) and be careful not to over/under credit a particular skill. For example, in question 17 more weight should be given to AO3 than to AO1. This will be exemplified and reinforced as part of examiner training and standardisation.
Section A
Social influence

01 Which two of the following are situational variables that can affect obedience? Choose two from the options A, B, C, D and E.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2
A and E

02 Using an example, explain the role of social influence processes in social change.

[6 marks]

Possible content:
- Social change refers to the change that occurs in a society and not at the individual level.
- Minorities bring about social change by being consistent, flexible and committed. Through social crypto-amnesia and the snowball effect, gradually the minority turns into the majority.
- Governments/lawmakers can bring about social change through power and through the process of obedience.
- Credit reference to conformity processes that may influence social change such as normative and/or informational social influence.
- ‘Processes’ may refer to insights gained through explanations/theories and/or studies though detailed descriptions of studies (eg Moscovici) are only relevant if they are used effectively to show how they have helped our understanding.
- A wide range of examples are acceptable eg changing attitudes in relation to ‘green’ issues such as recycling; the smoking ban; changing views on homosexuality; votes for women, etc. but students must demonstrate how social influence processes affect the change in attitude, behaviour, etc.

Credit other relevant material.
Discuss explanations for conformity. Refer to Steph and Jeff as part of your discussion.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO2 = 4 and 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 explanations for conformity is accurate and generally detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Application to the stem is appropriate and links between the explanations and the stem content are explained. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of explanations for conformity is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. Application to the stem is appropriate although links to the explanations are not always well explained. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of explanations of conformity is present but is vague/inaccurate or one explanation only is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. Application to the stem is partial. 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 research into explanation(s) of conformity is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. Application is limited 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 at least two explanations for conformity (usually those named in the specification and implied in the stem):

**Normative social influence**
- Refers to the social rules that govern behaviour and the need to be seen as a member of the social group/fit in.
- This relates to a desire for social approval/acceptance/avoidance of rejection.
- Suggests that conformity is public agreement with the group and not private agreement (compliance).
- Change in attitude/behaviour is temporary.

**Informational social influence**
- Refers to the idea that the individual believes the group has more knowledge/expertise.
- Suggests that conformity is agreement with the group due to uncertainty about correct responses or behaviour on the part of the individual.
- When public behaviour and private opinion match (internalisation).
- Conformity is driven by the need to be right/have accurate perception of reality.
- Change in attitude/behaviour is likely to be more permanent.
**Application**
- Links to the stem: Steph – conformed for informational reasons – explanation of why this; has become ‘quite passionate’ suggesting the change in attitude is permanent; internalisation has taken place.
- Jeff – conformed for normative reasons – explanation of why this is; didn’t want to be the ‘odd one out’; suggests behaviour is temporary; compliance.

**Possible Discussion**
- Use of evidence to evaluate/discuss the explanations.
- Normative social influence can explain the results of conformity studies in unambiguous situations eg Asch.
- Informational influence can explain conformity in ambiguous situations in which both public and private agreement occurs eg Sherif, Jenness.
- Analysis of Asch variations when linked to normative social influence or informational social influence.
- Credit use of examples to illustrate explanations.
- Discussion of alternative explanations of conformity eg dispositional factors and other explanations such as ingratational.
- Discussion of difficulty measuring and/or distinguishing between the two explanations.
- Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to the discussion of the explanations.

Credit other relevant material.
Section B
Memory

04 Evaluate the use of case studies, like that of Patient X, in psychological research.  

[5 marks]

Marks for this question AO3 = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4–5</td>
<td>Evaluation of the use of case studies in psychological research is clear and accurate. There is at least one strength and one limitation, though a number of points may be presented in less detail. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>Evaluation of the use of case studies is limited. The answer may contain strengths or limitations, or both are presented but are lacking in detail. The answer may lack accuracy and organisation. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One evaluative point is stated but not developed, or there may be more than one but there is substantial inaccuracy. Specialist terminology is absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likely content:

- Depth/detail of data collected – qualitative
- Validity/meaningfulness of data, insight gained
- A single anomalous case may lead to revision of a theory
- Researcher bias/subjective interpretation
- Unscientific/unreliable, cannot be replicated
- Problems of generalisation

Accept other valid points.

Application to the case of 'Patient X' may be present but is not essential for full marks.

05 Briefly explain how the experiences of Patient X could be interpreted as supporting the multi-store model of memory. 

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

1 mark for the link to the MSM: this suggests that STM and LTM are separate stores/functionally different (supporting the model).

Plus

1 mark for the idea that whilst Patient X's STM is functioning normally, he is unable to retain new info in LTM/the link between STM and LTM appears to have been cut.
06 With reference to the experiment involving Patient X, outline two types of long-term memory.  

Marks for this question AO2 = 4

2 marks for an outline of two types of LTM from the following (1 for each type):
- Episodic – memory for events/autobiographical memory
- Semantic – memory for facts/general knowledge/the rules of language
- Procedural – memory for motor skills/actions/’muscle memory’

Plus

2 marks for linking the two types to the information in the stem (1 for each type):
- Episodic – he had no recollection of ever doing the task
- Semantic – he could not remember the names of the psychologists
- Procedural – his performance improved on the rotating disc task over consecutive days

07 Discuss two differences between the types of long-term memory you have outlined in your answer to question 06.  

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 two differences is clear and mostly accurate. For full marks, there must be reference to both types of memory within each difference discussed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Discussion of two differences are both incomplete/partly accurate. For 1 mark there may be one difference briefly stated. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
Possible differences (depends on the types of LTM chosen):
- Semantic/episodic – ‘knowing that’/declarative memory; available for conscious inspection – procedural – ‘knowing how’/non-declarative memory; often unavailable for conscious inspection
- Semantic – may not recall when we learned/encoded these memories – episodic – stored with reference to time and place
- Credit differences based on the durability/resistance to forgetting of different types of memory
- The fact that evidence suggests that these types of memory reside in different areas of the brain
- Credit use of evidence as part of the discussion of the differences.

Credit other valid differences.

Do not credit differences that merely restate the definitions of both types of memory.
08 Outline retrieval failure as an explanation for forgetting. [3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3

Possible content:
- Forgetting occurs in the absence of appropriate cue/prompts/triggers/clues/‘tip-of-the-tongue’ forgetting
- Context dependent – being in a different place may inhibit memory
- State dependent – being in a different mood/state of arousal may inhibit memory
- Category dependent – lack of organisation may inhibit memory
- Credit reference to the encoding specificity principle
- Credit explanation if embedded within an example

1 mark for naming types only
2 marks only if answer is couched in terms of ‘remembering’ rather than forgetting

Credit other relevant material.

09 Explain how the cognitive interview is used to improve the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. [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 clear and accurate. There is clear explanation of how it improves the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the cognitive interview is present though there may be some inaccuracy/lack of clarity. There is some explanation of how it improves eyewitness testimony. The answer is mostly clear and organised. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of the cognitive interview is briefly stated with little elaboration. The explanation of how it improves eyewitness testimony may be partial or absent. The answer may include inaccuracies and be poorly organised. 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:
Not all features of the cognitive interview need to be covered for full marks:
- Context reinstatement – trying to mentally recreate an image of the situation, including details of the environment, the individual’s emotional state including their feelings at the time of the incident – may all act as cues/triggers to recall
- Recall from a changed perspective – trying to mentally recreate the situation from different points of view eg. describing what another witness present at the scene would have seen – promotes more ‘holistic’ view of the event which may enhance recall
- Recall in reverse order – the witness is asked to describe the scene in a different chronological order eg. from the end to the beginning – to verify accuracy
• Report everything – the interviewer encourages the witness to report all details about the event, even though these details may seem unimportant – may highlight something that has been ‘overlooked’

The main additional features of the enhanced cognitive interview are:-
• Encourage the witness to relax and speak slowly – reduction in anxiety may enhance recall
• Offer comments to help clarify witness statements – may improve detail of statement
• Credit links to theory to explain how accuracy may be improved eg retrieval failure – importance of context
Section C
Attachment

10 Explain one way in which the researchers may have checked whether their categories were reliable. [3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

One mark for knowledge of inter-rater (observer) reliability (this may be named or implicit in the application)

Plus

Up to two marks for applying knowledge of how reliability of the category system could be assessed in this study.

For example:
The consistency between the recordings of two researchers would be assessed by asking each researcher to categorise the essays independently for 'references to love'. The data would then be compared and if similar then the analysis is reliable.

Credit reference to the fact that the correlation coefficient between the researchers’ data should exceed 0.8.

11 Draw a suitable graphical display to represent the data in Table 1. [3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

Up to 3 marks for an accurate sketch of a bar chart to represent the data in Table 1
• 1 mark for an appropriate title
• 1 mark for correctly labelled axes
• 1 mark for accurately plotted bars (4 in total)

A graph to show the total number of references to love and references to fear of rejection in essays written by the care group and the non-care group
12 Express the total number of references to love in the essays written by the care group as a fraction of the total number of references to love in the essays overall. Show your calculations. [3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3
- 1 mark for calculating the total number of references to love overall (16 + 40 = 56)
- 1 mark for representing the total number of references to love in the care group as a fraction of the total number of references to love overall (16/56)
- 1 mark for dividing both parts of the fraction by the lowest common denominator (16/8 = 2; 56/8 = 7) to produce the correct answer (2/7)

13 Explain how the data collected from the interview might have improved upon the data collected from the content analysis. [3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 3
3 marks for clear explanation plus coherent elaboration
2 marks for explanation plus some elaboration
1 mark for vague / muddled explanation

Students may make a single, elaborated point or a number of points in less detail.

Possible content
- The interviewer could have asked follow-up questions to gain greater insight into some of the points raised in the essay
- The interview would produce more detail/depth of information than the participant would have been able to reveal within the essay
- Interview data would have provided a further measure of reliability/validity of the original essay content
- The interviewer may have gained rapport with the participant so they have felt comfortable revealing more personal/sensitive information face-to-face

Accept other valid points.
14. Explain Bowlby's monotropic theory. Refer to the data in Table 1 in your answer. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4 and AO2 = 2

<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 Bowlby’s monotropic theory is clear and accurate. There is appropriate use of the data in Table 1 and clear links made to Bowlby’s theory. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of Bowlby’s monotropic theory is present though there may be some inaccuracy/lack of clarity. There is some attempt to use the data in Table 1 though the links to Bowlby’s theory may not always be clear. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of Bowlby’s theory is briefly stated with little elaboration. The use of data in Table 1 in the context of Bowlby’s theory may be inappropriate or absent. The answer may include inaccuracies and be 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 Bowlby’s monotropic theory:
- Unique ‘monotropic’ relationship with mother-figure
- Notion of critical/sensitive period up to approx. 2 years
- Importance of internal working model for future relationships
- Social releasers to facilitate bond
- Reciprocal process

Accept other valid points.

Possible application:
- The care group made fewer references to love in their essays/more reference to fear of rejection which suggests their lack of monotropic bond may have affected the quality of their future relationships
- Failure to form internal working model in the care group
- Adopted at 5 so missed critical period for formation of bond
15. Briefly evaluate Bowlby's monotropic theory. In your answer, refer to multiple attachments and the role of the father.  

[6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 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>Discussion of Bowlby’s monotropic theory is clear and accurate. There is appropriate reference to multiple attachments and the role of the father. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Discussion of Bowlby’s monotropic theory is present though there may be some inaccuracy/lack of clarity. There is some reference to multiple attachments and/or the role of the father. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Discussion of Bowlby’s theory is brief with little elaboration. The reference to multiple attachments and/or the role of the father may be inappropriate or absent. The answer may include inaccuracies and be 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:
Discussion of Bowlby’s monotropic theory:
- Idea of monotropy not supported by research eg Schaffer and Emerson (1964) demonstrated importance of multiple attachments
- Credit reference to stages of attachment within this context
- Cross-cultural research supports forming of multiple bonds
- Bowlby underestimated the role of the father – saw father’s role as primarily economic
- Outdated sexist view – importance of equal responsibility for childcare in many families/father as primary caregiver

Accept other valid discussion points not related to multiple attachments or role of the father eg use of evidence to contradict/support internal working model, social releasers, etc.
Section D
Psychopathology

16 Which two of the following are cognitive characteristics of depression? Choose two from the options A, B, C, D and E. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2
B and C

17 Outline and discuss one biological explanation for obsessive-compulsive disorder. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2 and AO3 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Outline of one biological explanation for OCD is clear and accurate. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Outline of one biological explanation for OCD is present though there may be some inaccuracy/lack of clarity. Discussion is present but may lack detail. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Outline of one biological explanation for OCD may be brief with little elaboration or clear but there is no discussion present. Attempted discussion may be partial or inappropriate. The answer may include inaccuracies and be 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>

AO1 Possible content:
- Genetic influence – inherited predisposition/vulnerability; based on concordance rates within family/twin studies
- Biochemical causes eg low levels of serotonin in the brain; linked to obsessive thoughts
- Neuropsychological causes eg hyperactivity of basal ganglia; linked to repetitive motor functions

Accept other valid explanations.

AO3 Possible discussion
- Use of evidence to support/contradict explanations
- Confounding influence of environment in genetic explanation
- Effectiveness of drug treatment eg SSRIs
- Not effective for all patients
- Issues of generalisation/replication
- Broader issues: determinism; reductionism

Accept other valid discussion points.

Do not accept methodological evaluation of evidence unless used explicitly to discuss the explanation.
Discuss two behavioural treatments for phobias. Refer to the conversation above in your answer.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO2 = 4 and 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 two behavioural treatments for phobias is accurate and generally detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Application to the stem is appropriate and links between the treatments and the stem content are explained. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of two behavioural treatments for phobias is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. Application to the stem is appropriate although links to the treatments are not always well explained. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of two behavioural treatments for phobias is present but is vague/inaccurate or one treatment only is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. Application to the stem is partial. 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 one/two behavioural treatments for phobias is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. Application is limited 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>

Content
Knowledge of two behavioural treatments for phobias (usually those named in the specification and implied in the stem):

Systematic desensitisation
- Relaxation training
- Formation of anxiety hierarchy
- Stepped approach/gradual exposure
- Based on idea that two opposite emotions cannot co-exist/reciprocal inhibition

Flooding/implosion therapy
- Bombarded by fear
- Based on idea that anxiety will eventually subside
- In vivo/in vitro
- Credit description of evidence to support/challenge effectiveness
Application
- Links to the stem: mother – stepped approach/gradual exposure; credit additional steps/levels of hierarchy that could be applied to ‘treatment’ of a fear of water/swimming
- Father – flooding/bombardment of fear; credit for pointing out that such ‘treatment’ would not be appropriate for a 10-year-old

Discussion
- Use of evidence to support/challenge effectiveness
- Ethical issues (in flooding especially)
- Issue of generalisation outside of the clinical setting
- Reasoned discussion of time, cost implications
- More likely to be effective for specific phobias
- Theoretical underpinnings – classical conditioning; principle of extinction
- Comparison between the two treatments
- Comparison with alternatives eg drugs, psychodynamic therapy, etc.

Credit other relevant material.
### Assessment Objective Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social influence</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM/Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM/Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychopathology</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Paper Total      | 37  | 25  | 34  | 96    |

Research methods = 17 marks  
Maths = 6 marks