A2 Psychology Exam Preparation

Forensic Psychology

Exam style questions and Mark Schemes

Beechen Cliff School

For your information;

This booklet contains exam questions from specimen papers and past papers from both the new specification and the old one for AS and A2. Several may be very similar, I just wanted to provide you with all of the questions I have available. Mark schemes are in question order at the back of this booklet.

Exam questions from the old spec are slightly different in phrasing and mark scheme but are still useful practice and preparation.

Old spec questions have RED boxes around them.
Read the item and then answer the questions that follow.

In the UK, it is against the law to have more than one wife or husband at the same time. Smacking children was not illegal before 2004 in the UK, but now can be a criminal offence.

3.6 Referring to the statements above, explain two problems in defining crime. [4 marks]

3.7 Outline one cognitive distortion shown by offenders who attempt to justify their crime. [2 marks]

3.8 One method of offender profiling involves categorising offenders as either organised or disorganised offenders. Briefly explain one limitation of this method of offender profiling. [2 marks]

3.9 Discuss the psychological effects of custodial sentencing. [16 marks]

3.3 Briefly outline differential association theory as an explanation for offending. [2 marks]

3.4 Briefly explain one limitation of this theory. [2 marks]

3.6 Discuss biological explanations of offending behaviour. [16 marks]

3.0 Outline what is meant by geographical profiling in forensic psychology. [2 marks]

3.1 Discuss psychodynamic explanations of offending behaviour. [8 marks]

3.3 Discuss ways of measuring crime. [8 marks]
Following a series of riots in cities all over England, a politician was interviewed on the radio. He said, 'Rioters and looters should be sent to prison. We must send a clear message that this sort of behaviour is not acceptable. Society expects such behaviour to be severely punished.'

Briefly discuss two roles of custodial sentencing identified in the politician’s statement. (4 marks)

Another politician also took part in the radio interview. She argued, 'The people were rioting for a reason. They were angry with the police and lost control.'

Outline and briefly discuss one treatment programme for people who offend because they are angry. (4 marks)

Discuss Eysenck’s theory of the criminal personality. Refer to evidence in your answer. (12 marks)

Briefly discuss two limitations of official crime statistics as a way of measuring crime. (4 marks)

Explain what is meant by 'offender profiling'. (2 marks)

Outline and compare behaviour modification and anger management as treatments for offending. (12 marks)
Read the statements A, B, C and D below about treatments for offending behaviour.

A  The programme can only be carried out in a custodial or institutional setting.
B  The programme involves a three-stage process.
C  The programme focuses on reflecting on one’s own behaviour.
D  The programme assumes a direct link between action and consequence.

3  9 Which two statements above apply to anger management? Write the correct combination of letters in your answer book. [1 mark]

A and B
B and C
B and D
A and C

4  0 Which two statements above apply to behaviour modification? Write the correct combination of letters in your answer book. [1 mark]

A and B
B and D
C and A
A and D

4  1 Briefly outline how atavistic form might relate to offending behaviour. [2 marks]

4  2 Choose one alternative to custodial sentencing and explain two limitations of the alternative to custodial sentencing that you have chosen. [4 marks]

4  3 Outline and evaluate psychodynamic and learning theory explanations of offending. [12 marks]
36 Referring to the statements above, explain two problems in defining crime.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two problems are clear and coherent and both are applied clearly to the stem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two problems are clearly presented but only one is appropriately applied to the stem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two problems are presented and one is applied to the stem. The answer lacks clarity. OR One problem is clearly presented and appropriately applied to the stem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One problem is presented and/or applied to the stem. The answer lacks clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems:
- time relative because attitudes change according to historical context PLUS application: over time attitudes to child rearing and child discipline have changed and so, whilst smacking was common practice many years ago it is no longer acceptable
- culturally relative because social attitudes/mores differ between cultures PLUS application: having more than one wife/husband is socially acceptable in some cultures because it is legal and common practice.

37 Outline one cognitive distortion shown by offenders who attempt to justify their crime.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

Possible cognitive distortions:
- minimisation explaining the consequences as less significant/damaging than they really are
- hostile attribution bias blaming other factors for behaviour, eg blaming the victim.

Credit other relevant cognitive distortions.

38 One method of offender profiling involves categorising offenders as either organised or disorganised offenders. Briefly explain one limitation of this method of offender profiling.

[2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief explanation of a limitation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration.

Possible limitations:
- based on a restricted sample of 36 serial sex offenders (therefore cannot be generalised to a wide population)
- based on the self-reports from this sample (which cannot therefore be relied on for validity)
- distinction is an oversimplification (difficult to categorise some offenders as one type or another so is of questionable validity/usefulness)
- research (Canter 2004) shows evidence for the organised type only (suggesting that organisation is a characteristic typical of most serial killers).

Credit other valid limitations.
Discuss the psychological effects of custodial sentencing.

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 the psychological effects of custodial sentencing is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. 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 the psychological effects of custodial sentencing is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of the psychological effect(s) of custodial sentencing is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the psychological effect(s) of custodial sentencing is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- institutionalisation – leads to lack of autonomy, conformity to roles and a dependency culture
- brutalisation – prison acts as school for crime, reinforces a criminal lifestyle and criminal norms, leads to high recidivism rates, approx 70% of young offenders re-offend within 2 years
- prevalence of psychological problems and psychiatric disorders in prison populations, eg higher incidence of mental illnesses such as depression, anxiety, self-harm, suicide, low self-esteem, eg Zimbardo’s study demonstrating psychological effects of imprisonment
- labelling leads to loss of social contacts, reduced employability, all affecting recidivism rates
- answer could offer positive psychological effects resulting from opportunities, treatment, rehabilitation, remorse etc.

Credit other relevant psychological effects.

Possible discussion points:
- problem of cause and effect – difficult to show that problems are due to imprisonment, eg prisoners with psychiatric conditions may have problems before they are institutionalised
- prevention is better (Harrower 2001) avoids labelling and negative consequences of prison
- need for selectivity – only 8–10% of criminals commit 50% of crimes (Peterson 1981)
- alternatives, eg community sentence better for low-risk offenders (keep job and social contacts)
- counter-arguments re usefulness of custodial sentencing, eg justice is seen to be done, limits danger to public, possible reform, opportunity for new skills/training
- general arguments against custodial sentences, eg do not deter, given to appease public, simply acts as retribution.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the psychological effects.
33 Briefly outline differential association theory as an explanation for offending.  [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

Possible content

- Notion that offending depends on the norms/values of the offender’s social group
- Offending is more likely to occur where social group values deviant behaviour

2 marks for a clear and coherent outline
1 mark for a vague/muddled outline

34 Briefly explain one limitation of this theory.  [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

Possible limitation

- Only evidence in correlational
- Findings could also be explained through heritability
- Offenders may seek out people with criminal values

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation
1 mark for a vague/muddled explanation
Discuss biological explanations of offending behaviour.

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 biological explanations of offending behaviour is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough. 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 biological explanations of offending behaviour is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. 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>Some knowledge of biological explanations of offending behaviour is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. 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 biological explanations of offending behaviour is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content
- Genetic explanations, focusing on ‘criminal’ genes such as the MAOA gene (which controls levels of brain serotonin) linked to criminal aggression
- Brain pathology explanations, possibly linked to genes and/or early abuse; examples include the relationship between psychopathy and abnormalities of frontal lobe and amygdala function
- Credit biological aspects of Eysenck’s theory – cortical underarousal

Possible discussion points
- Evidence from MZ/DZ twin studies and family studies looking at genetic factors
- Findings support a genetic involvement in criminal behaviour but concordance rates in MZ twins are not high and leave plenty of room for non-genetic environmental factors
- Brain scanning studies that show pathology in brains of criminal psychopaths, but cannot conclude whether these abnormalities are genetic signs of early abuse
- Some evidence from genome-wide association studies for particular genetic factors linked to criminal psychopathy, but little replication
- Counter-evidence for environmental factors in offending behaviour; socio-economic status, social learning theory
- General nature of ‘offending behaviour’ – some specific forms may be more ‘biological’ than others eg physical aggression

Credit other relevant material.
Outline what is meant by geographical profiling in forensic psychology.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

1 mark for brief outline

Plus

1 further mark for elaboration

Possible content

- The study of spatial behaviour in relation to crime and offenders.
- Focuses on the location of crime as clues to where offenders live, work and socialise.
- Relevant data include the crime scene, local crime statistics, local transport, geographical spread of similar crimes etc.
- Based on the notion of schema theory and mental mapping

The data can be combined into a model, the jeopardy surface, though explicit reference to this is not necessary for 2 marks.
Discuss psychodynamic explanations of offending behaviour. [8 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3 and AO3 = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychodynamic explanations of offending behaviour is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. 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>5–6</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychodynamic explanations of offending behaviour is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychodynamic explanations of offending behaviour is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychodynamic explanations of offending behaviour is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content
Relevant psychoanalytic concepts include:
- Freud’s instinct theory and a focus on Thanatos and displacement in relation to aggressive offenders
- Freudian psychosexual model of development and the oedipal stage leading to development of the superego/conscience
- Tension between id, ego and superego, especially where superego is under- or over-developed

Possible discussion points
- Little research support for psychodynamic ideas
- Freud’s view that females should show less superego development and so be more vulnerable to offending is not supported by offending statistics
- Some evidence that antisocial behaviour in children/adolescents is linked to inadequate parenting – Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis; this can be linked to Freudian ideas of psychosexual development and the superego
- Comparison with alternative explanations for offending behaviour; social learning, genetics etc.

Note that general evaluation of Freudian ideas is not creditworthy unless explicitly linked to the discussion of offending behaviour.

Credit other relevant material.
Discuss ways of measuring crime. [8 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3 and AO3 = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of different ways of measuring crime is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. 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>5–6</td>
<td>Knowledge of different ways of measuring crime is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of different ways of measuring crime is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Knowledge of different ways of measuring crime is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible content**
- Official Home Office statistics
- Victim surveys (CSEW formerly BCS)
- Offender surveys

**Possible discussion points**
- No fully acceptable way of defining crime – crime as social construction
- Official statistics may be selective eg number of crimes or conviction rates?
- Figures may be massaged for political reasons
- Victim surveys include crimes not officially reported, so are more accurate
- It would be relevant to discuss reasons for non-reporting of crime eg lack of trust in police, trivial nature of some crime, fear of revenge attacks
- Offender surveys may be unreliable – over or under reporting; largely ignore white collar crime

Note that problems in defining crime are not referred to in the question and answers not covering definitions can receive marks across the board. However, as definitions and measurement are necessarily linked, discussion of ways of defining crime can be credited.

Credit other relevant materials.
Question 28

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 Up to two marks for knowledge of relevant roles of custodial sentencing. Given the context, students are most likely to focus on deterrence (individual and/or general), retribution or possibly incapacitation.
Deterrence - seeing/experiencing the negative consequence means that the offending behaviour should be avoided in the future; prison as negative reinforcement; avoidance learning; vicarious learning - seeing peers go to prison; punishment acts such that negative consequences will be avoided in future.
Retribution – society exacting revenge for unacceptable conduct.
Incapacitation – sending to prison removes the offender from society, putting the offender out of action.
Maximum 1 mark for simply naming two relevant roles.

Note: Do not credit reform as there is nothing relevant to reform in the stem.

AO2 Up to two marks for brief discussion of the two roles presented. For full marks students must comment briefly on each role. Relevant discussion points include: recidivism rates indicate prison does not deter (approximately 70% of young offenders re-offend within two years); exacting retribution does not change the offender’s behaviour (alternatives to prison may be better than straightforward punishment, eg restorative justice); retribution often occurs as a result of the political imperative to appear to be tough on crime; incapacitation is only temporary in most cases; even people in prison can continue to commit crime so incapacitation is not complete.

Question 29

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 Up to two marks for knowledge/outline of anger management programmes. Likely content includes: Novaco’s 3 stages of cognitive preparation (recognising own feelings of anger and what triggers anger), skills acquisition (learning strategies to control own anger, eg deep breathing, repeating calming mantra, counting to 10, application (practising using newly learned strategies in safe situations, eg role play of anger provoking situation). Credit description of specific programmes.

Although unlikely, credit may also be given where student makes a case for an alternative treatment being effective in this situation, (ie in relation to the stem material).

AO2 Up to two marks for discussion/evaluation. Students may focus on one issue elaborated or more than one issue in brief. Likely content includes: evidence for effectiveness in reducing anger, eg Ireland (2000); long-term v short-term effectiveness; misplaced assumption that offending is caused by anger (Loza and Loza-Fanous (1999); focus on cognition as opposed to changing behaviour; need for trained personnel.
Question 30

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.

AO1 Up to four marks for knowledge of Eysenck’s theory of criminal personality. Credit any of the following: personality is innate: we inherit a type of nervous system that predisposes us to offending; personality varies along three dimensions – neurotic – stable, extravert – introvert, psychoticism; typical criminal type is the neurotic-extravert; neuroticism leads to unstable, unpredictable behaviour; extraversion is due to chronically under-aroused nervous system which leads to sensation seeking; extraverts do not condition easily and do not learn from mistakes; high psychoticism – cold, heartless offender; high NE scores in delinquent population, eg McGurk and McDougall (1981). Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion/analysis/evaluation. Likely discussion points include: alternative explanations used to evaluate Eysenck’s theory, eg how biological explanations in part support Eysenck’s theory about neurological differences between offenders and controls; alternatives to the idea of a unitary type, eg Moffitt (1993) proposed four distinct types; incompatibility with modern personality theory, eg the 5 factor model (Digman, 1990) which emphasises role of other dimensions, eg conscientiousness and agreeableness, it is possible to have a high E and N score and still not offend; basis for the model is in the EPI; reliability and validity issues re EPI; inability to infer cause and effect; determinism and the implications of Eysenck’s emphasis on heritability and inevitability; reductionism and the need to consider wider influences, eg society; Eysenck’s theory in the historical context as anti-liberal; relevance to eugenic ideal; links between Eysenck’s traits and other explanations for offending, eg psychoticism and brain structure/function. Credit evaluation of evidence where used to discuss theory. Credit use of relevant evidence, eg (McGurk and McDougall, 1981), (Farrington et al. 1982).

Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented

Mark Bands
10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Eysenck’s theory of the criminal personality. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The student expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.
7 - 9 marks  **Good answers**
Answer shows knowledge and understanding of Eysenck’s theory of the criminal personality. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. References to research are relevant but are perhaps not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

The student expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

4 - 6 marks  **Average to weak answers**
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of Eysenck’s theory of the criminal personality. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The student expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The student uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

1 - 3 marks  **Poor answers**
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The student shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

---

**Question 29**

**Briefly discuss two limitations of official crime statistics as a way of measuring crime. [4 marks]**

**AO2 = 4 marks**

Up to two marks for each valid limitation. In each case, one mark for briefly explaining the limitation and one further mark for a relevant discussion point. Limitations are all likely to be based on lack of reliability eg does not account for any crime that is unreported; does not account for any crime that is unrecorded; does not reflect the ‘dark figure of crime’. Accept other relevant answers. Discussion points could include an explanation of why some crimes go unreported/unrecorded; specific types of crimes that are less likely to figure in the official statistics eg victimless crimes; limitation in terms of outcomes/implications eg how inaccurate official figures might affect enforcement policy etc; comparison with other ways of measuring crime eg victim surveys, offender surveys. Credit use of evidence in discussion.

Note – reliability/validity-based answers that discuss two separate limitations in respect of reliability/validity can achieve full marks.
Question 30

Explain what is meant by ‘offender profiling’. [2 marks]

AO1 = 2 marks

Up to two marks for knowledge of principles and/or procedures of offender profiling. Likely content: way of narrowing down the search for a perpetrator by excluding all those people who do not fit profiling criteria; uses bottom-up information about the crime/crime scene/nature of victim to predict characteristics/traits/circumstances of the offender; based on a two-type top-down categorisation of organised and disorganised; uses geographical information to inform about offender’s base; investigative approach based on identification of patterns. Accept other valid answers.

Question 32

Outline and compare behaviour modification and anger management as treatments for offending. [12 marks]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.

AO1 = 4 marks

Up to four marks for knowledge of anger management and behaviour modification as treatments for offending, usually two marks for each treatment. Note that the outlines should consist of specific techniques involved and not generalised statements about the aims. Likely content:

Anger management: 3 stage process of cognitive preparation (identifying sources/triggers/recognising anger), skills acquisition (learning control techniques such as counting, mantra etc), application practice (role playing dealing with anger situations)

Behaviour modification: use of operant conditioning in the form of positive reinforcement for desired behaviour, tokens as secondary reinforcers to be exchanged for primary reinforcers.

Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark

AO2 = 8 marks

Up to eight marks for comparison of the two treatments (can credit up to two marks for general evaluation of either/both treatments). Useful comparisons might include: type of behaviour for which each treatment is best suited, eg anger management is only useful for anger-based offending whereas behaviour modification is best suited to eliciting appropriate everyday behaviour whilst in prison; the context in which each treatment might take place, eg behaviour modification can only take place in the controlled environment of an institution; the role of the offender eg passive recipient of reinforcement versus active participant who has to be willing to change and the implications for motivation and general life enhancement; short-term versus long-term effectiveness eg the continuing effects of anger management after discharge; ethical considerations eg manipulative nature of behaviour modification.

Credit use of relevant evidence in discussion.

Credit evaluation of evidence where used in comparison.
Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

The answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of behaviour modification and anger management as treatments for offending. Comparison is full and includes thoughtful analysis. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

7 - 9 marks Good answers

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of behaviour modification and anger management as treatments for offending. Comparison is evident. The answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

4 – 6 marks Average to weak answers

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of behaviour modification and anger management as treatments for offending. There must be some comparison/evaluation for 5/6 marks, although this may be largely implicit. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

1 - 3 marks Poor answers

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

0 marks No relevant content
### 39 Which two statements above apply to anger management? Write the correct combination of letters in your answer book.

[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

B and C

### 40 Which two statements above apply to behaviour modification? Write the correct combination of letters in your answer book.

[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

A and D

### 41 Briefly outline how atavistic form might relate to offending behaviour.

[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and coherent answer using appropriate terminology and clear explanation of how atavistic form would lead to offending

1 mark for a vague answer that shows relevant knowledge but lacks clarity and use of appropriate terminology or is only implicitly linked to offending

Content: Genetic/evolutionary sub-species/throwback with primitive characteristics/behaviour not modified by expectations/rules of developed society, has lower moral standards, engages in offending behaviour to satisfy own immediate needs; self-fulfilling prophecy explanation, possessing physical characteristics that lead person to be treated in a certain way, leading to offending behaviour.
Choose one alternative to custodial sentencing and explain two limitations of the alternative to custodial sentencing that you have chosen. [4 marks]

[AQO2 = 4]

For each limitation:
2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation.
1 mark for a vague/brief/muddled explanation or a limitation briefly stated.

Likely points:
- Tagging – unlikely to lead to reform – can still maintain criminal contacts; little deterrent – not seen as severe enough; badge of honour
- Restorative justice – offender may not be truly remorseful; just using RJ as a ploy for early parole; victim may be reluctant/intimidated/afraid to participate; requires trained mediator to be effective
- Community sentencing – leads to resentment; socially divisive and stigmatising; not seen as sufficiently punitive by general public
- Fines – rarely lead to reform but only if penalty is very severe; little stigma attached and therefore re-offending is not deterred; more damaging for lower socio-economic groups than for middle/higher socio-economic groups

Credit limitations of other alternatives.
Outline and evaluate psychodynamic and learning theory explanations of offending. [12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to 4 marks for outlines of psychodynamic and learning theory explanations. Likely content:
- Psychodynamic: role of the superego; Blackburn’s offending types of superego – deviant, weak, over-harsh; affectionless psychopathy theory (Bowlby); role of defence mechanisms eg sublimation
- Learning theory: differential association theory – influence of role models; role of societal norms, values and expectations; peers/family as reinforceers of offending behaviour; general learning theory concepts as they relate to offending eg conditioning, associative learning, reinforcement, vicarious reinforcement; modeling

One mark for description of relevant evidence

AO2
Up to 8 marks for evaluation of psychodynamic and learning theory explanations. Likely points:
Psychodynamic
- Problems of testability – theory based on unconscious mechanisms
- Deterministic approach – psychic determinism eg Bowlby early damage cannot be overcome; consequences for attempting reform
- Use of evidence eg against Freud’s theory of superego development – females are less likely to offend than males; most people without a same-sex parent with whom to identify do not offend
- Difficulty establishing cause and effect – does personality determine offending or does offending affect personality?

Learning theory
- Deterministic approach – environmental determinism eg influence of environment cannot be avoided; consequences for attempting reform
- Use of evidence eg Bandura’s research into imitation of aggression and Farrington’s Cambridge Delinquent Development research
- Difficulty establishing cause and effect – role of confounding variables such as level of education and intelligence

Credit also comparisons between explanations
Maximum 7 marks if one explanation only

Does not require perfect balance for top band

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to each explanation. Evaluation of each explanation includes reference to a number of issues and shows thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative points are well developed. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

7 - 9 marks Good answers

Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to each explanation. Evaluation of each explanation is evident and some points are developed. There is minor irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.
An otherwise very good answer covering only one explanation can get a maximum of 7 marks.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs.

Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

4 - 6 marks Average to weak answers

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to each explanation although there is greater focus on one than the other OR one is well done. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

1 - 3 marks Poor answers

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

0 marks No relevant content