

Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCSE in Psychology
(5PS02) Unit 2: Social & Biological

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2014

Publications Code UG039789

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Elaboration marks should only be awarded where the markscheme indicates and only if the point being made is an extension of an existing point which has earned credit.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response. Where only the 'first' answer can earn credit means top left.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed.

The strands are as follows:

- ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear
- select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter
- organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

/	means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.
()	means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.
[]	words inside square brackets are instructions or guidance for examiners.
Phrases/words in bold	indicate that the <u>meaning</u> of the phrase or the actual word is essential to the answer.
TE	(Transferred Error) means that a wrong answer given in an earlier part of a question is used correctly in answer to a later part of the same question.
OWTTE	means Or Words To That Effect
ORA	means Or Reverse Argument

Unit 2: Social and Biological Psychological Debates

Topic C: Do TV and video games affect young people's behaviour?

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1a	C Natural experiment	A03 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark															
1b	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Technique</th> <th>True</th> <th>False</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Children were tested in laboratories to see if they became violent after playing video games.</td> <td></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Children were observed in the school playground and classrooms to see if they were aggressive.</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leisure time of participants was recorded to see if time spent on leisure activities changed.</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A case study was conducted on one child to see how far they were affected by television.</td> <td></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Three marks for four correct crosses (or ticks), two marks for three correct crosses and one mark for two correct crosses. 0 marks if just one cross whether correct or incorrect. If the candidate has crossed both a true and false for the same statement, do not credit that technique. Ignore scored through answers (☒) as they indicate a mistake has been made and the candidate has changed their mind.</p>	Technique	True	False	Children were tested in laboratories to see if they became violent after playing video games.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Children were observed in the school playground and classrooms to see if they were aggressive.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Leisure time of participants was recorded to see if time spent on leisure activities changed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		A case study was conducted on one child to see how far they were affected by television.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A03 = 3 (3)
Technique	True	False															
Children were tested in laboratories to see if they became violent after playing video games.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>															
Children were observed in the school playground and classrooms to see if they were aggressive.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																
Leisure time of participants was recorded to see if time spent on leisure activities changed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																
A case study was conducted on one child to see how far they were affected by television.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>															

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1c	<p>2 marks for description of the results and/or conclusions of Williams' study. One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>She found that children in Notel became (twice as) /more aggressive/eq; Aggression increased following the introduction of TV/eq; The intelligence of the children studied had dropped following the introduction of TV/eq; There were noticeable gender differences developing between boys and girls after the introduction of TV/eq; Compared to Unitel and Multitel, where aggression had also increased, the increase was far greater in Notel/eq; The time spent engaging in leisure activities dropped following the introduction of TV/eq; She concluded that TV caused aggression/eq; She concluded that aggression can be explained by Social Learning Theory as children observed imitated aggression on TV/eq;</p> <p>Ignore ambiguous comments such as:</p> <p>'She found that children became more aggressive' or 'aggression increased' – without reference to the introduction of TV or the area (Notel)</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1d	<p>Two marks for one strength and two marks for one weakness of Williams' study. One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one strength/weakness, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Evaluation can include practical applications, methodological or ethical issues. Ignore restatements of results or conclusions.</p> <p>Strengths The behaviour was naturally occurring (first mark) it was conducted in a real place with a naturally occurring IV (second mark) not in a laboratory where behaviour is artificial (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>The behaviour was followed after two years for comparison before and after to be made (first mark) so the same children could be directly compared and any difference in behaviour reliably compared (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>The video cameras were set up in a natural setting of a playground (first mark) so normal children's activities could be observed as they occurred spontaneously (second mark) and cameras only started recording after a week to allow children to settle with them around (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>Weaknesses Being a natural experiment there was little control (first mark) over factors such as home life and cultural changes (second mark) control and restrictions of television viewing was not recorded (second mark) comparisons were not made between those children who watched a lot or little TV/eq;</p> <p>An observation of children's behaviour can be biased (first mark) the researchers were expecting to see higher levels of aggression in Notel, so may have recorded this when it was not really as aggressive as they observed (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>The towns were not entirely comparable because the towns had different channels (first mark) Notel only had access to the government controlled CBC channel and the others had US channels (second mark) and it was said that CBC had less violence compared to US channels/US channels had cartoon violence (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>The study was unique and one-off so cannot be repeated (first mark); so we cannot retest and check for reliability (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2a	<p>1 mark each correct aggressive behaviour. Take the first answer if more than one in an answer space.</p> <p>Pointing Jeering Shouting Swearing Raised voice Banging on desk Walking out Stamping feet Name-calling Punching</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points that indicate aggression that can be observed. Ignore non-aggressive behaviour or neutral behaviour e.g., touching, hand gestures, threatening behaviour, physical signs of aggression.</p>	<p>AO3 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2b	<p>Two marks for each ethical issue. If more than two issues, mark all and credit the best. If using the same ethical issue twice, mark only once, however, deception and informed consent are separate issues with similar commentary so mark independently and go with the intention of the candidate.</p> <p>Mark according to levels – use levels twice, one per issue.</p> <p>0 mark No rewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Correct identification of an appropriate ethical issue (named or described)</p> <p>2 marks Correct identification of an appropriate ethical issue and application to scenario OR correct identification and reasonable elaboration of the point.</p> <p>ID: Protection of participants/making sure participants were kept safe during the study; Application/elaboration: some participants were deliberately exposed to a violent game; violent games may cause distress or long term harm/eq; ID: Protection of participants; Application/elaboration: some participants may become distressed at the animal ethics debate and feel attacked in the debate; some participants may feel strongly about animal ethics and feel pressured to debate for the use of animals/eq; ID: Right to withdraw; Application/elaboration: participants were not told</p>	<p>AO 3 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p> <p>Link to 2c</p>

	<p>that they could leave the study/game play/ debate at any point/eq; ID: Right to withdraw; Application/elaboration: using friends might have meant their friends did not want to let Olwen and Tom down/eq; ID: Informed consent; Application/elaboration: participants were lied to so informed consent for the study of video game violence was not obtained/eq;</p> <p>There are other acceptable answers which are not on the specification such as: ID: Deception; participants were lied to about the nature of the investigation; Application: they were told it was about video game skills when it was about video game violence/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2c	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Credit only plausible suggestions for improving ethics . Ignore references to using a non-violent game (consider use of a less violent but still aggressive game e.g. mario cart) Ignore methodological improvements.</p> <p>TE: If b is blank but appropriate as a suggestion, all marks can be accessed. If c does not match b then no marks, if b is method issue and c is method suggestion, then no marks.</p> <p>Get presumptive consent from a different group of people (first mark) and use this to infer likelihood of actual consent (second mark)/eq; Offer right to withdraw; make sure participants understand that they can withdraw at any point in the study/eq; Use less violent game; a game that is still aggressive but not as violent as a boxing game/eq; Tell the participants at the start of the study the aims; so that they can be fully informed/deception can be avoided/they can chose whether or not to take part/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2) Link to 2b</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3a	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Use of the watershed as an example of censorship should not be credited as a word on its own without elaboration (e.g. 9pm/late night). Max 1 for examples (eg films that have been banned – Clockwork Orange, video games banned – COD, Grand Theft Auto)</p> <p>Definition (OWTTE) Preventing information from being viewed/controlling information/banned/restricted to age groups because of violent/sexual/inappropriate/content/ (confidential/secret/restricted information)/eq; Information considered harmful in ‘some way’ is not shown to protect the audience/eq</p> <p>Following/as well as the above definitions examples can gain credit. No examples can be credited in absence of the definition.</p> <p>The watershed is an example of censorship as harmful material is not shown until after 9pm/eq; Censorship can be managed through the use of ratings, such as U certificates/eq; Some films have been banned to protect the audience, such as Clockwork Orange. Music that has swearing during the daytime/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3b	C 9 pm	<p>AO1 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3c	<p>One mark per point/elaboration linking Emily’s behaviour to possible violence seen on TV. Concepts such as modelling, vicarious reinforcement, identification, role models, observational learning should be credited. Must be social learning explanation (can’t be biological, frustration-aggression or general learning model or tiredness at home affecting candidate). Accept ARRM with explanation. Examples gain credit.</p> <p>Max 2 marks if no reference to Emily’s aggression.</p> <p>According to SLT, Emily would have (watched and) copied/modelled the aggressive behaviour from TV/eq; Emily may have seen a role model of TV that was violence and copied the role model/eq;</p>	<p>AO2 = 5</p> <p>(5)</p>

	<p>The role model may share the same/similar characteristics as Emily, increasing the likelihood of being a role model/eq; If Emily is a young female and she looks up to a role model who is a young female superhero/eq;</p> <p>Emily's role model may be a aggressive/angry/violent female superhero/eq;</p> <p>Emily identified with the role model and wanted to be like them/eq;</p> <p>The role model may have been rewarded for the aggressive behaviour and Emily wanted to receive the same reward /known as vicarious reinforcement/eq;</p> <p>Examples</p> <p>Emily may watch her female superhero being praised for beating up the bad guys and want to achieve the same praise herself/eq;</p> <p>Emily might behave aggressively towards school friends as a result/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3d	<p>Explain how an educational psychologist might help Emily with her anger issues.</p> <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 1 mark if the answer is not related to Emily in at least one way. The response may detail one way or many ways – mark accordingly for breadth or depth. Ways can include; anger management, working with parents.</p> <p>Ignore vague responses such as 'talk to her', 'solve her problems' 'ask her', 'tell her what to do'. No credit for medication.</p> <p>The educational psychologist would work with the school and parents to give advise and support/eq;</p> <p>The ed psych would talk to Emily to try and find the roots/causes of her anger/eq;</p> <p>They would carry out an assessment of Emily's needs and behaviour/eq;</p> <p>They may observe Emily in the school/eq;</p> <p>The eucational psychologist may contact other agencies to help support the school and parents/eq;</p> <p>They would help parents and teachers deal with communication issues with Emily/eq;</p> <p>The educational psychologist may refer Emily to a child psychiatrist/eq;</p> <p>They may advise parents and teachers to reward positive behaviours/eq;</p> <p>The educational psychologist will help Emily identify triggers for her aggressive behaviour/eq;</p> <p>The would help Emily understand the faulty thinking patterns/eq;</p> <p>They would help her develop coping strategies, such as counting out/eq;</p> <p>She would practise using role play/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p>

Topic D: Why do we have phobias?

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	B Closed	AO3 = 1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	D Ranked style	A03 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6	A Open-ended question	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7	D Participants may feel their answer is restricted	A03 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8a	<p>C Some participants tried to help Darren and Ela by saying they disliked cats.</p> <p>D Many participants gave the middle rating on most questions.</p> <p>Ignore crossed through responses that have been replaced with an alternative answer. If more than two boxes crossed/ticked (without strikethrough) even if two out of the 3 or 4 crosses are correct, no marks can be given.</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8b	<p>1 mark for each point/elaboration. Three marks for one or more strengths. Ignore weaknesses. The following examples of one, two and three mark answers is not an exhaustive list and often combinations of different points can be equally credited.</p> <p>Max 2 marks for an answer that does not refer to investigating phobias (generic evaluation) at least once in the answer. 0 marks for just 'quick and easy' without elaboration of an example</p> <p>Questionnaires are standardised so all participants get the same questions, unlike a structured interview (first mark)/eq; this means that all participants are being asked the same questions on phobias and the findings can be directly compared (second mark)/eq; Lots of questionnaires can be sent out, so the results of the phobia survey are more likely to be reliable (third mark)/eq;</p> <p>They do not have the ethical concerns of an experiment because (informed) consent needs to be gained/eq; This is important as the subject is phobias which people might find distressing/eq; an experiment would not be appropriate in such cases as it may cause a phobic response, so a questionnaire is more ethical/eq;</p> <p>Questionnaires can ask direct questions about attitudes and opinions about phobias, which cannot be gained by an observation for example (first mark)/eq; It would be difficult and unethical to experiment on phobias as it can cause distress (second mark)/eq; observing a fear response does not gain the qualitative data that is able to be gathered using a survey (third mark)/eq;</p> <p>A large sample can be gathered as they are relatively easy to administer in large quantities (first mark)/eq; lots of data being returned can be better analysed and stronger conclusions drawn about the causes of phobias (second mark)/eq; data can be analysed and reliability is improved (third mark)/eq;</p> <p>Other strengths: Less intrusive than an interview More right to withdraw as do not feel they have to maintain participation The same instructions are given to everyone/same questions, so standardised.</p>	<p>A03 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

	Both qualitative and quantitative data gathered. Look for other reasonable marking points.	
--	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9a	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 1 mark for generic descriptions of evolutionary theory unrelated to spiders and cars.</p> <p>Ling's phobia is related to what was harmful in our evolutionary past/eq; Spiders were potentially harmful in our past/eq; Cars were not in our evolutionary past so could not have harmed us/eq; We have been genetically pre-programmed to be easily conditioned to fear spiders as a result of this/eq; The genetic predisposition has been passed down through generations through the genes/eq; Evolution has made us more scared of things that are different to humans (generic)/eq; Ancestors were scared of dangerous things and this is a hang up today/eq;</p> <p>Ignore comments saying cars were not harmful in our evolutionary past unless explaining they didn't exist.</p>	<p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9b	<p>The description is likely to be Bennett-Levy and Marteau (1984) but if offered an alternative study please check with your team leader if unsure. Do not accept Jones, Heinrichs or Pavlov. Accept Mineka (video splicing with snake and flower), Curio (blackbirds).</p> <p>Max 2 marks for each section: aims, procedure, results and/or conclusions.</p> <p>Bennett-Levy & Marteau A: Aimed to see what animals we think are quick/scary/different/sudden/more afraid of/would not want to be near to/eq; A: To test whether we are prepared to learn phobias of animals based on evolutionary theory/eq; P: Two questionnaires (and some interviews) were conducted concerning the same 29 animals/eq; P: The first questionnaire rated fear of animals and how near participants would like to be to the animals/eq; P: The second questionnaire asked participants to rate various features of the animals such as ugliness and sliminess/eq; R: Rat/spider were among the animals rated as most feared/eq; R: Lamb/robin rated as least feared/eq; R: Spider and cockroach rated as most ugly/eq; R: Slug were rated as most slimy and ugly/eq; R: Rats were rated as most speedy and sudden/eq; R: Men and women did not respond differently in terms of features of an animal but were less likely to approach certain animals than men/eq; R: Animals rated high for sliminess, ugliness and suddenness were less likely to be approached/eq; R: Animals rated high for sliminess, ugliness and suddenness were more feared/eq; R: Ugliness of an animal was related to how different the animal was</p>	<p>AO1 = 5</p> <p>(5)</p>

	<p>judged to be from a human/eq; C: They concluded that an animals features were related to how feared it was by humans/eq; C: They concluded that we have evolve a way of judging animals that are perceived to be dangerous, we are prepared to fear certain animals/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9c	<p>Two marks for one strength. One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one strength, mark all and credit the best. No marks for weaknesses.</p> <p>T.E. If the study in (b) does not match the study evaluated in (c) no marks can be given. If the study in (b) is not related to the evolutionary basis of phobias but (c) successfully offers a strength of that study, all marks can be given if the study is appropriate for this topic (phobias) and satisfies the requirements of the question (ie not just explain why we have a phobia). If no study is described in (b) but a strength of an identifiable study is given in (c) max 1 mark can be given. No marks if study is not concerning phobias in any way.</p> <p>Bennett-Levy & Marteau Two questionnaires/independent groups were used to prevent demand characteristics (first mark) this means that the participants who answered the first questionnaire did not alter their responses in the second questionnaire as different participants were used (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>The questionnaire was ethical as it did not expose participants to harm (first mark) showing participants a picture of an animal or an actual animal may have caused distress in phobics (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>It was good that both males and females were used in this study to show gender differences in phobias/eq; This makes the study more representative/eq;</p> <p>The findings are useful because they show that you don't have to have a scary experiences to develop phobias it is the features of the animals that are important/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>Clipped with b</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark						
10a	<p>Explanation</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; height: 50px; vertical-align: top;">Identification</td> <td style="width: 50%; height: 50px; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Example</p> <p>Delia wants to be like her sister. Her sister is afraid of dogs, so Delia acts as if she is afraid of dogs too.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; height: 50px; vertical-align: top;">Vicarious reinforcement</td> <td style="width: 50%; height: 50px; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Janek becomes scared when he is stuck in a lift, so is nervous of going in a lift again.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; height: 50px; vertical-align: top;">Classical conditioning</td> <td style="width: 50%; height: 50px; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Rachel sees Jack getting attention because he is scared of water, so Rachel says she is scared of water and avoids going swimming.</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Ignore crossed through lines. 0 marks for 1 correct line, 1 mark for 2 correct lines, 2 marks for three correct lines. If one explanation/example is matched with more than 1 explanation/example then 0 marks for that answer.</p>	Identification	<p>Example</p> <p>Delia wants to be like her sister. Her sister is afraid of dogs, so Delia acts as if she is afraid of dogs too.</p>	Vicarious reinforcement	<p>Janek becomes scared when he is stuck in a lift, so is nervous of going in a lift again.</p>	Classical conditioning	<p>Rachel sees Jack getting attention because he is scared of water, so Rachel says she is scared of water and avoids going swimming.</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>
Identification	<p>Example</p> <p>Delia wants to be like her sister. Her sister is afraid of dogs, so Delia acts as if she is afraid of dogs too.</p>							
Vicarious reinforcement	<p>Janek becomes scared when he is stuck in a lift, so is nervous of going in a lift again.</p>							
Classical conditioning	<p>Rachel sees Jack getting attention because he is scared of water, so Rachel says she is scared of water and avoids going swimming.</p>							

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10b	<p>Accept the correct answers below. One mark for each correctly placed term. Ignore crossed out answers. Accept reasonable spellings. In the whole response ignore unconditioned stimulus and unconditioned response as these are incorrect.</p> <p>Leon was taken horse riding as a treat for his birthday. He really liked horses and was looking forward to his riding lesson. The horse was a/an _____ neutral stimulus/NS _____ because Leon was not scared of horses at first.</p> <p>During the riding lesson, Leon lost his balance and fell off the horse. Leon did not want to go back on the horse because he was frightened of falling and hurting himself again. Classical conditioning would explain that after his fall, for Leon the horse would become the _____ conditioned stimulus/cs/conditional stimulus _____, which Leon now associated with fear. Fear was now the _____ conditioned response/cr/ conditional response _____ for Leon.</p>	<p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10c	<p>One mark per qualification stated beyond Level 3 (A-Levels). Take the first answer if more than one in an answer space.</p> <p>Qualification: Degree/Masters (in Psychology) BPS recognised degree Doctorate in clinical psychology Chartered status BPS conversion course</p> <p>Do not accept 'Psychology qualification' GCSEs A Levels Skills – e.g. listening skills, being a good listener, interested in people Work experience/shadowing</p> <p>Look for any other relevant qualification.</p>	<p>AO 1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10d	<p>It is expected that candidates will write about systematic desensitisation or flooding. However, other suitable therapies are creditworthy such as hypnotherapy, psychoanalysis, CBT. If more than one therapy described (however one therapy can include techniques from others), mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Max 2 marks if no reference to the scenario (horses/Leon)</p> <p>Ignore unidentified therapies, either by name or description e.g. talking to them (without any other reference to psychoanalysis), getting them on a horse (without reference to any other aspect of flooding). It does not matter if the name of the therapy does not match the description as long as the description is appropriate. Take care that evaluation is not credited (ie, it is OK to say that there is a right to withdraw (SD) but not if used evaluatively such as it is more ethical because of a right to withdraw).</p> <p>Eg Flooding Leon should be explained the therapy and told the nature of it before it starts/eq; Leon would be deliberately exposed to a horse/eq; This could be by putting him in stable/near a horse/eq; Leon would be forced to stay with the horse/eq; His anxiety would be initially very high/eq; Eventually his fear would subside/eq; He would learn to associate horses with relaxation/no fear/eq; He cannot be calm and scared at the same time/reciprocal inhibition/eq;</p> <p>Eg Systematic desensitisation Leon would have to develop a hierarchy of fears with his therapist/eq; This is a list of horse related situations which provoke mild to strong anxiety/eq; Leon would be taught relaxation techniques/eq; Relaxation techniques such as deep breathing/biofeedback/eq; Leon would be presented with/have to imagine his least feared situation/eq; Starting with a picture of a horse for example/eq; He would relax before he moved up the hierarchy of fears/eq; SD is based on classical conditioning/eq; Leon would learn to associate relaxation with each step of his hierarchy/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p>

Topic E: Are criminals born or made?

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11a	A. XYY	AO1 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11b	<p>One mark per point/elaboration of findings (results and/or conclusions). Ignore aims and procedure. The study measured various personality dimensions, intelligences and demographic features. If unsure please seek help for your team leader. Ignore 12/16 XYY and XXY as sample – this is procedure and not findings.</p> <p>XYY males had a lower level of intelligence/eq; XYY tended to be (more) aggressive/eq; intelligence rather than the XYY gene was a cause of potential aggression via social reasons (lack of education and opportunity)/eq; There were more similarities between XYY and XXY males than differences/eq; XYY is not a (direct) cause of aggression/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points</p>	AO1 = 3 (3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11c	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Accept both practical and ethical issues with researching convicted offenders. Do not accept evaluation of Theilgaard study.</p> <p>Offenders may lie about their criminal past/eq; Criminals may underplay their crimes for early release/to make you feel sorry for them/to look good/to prevent others getting in to trouble/eq; They may be distressed and remorseful about their crimes/eq; They feel under pressure to answer questions because they are in prison/eq; Fear of reprisal from other criminals may result in distress when discussing crimes/eq; Their memories might be unreliable/eq; They may glorify their crimes to make themselves look more criminal than they were/to show off/to gain prison respect/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	AO3 = 4 (4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12a	<p>1 mark for the dependent variable. Do not accept simplistic answers, e.g. guilt/how guilty they were.</p> <p>How guilty the defendant was rated on a scale/eq; Guiltiness from 1-5/eq;</p> <p>OWTTE – but should contain reference to the scale/rating and guilt Ignore ratings, guiltiness, answers, 1-5 on own as basic answer.</p>	<p>AO3 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12b	<p>Mark according to the levels below.</p> <p>0 marks – no rewardable material</p> <p>One mark for a basic answer: e.g. So they didn't repeat the study/so they didn't guess what was going on/because of demand characteristics/so they didn't hear both accents/eq;</p> <p>Two marks for an explained answer: e.g. So they didn't repeat the study and hear both accents as they would have been influenced by hearing both/they may have guessed the aim of the study by hearing both accents / responded to demand characteristics/eq;</p>	<p>AO3=2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12c	<p>1 mark for correct answer.</p> <p>Numbers/numerical/eq; Rating scales generate numbers/eq; Not prose/eq; Can be put into graphs and tables/statistics/counted/eq; Data types such as percentages/totals/tally's/mean/median/mode/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO3 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12d	<p>B. It can be easily analysed</p>	<p>AO3 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12e	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Candidates can draw upon research studies/theory to explain their answer. If candidates do both race and appearance/attractiveness then mark all and credit the best. Ignore accent.</p> <p>Race Participants shown a picture of a white defendant may rate less guilty than a black defendant/eq; or vice versa (based on social desirability) This was shown in research where race was a factor affecting jury decision making/eq; This is based on stereotyping/eq Dane and Wrightsman found that white defendants were more likely to receive lighter sentences than black defendants/eq;</p> <p>Appearance/attractiveness Participants shown a picture of an attractive defendant are likely to rate as less guilty than an unattractive defendant/eq; We stereotype attractive people as less likely to commit a crime and so less guilty/eq; Appearance is linked to type of crime, so burglary is seen as more likely to be committed by an unattractive person/eq; Attractive people are more likely to be judge guilty of crimes like Fraud/eq; Sigall and Ostrove found that attractiveness was rated less guilty if unlinked to the crime being committed/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
13	B nurture	AO 2 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
14a	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. No credit for examples alone. Only credit examples if they add more information to a marking point or they help to explain a marking point.</p> <p>To help the police catch criminals/eq; Ignore tautological answers such as 'create a profile of a criminal'</p> <p>Generates profile as a list of possible characteristics of the defendant/eq;</p> <p>Police use the list to narrow down possible suspects/eq;</p> <p>May suggest key evidence that they might find such as souvenirs taken from the victims/eq;</p> <p>Typical information in a profile includes age, sex, occupation, marital status (list of two of more features for this mark)/eq;</p> <p>It can help suggest interview techniques the police could use/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO 1= 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
14b	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one reason given then mark all and credit the best. Answers should focus on effectiveness, however, answers concerning appropriateness may be linked to effectiveness and receive credit. If unlinked (e.g. Rachel Nickell resulted in victimisation of Colin Stagg) no credit can be given. Ignore criminals may move out of the area.</p> <p>OP is argued to be nothing better than guesswork/is not accurate (first mark) as success rates are not significant (second mark)/wrong person might be caught/eq;</p> <p>It is difficult to judge success/effectiveness (first mark) as the profile does not specifically highlight the actual perpetrator (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>Many other factors can influence the success of a case other than the profile (first mark), such as police effectiveness, use of profile itself (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>Many police are reluctant to use the profile (first mark)and resort to traditional police work (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>The offender can easily slip through the net created by the profile (first mark) by changing characteristics/or change their signature/MO, etc (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>OP can lead police down the wrong path (first mark) and the real offender can get away (second mark)/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO 2= 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Indicative content
<p>15*</p> <p>4 AO1 + 4 AO2</p>	<p>Refer to the levels at the end of the indicative content.</p> <p>Appropriate answers may include the following indicative content, but the list is not exhaustive so look for other reasonable points.</p> <p>Description and evaluation of ONE social explanation, eg Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis, family circumstances, parenting strategies, self-fulfilling prophecy, Social Learning Theory. If more than one, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Family patterns (divorce (MDH), parental occupation, housing, family size, etc – all or one can be accepted)</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maternal deprivation can explain criminal behaviour as John Bowlby argued that separation may lead to delinquency. • If an attachment between child and caregiver is broken during the sensitive period of attachment the child may feel unloved/lack safe base/feel rejected. • The child may grow up feeling rejected and rejects others resulting in a lack of empathy and remorse. • Lack of remorse can lead to criminality as the individual has no sense of consequence towards other for their actions. <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bowlby's 44 thieves study supports this theory as children whom suffered deprivation were more likely to be delinquent and shown affectionless psychopathy. • Bowlby's study is not good evidence because he may have been biased in his interpretation of affectionless psychopathy/his sample was biased to those boys who attended a single centre in London/his control group used for comparison were also boys attending the centre with issues so not a useful control. • Bowlby's study is good evidence for his theory of maternal deprivation because he used an independent social worker to avoid bias in interviewing the boys/he gathered qualitative data and systematically reviewed all data to come to his conclusions. <p>Self-fulfilling prophecy</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self fulfilling prophecy can explain how labelling can cause anti-social behaviour. • An individual may commit an act of anti-social behaviour/be implicated in anti-social behaviour. • Becomes labelled as anti-social as a result. • Is treated in accordance with the label. • Behaviour is interpreted as anti-social. • Internalises the label/believes that they are anti-social. • Labels can be based on stereotypes. <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madon found that parental predictions of binge drinking

	<p>(as an anti-social behaviour) could be predicted, implicating possible parental labelling of their children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jahoda found that Ashanti tribe members given a name for a day of the week suggesting aggressive an nature were more likely to have a criminal record. • Rosenthal and Jacobsen found that teachers labelling of students intelligence affected their IQ scores, which is evidence of labelling in an academic context but could be used as evidence for SFP. • SFP ignores the influence of genetic factors which may control aggression. • SFP is very hard to experimentally study ethically. <p>Look for other material</p>
--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-2	Candidates offer a very limited account of one social explanation. There is no attempt to evaluate or any attempt is not worthy of credit. The answer is not always focused on the question and is not explained clearly.
Level 2	3-4	Candidates express brief and basic knowledge and evaluation of one social explanation of criminality OR There is an imbalance between description and evaluation or one element is missing/very brief.
Level 3	5-6	Candidates have described one social explanation well with range or detail. There is good/clear evaluation which may be brief but accurate in one way/OR/basic evaluation in more than one way.
Level 4	7-8	Candidates have described one social explanation very well with detail and range of points made. There is good attempt to evaluate in more than one way. (Evaluation may also involve comparison with an alternative explanation).

