Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO1 = 6   AO2 = 4   AO3 = 6]

Level	Mark	Description
4	13-16	Knowledge of one or more ways of dealing with offending is accurate and generally well detailed. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9-12	Knowledge of one or more ways of dealing with offending is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Application/discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5-8	Limited knowledge of one or more ways of dealing with offending is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion/application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-4	Knowledge of one or more ways of dealing with offending is very limited. Discussion/application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:
- behaviour modification – operant conditioning techniques to encourage positive behaviours; token economy systems using positive reinforcement in the form of secondary reinforcers for desired behaviours; secondary reinforcers (tokens) accrued and exchanged for primary reinforcers (intrinsic rewards)
- anger management – three-stage approach: cognitive preparation – identification of cues to anger, eg specific context or comments; skills acquisition – offender learns skills to manage own behaviour in anger-provoking situations; application practice – offenders have role-play opportunities to practise new skills and receive feedback
- custodial sentencing – aims (rehabilitation, retribution, deterrence, incapacitation/protection of society); psychological effects, eg brutalisation and repeat offending, deindividuation, depression; recidivism.

Possible application:
- custodial sentencing – Vera has re-offended regularly so aims of custodial sentencing have thus far not been met – she has not reformed, been rehabilitated, been deterred. Prison appears to have been temporary

incapacitation only
- behaviour modification – system of reward to manage Vera's temper could involve: tokens (secondary reinforcers) for pre-determined good/desired behaviour, eg waiting in line at mealtimes, not shouting at other prisoners; tokens might be exchanged for extra phone calls, visits, special food (primary reinforcers)
- anger management – to address long-term change: for cognitive preparation Vera writes about times she has been in trouble; in her classes she will practise skills such as relaxation, mantra, breathing techniques, positive self-statements and will role play situations which led to assault.

Possible discussion:
- use of evidence to support/counter effectiveness of ways of dealing with offending, eg Zimbardo (1971) institutionalisation; Snow (2006) self-harm; Hobbs and Holt (1976) token economy; Feindler (1984) anger management; Keen (2000) anger management; Ireland (2000) anger management
- re-offending rates/recidivism as an argument against incarceration
- ethics of control – behaviour modification is seen as manipulative, dehumanising
- short-term versus long-term benefits and suitability for different types of offender
- passivity (behaviour modification) versus active engagement and need for motivation to change (anger management)
- anger management role-play as an artificial situation – benefits do not transfer so well to real life situation
- problems determining effectiveness of interventions
- comparisons with other interventions.

Credit other relevant material, for example, restorative justice (but using this does not lend itself easily to application).

[16]

Q2.

(a) **[AO1 = 1]**

1 mark for restorative justice programmes.

1

(b) **[AO2 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Outline of recommendation is clear and detailed. Application shows sound understanding of the way of dealing with offending. The answer is coherent with appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Outline of recommendation is limited/muddled. Detail is lacking. Application shows some misunderstanding or lack of clarity. Use of specialist terminology is either absent or

		inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:
- case worker would recommend Jack and victim meet for restorative justice sessions then Jack will see the consequences – encouraging empathy in Jack
- case worker should encourage the burglary victim to explain to Jack what effect the burglary has had, eg loss of confidence, fear of people breaking into the house – this is to empower the victim and promote healing
- case worker could arrange for Jack to provide some form of restitution, eg returning the burgled goods or mending broken window etc.

Credit other relevant material.

Note: can still credit relevant material for part (b) even if the answer to (a) is incorrect or (a) is not answered.

Note: if answer to (a) is incorrect can credit (b) in respect of incorrectly identified way eg if answer to **(a)** is 'anger management' then can credit any relevant application of anger management in answer to part (b).

4

(c)   **[AO3 = 2]**

2 marks for a clear and coherent limitation with some elaboration.
1 mark a limited/muddled explanation.

Possible limitations:
- limited appropriateness – some victims may refuse to meet with the offender because they fear intimidation
- restorative justice programmes differ widely so are very difficult to evaluate – there is no one model so every case is different
- seen as a soft option where offenders might pretend to show remorse when they do not really; does not satisfy the public demand for retribution/punishment.

Credit other relevant limitations.

Note: credit limitations that match the answer to part (b)

2

[7]

Q3.

[AO2 = 4]

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Explanation of how anger management could be used to deal with Peter's offending is clear and appropriate. There is appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Explanation is limited, muddled or inappropriate. Use of specialist terminology is absent or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible application:
- therapist would help Peter to understand the specific triggers/cues that precipitate his anger, such as being in the bar/hearing stupid jokes – this is the cognitive preparation stage
- therapist would teach Peter skills to calm himself so his pulse does not race, eg teach him a mantra or positive self-statements, eg 'I am calm and relaxed' – the skills acquisition stage
- therapist would give Peter the chance to rehearse difficult situations in role-play sessions so he could get used to using self-control and not be provoked by 'hearing people talk' – the application training/practice stage
- therapist would give constructive feedback to Peter on his performance in the practice situations
- Peter would practise his new skills during the week and make a diary of his performance in anger provoking situations, eg arguments in the gym.

Credit other relevant material.

[4]

Q4.

[AO3 = 6]

For the strength, award marks as follows:

3 marks for a clear, coherent and detailed outline, using appropriate terminology.
2 marks for an outline which lacks some detail.
1 mark for a very limited/muddled outline.

Possible strengths:
• use of evidence to support the effectiveness
• addresses the thoughts/beliefs that underpin aggression, not just the behaviour – links to models in cognitive psychology
• promotes transferable skills such as self-reflection, self-confidence and self-control which can be generally life-enhancing
• comparison with behaviour modification, eg anger management is more long-term.

PLUS

For the limitation, award marks as follows:

3 marks for a clear, coherent and detailed outline, using appropriate terminology.
2 marks for an outline which lacks some detail.
1 mark for a very limited/muddled outline.

Possible limitations:
• requires the skills of a trained therapist so limited availability in prisons and expensive compared to reward-based behaviour management programmes
• relies on practising skills in role-play situations so unlike a real-life incident
• only useful for clients whose offences are caused by aggression – many offences are not aggression driven
• questions over long-term effectiveness – some studies show short-term only
• not all clients benefit – need to be motivated to change and engage properly in sessions and doing homework tasks.

Credit other relevant strengths and limitations.

[6]