

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO1 = 3]

3 marks for a clear and coherent outline with some elaboration.**2 marks** for a clear outline which lacks detail.**1 mark** for a limited/muddled outline.**Possible content:**

- offenders have distinctive, inherited/genetic personality traits
- high in neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism
- people with a high extraversion score are impulsive, seek sensation, drawing them to the thrill of criminal behaviour
- people with a high neuroticism score tend towards offending because they are unstable and unpredictable; they do not condition easily therefore do not learn by mistakes
- people with a high psychoticism score are cold, lack empathy and are prone to aggression.

Credit other relevant material.

[3]

Q2.

[AO1 = 6]

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Knowledge of how cognitive distortions might be involved in offending behaviour is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
2	3-4	Knowledge of how cognitive distortions might be involved in offending behaviour is mostly appropriate but lacks detail and/or clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology
1	1-2	Knowledge of how cognitive distortions might be involved in offending behaviour is limited/very limited. The answer lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- an offender's biased/dysfunctional thinking about their offence serves to legitimise behaviour and maintain a positive view of the self
- hostile attribution bias suggests offenders misinterpret social cues and justify their actions to themselves by attributing cause to the victim, eg an unprovoked act is justified on the grounds that the victim did something to initiate the violence

- minimalisation (minimisation) – offenders justify offence to themselves by playing down the significance of their act, eg suggesting injuries inflicted in a vicious assault were mild. This bias acts to reduce an offender's feeling of guilt
- other forms of cognitive distortion seen in offenders, eg belief in a just world leading to victim blaming.

Credit other relevant material.

[6]

Q3.

[AO3 = 6]

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Evaluation of the role of cognitive distortions in offending is detailed and effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
2	3-4	Evaluation of the role of cognitive distortions in offending is mostly effective but lacks detail and/or clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology
1	1-2	Evaluation of the role of cognitive distortions in offending is limited/very limited. The answer lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible evaluation:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the existence of cognitive distortions in offenders
- hostile attribution bias can explain reactive aggressive behaviour better than pre-meditated and planned aggression
- most research relies on use of hypothetical stories/vignettes to determine likely response – this is unlike real aggression in a real-life situation
- cognitive explanations, eg minimalisation can describe how an offender rationalises/interprets his/her actions but does not necessarily explain the initial cause of the offending
- relative importance of cognitive distortion in relation to other explanations for aggression
- implications for dealing with offending – changing cognitive appraisal might lead to successful rehabilitation.

Credit other relevant material.

[6]

Q4.**[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]**

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

Possible content:

- superego-based explanations – id is insufficiently controlled/moderated because of problems with development of the superego in Phallic stage (morality principle)
 - deviant superego due to identification with deviant parent
 - under-developed/weak superego due to failure to identify fully
 - over-harsh/overdeveloped superego is excessively punitive so crimes are committed to fulfil unconscious desire for punishment
- importance of early experience - attachment-based explanation – Bowlby's maternal deprivation hypothesis – deprivation leads to affectionless psychopathy and delinquency
- defence mechanisms allow offender to unconsciously justify behaviour, eg:
 - displacement – might explain why innocent victims are targeted as substitutes for real objects of anger/frustration
 - sublimation – desire to commit a heinous crime is diluted, eg vandalising a person's car instead of physically attacking them
 - rationalisation, eg 'rich people deserve to be burgled because they have much more than everyone else'.

Possible discussion:

- lack of falsifiability – concepts are unconscious and therefore cannot be empirically tested
- seeing the problem as within the person neglects the complexity of the social conditions of offending, eg deprivation, lack of education, poverty etc
- male identification is stronger (according to Freud) therefore males should be more moral than females – evidence that more males offend
- no evidence to suggest children without a same-sex parent offend more
- problems with maternal deprivation theory: Bowlby's evidence; blaming the mother; confusing privation and deprivation
- psychic determinism: suggests offenders cannot be held responsible; if problems are rooted in childhood experience behaviour cannot change
- alternative explanations, eg social learning, differential association
- nature-nurture debate – psychodynamic theory combines innate drives (id) and effects of early experience.

Credit other relevant material.

[16]

Q5.

[AO1 = 6]

Level	Mark	Description
3	5-6	Description is clear, accurate and detailed. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
2	3-4	Description is mostly clear but lacks detail in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Description is limited/muddled. The answer lacks clarity and accuracy. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- superego-based explanations – id is insufficiently controlled/moderated – deviant superego due to identification with deviant parent in Phallic stage; under-developed/weak superego due to failure to identify fully in Phallic stage; over-harsh superego is excessively punitive so crimes are committed to fulfil unconscious desire for punishment
- attachment-based explanation – Bowlby stated maternal deprivation leads to consequences such as affectionless psychopathy and delinquency
- defence mechanisms allow the criminal to unconsciously justify criminal behaviour, eg a criminal might use rationalisation, eg 'rich people deserve to be burgled because they have much more than everyone else'.

Credit other relevant material.

[6]