

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2013

GCSE Psychology (5PS02/01)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 2013

Publications Code UG037253

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

General Guidance on Marking – GCSE Psychology

All candidates must receive the same treatment.

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for incorrect or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing correct application of principles and knowledge.

Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even unconventional answers may be worthy of credit.

Candidates must make their meaning clear to the examiner to gain the mark. Make sure that the answer makes sense. Do not give credit for correct words/phrases which are put together in a meaningless manner. Answers must be in the correct context.

Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the Team Leader must be consulted.

Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

- an idea of the types of response expected
- how individual marks are to be awarded
- the total mark for each question
- examples of responses that should NOT receive credit (where applicable).

/ 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 meaning 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.

Quality of Written Communication

Questions which involve the writing of continuous prose will expect candidates to:

- show clarity of expression
- construct and present coherent arguments
- demonstrate an effective use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Full marks can only be awarded if the candidate has demonstrated the above abilities.

Questions where QWC is likely to be particularly important are indicated "QWC" in the mark scheme BUT this does not preclude others.

Question Number	What was the dependent variable in Anderson and Dill's experiment? Answer	Mark
1(c)	<p>Although it is expected that candidates refer to the main experiment (study 2) the correlation is also creditable.</p> <p>0 marks – no rewardable material</p> <p>One mark for a basic DV</p> <p>Correlational study: Delinquency World view Aggressive behaviour</p> <p>Experiment: Aggression/aggressive thinking Noise given Violence Hostility Competition World view</p> <p>Two marks for a detailed DV</p> <p>Correlational study: Aggression impulsivity Trait aggression (verbal, physical, hostility, anger) Self reported aggressive/non-aggressive delinquency Perception of crime likelihood</p> <p>Experiment Intensity/length of blasts of noise participant choose to deliver Cognitive aggressive thinking reaction test Aggressive competition reaction time test Crime and safety ratings</p> <p>OWTTE</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	What did Anderson and Dill conclude from their experiment? Answer	Mark
1(d)	<p>One mark for clear conclusion. Ignore reference to any specific results (e.g. Ps gave more loud blasts etc.) Although it is expected that candidates refer to the main experiment (study 2) the correlation is also creditable.</p> <p>Credit just 'video games increased aggression' – candidates do not have to state 'violent video games...'</p> <p>Correlational study: Both aggressive and non-aggressive delinquent behaviour was related to exposure to violent games and trait aggression; Time spent playing video games was linked to delinquent behaviour; Playing violent video games is linked to the development of an aggressive personality;</p> <p>Experiment: Playing violent video games increased aggression; Violent video games make players think aggressively (priming of aggression); Violent video games made females more aggressive than males. Violent video games cause aggression; High levels of irritability and violent game play increases aggression/irritability is a vulnerability factor in susceptibility to aggression in response to violent game play;</p> <p>Consider OWTTE and other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Explain one problem with Anderson and Dill's study. Answer	Mark
1(e)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Answers may conclude alternative explanations/interpretations of findings (e.g. nature/nurture) or methodological issues with research.</p> <p>The points raised need to be linked to Anderson & Dill to gain two marks as the Q is explain rather than outline (e.g. aggressive behaviour). If no explicit link then max 1.</p> <p>Ignore application issues.</p> <p>The conclusions are drawn from a lab experiment so may be unrealistic (1 mark); participants do not naturally administer loud blasts of noise to an opponent (second mark); Ps may have acted differently to when they play games at home (alternative second mark);</p> <p>The study was unethical as they deceived Ps (1 mark); they were told it was a study about motor skills (rather than about aggression) (second mark);</p> <p>The study was unethical as Ps may have been harmed (1 mark); the loud blast of noise would not have been pleasant for the losing Ps (second mark);</p> <p>The findings are only of short term exposure to video games (1 mark); long term exposure may have a different effect (second mark);</p> <p>They were part of a psychology experiment about video games and could have guessed the aims (1 mark); which would make the conclusion unreliable/less valid (second mark);</p> <p>Research only linked aggressive video game play to delinquency/aggression traits (1 mark); so causation cannot be established (second mark);</p> <p>Consider OWTTE and other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A02 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Explain one strength of Anderson and Dill's study. Answer	Mark
1(f)	<p>Two marks for one strength. One mark for a basic strength of study and a further mark for elaboration.</p> <p>The points raised need to be linked to Anderson & Dill to gain two marks as the Q is explain rather than outline (e.g. aggressive behaviour). If no explicit link then max 1.</p> <p>It was conducted in a laboratory so has control (1 mark), so other variables did not have an effect of the punishments they gave (2nd mark);</p> <p>Participants were split into two separate groups of violent or non-violent game (1 mark) so demand characteristics/order effects/ were reduced (2nd mark);</p> <p>There were strong controls like the length of time they played for (1 mark), this makes the findings more replicable/reliable (2nd mark)</p> <p>They used as control group as a comparison (1 mark), this allowed them to conclude a cause-effect relationship between <i>type</i> of game and aggression (2nd mark)</p> <p>They were 'blind' to the aim of the study (1 mark), this means their aggressive behaviour should be more valid as they were less likely to show social desirability(2nd mark)</p> <p>Has good application in terms of putting age restrictions on video games (1 mark), as there was a link between violent video games and aggression, games should not be sold to 'minors' (2nd mark)</p> <p>Correlation involved the use of tried and tested self report scales for aggression (1 mark), this makes the findings more replicable/reliable(2nd mark);eq</p> <p>The correlational element of the study investigated aggressive behaviour in real life and not just in the laboratory (1 mark), so this makes the study more ecologically valid (2nd mark);eq</p> <p>Consider OWTTE and other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Describe how Burt might go about conducting a content analysis on the video game.	
	Indicative content	
2(a) AO3 = 3	<p>See levels below for marking Answer must be a content analysis, ignore answers/answer parts referring to experimental procedures.</p> <p>Burt may choose to play the game himself; Burt may choose to watch his brother playing the game; Burt would need to categorise behaviour he felt was aggressive/non-aggressive; Burt might choose punching as violent behaviour; Burt would need to tally each time he saw a category of behaviour shown on the video game; Burt would total his tallies to see how much aggression he observed;</p> <p>There may be other procedural points.</p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
	1	Brief and/or basic outline of how Burt might conduct the content analysis including one of the three from how (e.g. played game or watched brother), the what is clear (naming specific behaviours that could be looked for) and the recording (e.g. tallying up the behaviours). Or two are generic; e.g. Burt would study the game and record what violence was in it.
	2	Good description of how Burt might conduct his content analysis that including two of the three from how (e.g. played game or watched brother), the what is clear (naming specific behaviours that could be looked for) and the recording (e.g. tallying up the behaviours). e.g. Burt would choose the game and study them and record the content using tallies.
	3	Detailed description of how Burt might conduct the content analysis that includes the how (e.g. played game or watched brother), the what is clear (naming specific behaviours that could be looked for) and the recording (e.g. tallying up the behaviours; e.g. Burt would choose a violent game that his brother plays, decide what was violent and not violent, such as punching, and record each instance of punching using a tally.

Question Number	Burt was worried that his content analysis may be subjective. This means that: Answer	Mark
2(b)	C Burt's opinion of aggressive behaviour may be different to someone else's.	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Burt's friends were interested in his conclusion and they asked him whether other video games contained the same amount of aggression. What would Burt have to do to answer this question? Answer	Mark
2(c)	C Study a greater variety of video games.	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Burt felt that a content analysis was a good research method to use to study aggression in video games. This is because: Answer	Mark
2(d)	B he was able to record how much aggression is viewed	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Describe ethical issues that need to be considered when conducting experimental research into video games and aggression. Answer	Mark
2(e)	<p>Four marks for outlining ethical issues. Protection of participants is an overarching guideline that encompasses many guidelines, such as distress and right to withdraw. Watch out for repetition of the same issue. Candidates <i>must</i> relate it to aggression/video games. Credit any guideline which is <i>relevant</i> to research into aggression.</p> <p>Do not credit descriptions of guidelines that are not related, <i>by the candidate</i> to video games and/or aggression (e.g. just outlining why, in general, we should respect confidentiality or gain informed consent). Remember the Q is asking about ethical <i>issues</i> not ethical <i>guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Credit findings of studies if they are used to highlight an issue.</p> <p>Accept answers that use Burt and his brother as examples.</p> <p>It is deliberately trying to cause aggression; Participants are not protected because they are exposed to aggression; It may result in long term aggressive behaviour; Informed consent is often not gained because this may change how aggressive people will be playing a game; They may feel as though they have to finish the game so the right to withdraw may be violated; Ps may be made to play a game they would not usually want to and it is unethical to get someone to do this; Participants may not leave the study in the same psychological state as they entered because they have been made to be aggressive; Participants will probably be deceived about the (aim of) study in order to get a valid measure of aggression; They must ensure that Ps don't get distressed from playing a violent video game; After playing the game, Ps may remain aggressive/behaviour gets worse (for a while); The increase in aggression from playing the games may cause the Ps distress; Must ensure that the game is age appropriate as it may contain disturbing scenes (and cause Ps distress); e.g. Anderson & Dill could have damaged Ps hearing from the loud noises;</p> <p>Consider OWTTE and look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A03 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p>

Question Number	Lydia was watching TV and saw a cartoon character being praised for playing nicely in the school playground. The next day Lydia played nicely with her school friends. Lydia copied the cartoon character because of: Answer	Mark
3	A Vicarious reinforcement	AO2 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Keith wants to be just like his father. He is often found dressing up in his father's clothes and pretending to be his father working on the computer. Keith copying his father is because of: Answer	Mark
4	B Identification	AO2 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Outline a biological explanation of aggression. Answer	Mark
5(a)	<p>There is one ID mark available. A candidate cannot score 2 ID marks. Biological explanations can include all or one of the following; the role of the limbic system/amygdala, the role of hormones, the influence of genetics.</p> <p>No credit for non-biological approaches/explanations. Examples can gain credit if they add to the description and are not expressed in an evaluative way.</p> <p>Limbic system [ignore just the brain]/amygdala [ID]; Damage to this area can result in problems trying to control aggression/recognise aggression/producing aggression; Damage to this area can be caused by tumour or trauma; such as the case of Charles Whitman where a tumour pressed against his amygdala and caused aggression;</p> <p>Testosterone/hormones [ID]; High levels of testosterone can cause aggression; Testosterone is a hormone that is produced in higher quantities in males; Injecting testosterone in animals increases aggression; Castrating animals lowers testosterone and lowers aggression;</p> <p>Genetics /can be inherited [ID]; The XYY chromosome abnormality was once implicated as a genetic basis for aggression; Selective breeding in animals has led to some evidence of highly aggressive animals; Twin and adoption studies have shown a high concordance for aggression; Individuals with low MAOI activity have been shown to be aggressive under provocation (warrior gene);</p> <p>OWTTE and look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Outline one strength of a biological explanation of aggression. Answer	Mark
5(b)	<p>Explanations to give one strength of include; the role of the limbic system/amygdala, the role of hormones, the influence of genetics.</p> <p>Do not credit simple statements like ‘...there is evidence from a study.’</p> <p>e.g. Testosterone Animal studies have been conducted to show that increased testosterone leads to aggression/castration leads to lowered aggression; Human blood samples of testosterone levels correlate with self-reported aggression;</p> <p>e.g. Limbic system/amygdala the case of Charles Whitman who had a tumour pressing against his amygdala has been linked to his murders; [King, 1961] reported a documented case of aggression induced by the electrical stimulation of a woman’s brain;</p> <p>Generic Research is scientific as physiological/bodily measures can be taken as evidence; Objective measures can be taken of hormone levels/genes/brain scans, which are scientific;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Compare two explanations of the causes of aggression. Comparisons include similarities and/or differences. Answer	Mark
6	<p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>Students are likely to be focusing on Social Learning Theory and the biological theories (treat one/all biological theories as the same). Two different biological theories can be compared. However, they may have studied other explanations for aggression which can be credited here e.g. operant conditioning, classical conditioning, labelling, self-fulfilling prophecy, family patterns.</p> <p>If a candidate simply writes a paragraph on one explanation then a paragraph on a different explanation then max 1 as the comparison is implicit.</p> <p>The biological approach states that aggression comes from within us, whereas Social learning theory says that it comes from sources in our environment ;</p> <p>Both theories cannot prove causality, the reverse may be true;</p> <p>Social learning theory we cannot be sure that aggressive children do not seek out media, similarly aggression may cause higher levels of testosterone;</p> <p>Both are difficult to study directly; e.g. Observed media can be imitated with a delay so hard to study, the limbic system is unethical to study in live humans;</p> <p>Social learning theory is on the nurture side of the debate and biological theories on the nature side of the debate;</p> <p>Social learning theory ignores the influence of biological reasons and biological reasons ignores the role of the environment;</p> <p>If chosen two biological theories</p> <p>Both hormones and brain structure are biological;</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	Jez and her class were given a questionnaire on phobias by their teacher. The first question asked whether or not she had a phobia. What type of question is this? Answer	Mark
7	C Closed question	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	The next question asked Jez how she might feel around certain animals, such as a spider. What type of question is this? Answer	Mark
8	A Open-ended question	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Jez was then asked to describe where she thought phobias might come from. What type of question is this? Answer	Mark
9	A Open-ended question	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	On the questionnaire Jez lied and said she had a phobia. This answer is an example of: Answer	Mark
10(a)	A social desirability	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Jez found that everyone in her class had been given the same guidance at the beginning of the questionnaire. In psychology this guidance is known as: Answer	Mark
10 (b)(i)	B standardised instructions	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Other than telling the students how to complete the questionnaire, explain another purpose of this guidance. Answer	Mark
10 (b)(ii)	One mark for one use of standardised instructions other than knowing how to complete the questionnaire. If more than one use, mark all and credit the best. Do not credit answers that refer to 'it being fair'. Is used as a control; To make sure everyone gets the same so results are not affected by different instructions; So the participants are treated in the same way; Allows good ethics, such as the right to withdraw; To avoid experimenter bias; OWTTE. Look for other reasonable marking points.	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Jez preferred to answer the open-ended questions in the questionnaire. Using your knowledge of this type of questioning, explain why Jez may have preferred answering open-ended questions compared to closed questions. Answer	Mark
10(c)	1 mark per point/elaboration. Candidate answer can be 'preferred open-ended questions' or 'didn't prefer closed questions'. It allows Jez to respond freely; Closed questions are restrictive; Jez can explain her answer with detail; Closed questions do not allow detail as answer is forced/optioned; Jez preferred them as she can explain her reasons – her main reason may not have been a choice if a closed Q was used/more detail than a simple yes/no answer (2 marks) OWTTE. Look for other reasonable marking points.	AO3 = 2 (2)

Question Number	Jez's teacher preferred using the closed questions in the questionnaire. Using your knowledge of this type of questioning, explain one reason why the teacher conducting the questionnaire may have preferred to use closed questions in her study. Answer	Mark
10(d)	1 mark per point. If more than one then mark all and credit the best. Candidate answer can be 'preferred closed questions' or 'didn't prefer open-ended questions'. Reject simply 'easier' or 'quicker' by itself Easier to analyse as they are not detailed; Can be simply counted up; Do not require interpretation which is time consuming; Not vulnerable to experimenter bias as no interpretation; Objective and factual; OWTTE	AO3 = 1 (1)

Question Number	<p>Angharrad has a phobia of cats. Her teacher explained that she may have developed her fear through the process of classical conditioning.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of classical conditioning, describe how Angharrad's teacher may have explained how she developed her fear of cats.</p> <p>You may use a diagram as part of your answer.</p> <p>Answer</p>	Mark
11(b)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Accept diagrams related to the scenario up to max 2. No credit for unlinked diagrams. Answer must include Angharrad and/or cats or fear. To gain maximum there must be reference to an association or similar and the UCS must be clearly identifiable (e.g the scratch, loud noise etc.).</p> <p>If the UCS is unclear (e.g. they simply state UCS/a feared object/ something scary) then max 2.</p> <p>Before developing her fear, the cat would be the NS/cat originally produces no fear response; She may have associated something bad with the cat (e.g. a loud noise); Angharrad/She could have been bitten/scratched by a cat; She will have been scared/hurt by the bite/scratch; She would have associated the fear with the cat so is now scared of them;</p> <p>1 mark diagram Cat + scratch = fear, then Cat = fear</p> <p>2 mark diagram Cat (NS) = No Fear; Cat (NS) + Scratch (UCS) = Fear (UCR); Cat (CS) = Fear (CR);</p>	<p>A02 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Which side of the nature-nurture debate does the theory of classical conditioning fit into? Explain your answer. Answer	Mark Type 1
11(c)	<p>1 mark for nurture ID and a further mark for reason or evidence. If the candidate's answer refers to nature and makes clear reference to UCS-UCR being an innate biological reflexive action, then credit can be given. Please send to review if unsure.</p> <p>Reject answers that just state '...because it is learnt' or 'because it is the environment/surroundings' – answer must be qualified (see examples below).</p> <p>Nurture; (ID) Learning is based on experiences from our environment; We are not born with behaviours such as phobias, they are learnt; Watson and Raynor (1920) showed us how we can learn a behaviour through association;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Name the therapy used to treat Little Peter. Answer	Mark
11 (d) (i)	<p>If more than one therapy written, take the first answer.</p> <p>(Systematic) desensitisation/deconditioning. Do not credit systematic by itself.</p> <p>Accept various spellings.</p>	<p>AO1 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Describe how this therapy could be applied to treat Angharrad's phobia of cats. Answer	Mark
11 (d) (ii)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>TE: If di is blank and dii appropriately describes how Angharrad can be treated using systematic desensitisation, all marks are available. If di is wrong (flooding) and dii correctly applied systematic desensitisation to treat Angharrad, max 1 mark can be given. If di is flooding (no mark given) and dii is flooding full marks can be given for this part.</p> <p>Each step must be linked to Angharrad's fear of cats. Do not credit just pure description of systematic desensitisation without any linking.</p> <p>Ignore reference to role models</p> <p>Angharrad can be any age, so accept any relevant conditioned stimulus e.g. toys, relaxation techniques.</p> <p>Angharrad can develop a hierarchy of fear; The lowest level might be looking at a picture of a cat with the highest being to stroke one; She would be taught relaxation techniques to keep her calm at each level; She will only progress to the next level of the hierarchy if she agrees/improvement is seen; Beginning at the least feared scenario, using relaxation (or equivalent) to progress to more feared scenarios; The idea is that she will begin to associate relaxation with cats; She could be gradually introduced to a cat starting from a distance and then getting closer each time/encouraged to get closer and closer to a cat each time</p> <p>Angharrad could be given something that makes her happy whilst she is around cats; The cat could be introduced slowly whilst she has her happy object; Eventually she will be happy around cats because she associates the cat with being happy;</p> <p>OWTTE</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Other therapies such as flooding can be used to treat phobias. Describe flooding as a treatment for phobias. Answer	Mark
11(e)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 1 for explained example. Do not credit statements like "Put in a room of spiders".</p> <p>Ignore reference to thinking/cognition/forgetting fear.</p> <p>A phobic object is deliberately forced onto the phobic/exposed to highest level of fear/phobia immediately/facing their fear head-on; For example, someone who fears heights is taken to the top of a building and made to look over/someone who fears cats is put in a room with a cat in it;</p> <p>The phobic is scared/anxious (for a while) eventually calms down/relaxes/becomes less anxious;</p> <p>The phobic learns to associate the object with calm and no fear;</p> <p>The phobic cannot escape the situation/forced reality/locked in a room with their phobic object in it;</p> <p>You cannot react fearfully forever;</p> <p>Based on reciprocal inhibition;</p> <p>OWTTE. Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Outline one ethical issue with using flooding as a treatment for phobias. Answer	Mark
11(f)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. To gain 2 marks the candidate must either name the ethical issue/guideline within their outline <i>or</i> have it embedded in their answer, otherwise one mark. If more than one ethical issue identified and outlined, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>No ID mark here. No credit for just naming an ethical guideline.</p> <p>The patient/phobic becomes highly distressed by being directly exposed to their fear, so could be <i>physically or psychologically harmed</i>;</p> <p>They cannot escape the situation/<i>no right to withdraw</i> and has to endure the fear;</p> <p>Causes high levels of physiological arousal that may cause <i>physical or psychological harm</i>;</p> <p>OWTTE. Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Describe the evolutionary preparedness theory of phobias and explain how the findings of Bennett-Levy and Marteau's (1984) study can be used to support this theory.	
	Indicative content	
12* AO1 = 3 AO2 = 3	<p>Ignore any other study described.</p> <p>Evolutionary preparedness We are scared of animals that could have harmed us in our evolutionary past. This is when animals could have caused our death so avoidance was crucial for survival. This preparedness for fear has been passed down through the genes to ensure survival. For early humans, fearing certain animals and situations would have been adapted so this association would have been passed on through generations. Modern objects are less feared because they did not feature in our evolutionary past.</p> <p>Bennett-Levy & Marteau (outline of findings) They found that rats and cockroaches were rated as more feared compared to rabbits. Cockroaches and spiders were perceived as being ugly. Animals that were different looking than humans were rated uglier. Those animals with higher fear ratings were less likely to be approached. Men and women did not differ in fear rating but women were less likely to approach feared animals.</p> <p>Bennett-Levy & Marteau (explaining how it supports) They concluded that we are more <i>prepared</i> to learn phobias of animals that are ugly, slimy and speedy. As they found that ugliness, sliminess etc. make animals more frightening, it suggests that we are more <i>prepared</i> to be scared of them. This is because ugly, slimy etc. animals those which people are more likely to have phobias of. Animals which could potentially pose a threat to humans were feared (like jellyfish or snakes) so through evolution we would be 'programmed' to fear them (the same argument can be applied to speediness). Being fearful of speedy/ugly/dangerous animals would have benefitted early humans so this is why we fear them now.</p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
0	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-2	<p>A brief and basic description of either the study or theory OR a basic description of preparedness and no mention of Bennett-Levy OR a basic description of Bennett-Levy and no mention of preparedness OR brief mention of preparedness and Bennett-Levy</p> <p>Writing communicates ideas using everyday language but the response lacks clarity and organisation. The students spells, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.</p>
Level 2	3-4	<p>A basic description of preparedness and a basic description of the findings from Bennett-Levy with no linking to preparedness OR A good description of preparedness with a limited/no attempt at the use of Bennett-Levy in explaining how it supports the theory</p>

		<p>OR a good attempt at explaining how Bennett-Levy supports preparedness with a limited/no account of describing preparedness</p> <p>Writing communicates ideas using psychological terms accurately and showing some direction and control in the organisation of material. The student uses some of the rules of grammar appropriately and spells and punctuates with considerable accuracy, although some spelling errors may still be found.</p>
Level 3	5-6	<p>At least a good description of preparedness and a good use of Bennett-Levy in explaining how it supports the theory.</p> <p>Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely selected psychological terms and organising information clearly and coherently. The student spells, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy.</p>

Topic E: Are criminals born or made?

Question Number	State two characteristics of a defendant that have been shown to affect jury decision-making. Answer	Mark
<p>13 (a) (i)</p>	<p>One mark for each characteristic. The characteristic identified must be represented in genuine psychological literature. Please refer to review if unsure.</p> <p>If more than one written under Characteristic 1 and/or Characteristic 2 then credit the first one only.</p> <p>Reject 'appearance or looks' as it is too vague. Reject 'good-looking, ugly by itself' but do credit good looking vs. ugly as this can be taken as attractiveness.</p> <p>Attractiveness/good looking vs. ugly; Race/skin colour; Accent; Baby facedness; Gender; Age/young or old;</p> <p>There are others.</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Explain how one of the defendant characteristics you have stated in (a)(i) might affect jury decision-making. Answer	Mark
<p>13 (a)(ii)</p>	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one defendant characteristic explained, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>TE: If ai is blank but aii correctly explains appropriate defendant characteristic, all marks are available. If ai is incorrect but aii correctly explains an appropriate defendant characteristic max 1 mark. If ai is incorrect in identifying a defendant characteristic but does identify a non-legal feature that could plausibly influence jury decision making (e.g. stereotypes) and aii correctly explains this, then max 1 mark can be awarded. If (a)(ii) does not match either characteristic from (a)(i), then no marks.</p> <p>Attractiveness. Jurors see attractiveness as intelligence, honesty and friendliness, so not characteristics of a criminal (1 mark), therefore they are then less likely to find the person guilty/considered less likely to commit a crime (2nd mark) They use the <i>stereotype</i> of attractiveness to base their decision (1 mark), so they would not expect someone attractive to be violent so are less likely to find them guilty (2nd mark) Sigall and Ostrove found that beautiful people receive less harsh sentences for certain crimes (burglary) (1 mark), however if the crime is fraud where attractiveness might 'help' people get tougher sentences (2nd mark);</p> <p>Only award one mark for a reverse explanation like 'attractive people are less likely to be guilty whereas unattractive people are more likely to be guilty'</p> <p>Race. If the jurors <i>perceive a/have stereotypes about</i> a certain race this could affect their decision (1 mark), if the stereotype of that race is linked to criminal behaviour then they are less likely to find that person innocent (2nd mark)</p> <p>Accent. Jurors hear accents and judge people based on <i>stereotypes</i> of the accent (1 mark); Posh accents are not associated with violent crime so are seen as less guilty (2nd mark) Some regional accents are seen as associated with violent crime so are judged more harshly (1 mark), Mahoney and Dixon found that Brummie accents were associated with armed robbery (2nd mark)</p> <p>OWTTE</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Sigall and Ostrove (1975) conducted an experiment on jury decision-making. Explain one strength and one weakness of this study. Answer	Mark
13(b)	<p>Two marks for one strength and two marks for one weakness. One mark for a basic strength of study and a further mark for elaboration.</p> <p>The points raised need to be linked to Sigall & Ostrove to gain two marks as the Q is explain rather than outline (e.g. attractiveness). If no explicit link then max 1.</p> <p>Do not credit 'it was unrealistic/does not relate to real life/was not true to life' by itself – it needs to be qualified (see below). Candidates can still pick up one mark for outlining what was not realistic though even if they do simply state 'it was not real life'.</p> <p>Do not credit 'large sample' as a strength as there were only 20 <i>per group</i>.</p> <p>Strength The study was highly controlled like using the same story for burglary/fraud conditions/ (1 mark); so it can be said to be reliable/replicable (second mark); so the researchers could establish a cause-effect relationship between attractiveness and guilt (second mark alternative);</p> <p>A control group was used as a comparison (1 mark); this was to ensure that the photo had a real effect on decision making (second mark alternative); this ensured that the researchers would know it was attractiveness causing changes in guilty verdicts; (second alternative mark)</p> <p>An independent measures design was used as different groups did not see the other photo/description (1 mark); this was to minimise demand characteristics/participants did not guess the study aim (second mark);</p> <p>Weaknesses The study was not a realistic representation of what would happen to a real juror (1 mark); Real jurors would see the defendant and make decisions on more than looks alone (second mark); this means that the results may not apply to real courtroom situations (second mark alternative);</p> <p>The measures of sentence was not realistic (1 mark); jurors do not normally give a sentence length, they just decide on guilt/it is the judges job to do this not the jury (second mark); real jurors would not complete a questionnaire, they would make a decision based on discussion (second mark alternative);</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p>

Question Number	Describe what is meant by 'twin study' as a research method. Answer	Mark
14(a)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Examples of actual twin studies of criminality is Max 1 mark but must be about methodology and not just results. Ignore tautological simple answers.</p> <p>A twin study is when a pair of twins (groups of pairs) are compared; To look for differences/similarities between them; Look at sets of twins to see whether if one twin is a criminal (or any named example), the other one is too/the other one is not; Comparing whether identical twins and non-identical twins are criminals (or any named example) or not; If one is a criminal (or any named example) and so is the other then it is because of genetics; If one is a criminal (or any named example) and the other one is not then it is because of the environment/upbringing; Twins are used to see if criminality (or any named example) is biological (or not); MZ twins share 100% genetic material/DZ twins share 50% of their genetic material; They are used to show how much nature (or nurture) affects them as they biologically the same; MZ concordance should be higher than DZ concordance if there is a biological basis for criminality;</p> <p>OWTTE. Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Describe what the findings of twin studies tell us about the biological basis of criminality. Answer	Mark
14(b)	<p>One mark for a finding from a study; one mark for saying if it supports or goes against the biological basis for criminality. One mark max can be given for a general conclusion (see below).</p> <p>For Christiansen, allow 2% either way for the results (48-54%). If a candidate does not name Christiansen but has figures that show it is that study [MZs (52%) and/or DZs (22%)] then it can gain the 'finding mark'</p> <p>Christiansen (1977) found a high concordance for/more likely to see criminality/property theft amongst identical twins (1st mark); This suggests a biological basis (for theft) (2nd mark);</p> <p>Christiansen (1977) found that if an identical twin was a criminal, the is a 52% chance (or 52% more likely) that the other twin is a criminal (1st mark); this suggests a biological basis for criminal behaviour (2nd mark);</p> <p>Dalgard and Kringlen (1976) found evidence for the inheritance of criminal tendency in recorded crime (1st mark); but the concordance was not statistically significant suggesting no biological basis (2nd mark);</p> <p>Eley (2003) found a significant concordance for twins and antisocial behaviour (1st mark); suggesting a biological basis for criminality (2nd mark);</p> <p>General conclusion – studies have shown if one twin has committed a crime then it is more likely/a good chance that the other twin will also commit a crime (1 mark); Likely to be biological because identical twins are likely to share criminal behaviour than non-identical twins because they share the same genetics (1 mark); There is a higher chance that both twins will be criminals if they are identical twins (1 mark);</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Explain one practical issue when conducting biological research into criminality. Answer	Mark
14(c)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Be generous on what is a practical issue. One mark for identifying a feasible issue and one mark for explaining the consequence of the issue.</p> <p>Reject ethical issues.</p> <p>Biological 'links' may be a result of upbringing rather than biology (1 mark); this is because children/twins are raised in the same environment so learn criminality (second mark);</p> <p>The research is only conducted on criminals who are caught/convicted (1 mark); so research misses out criminals who are not caught meaning any biological research is inconclusive/not representative (second mark);</p> <p>Research into the criminal gene ignores the complexity of genetic interaction (1 mark); and the role the environment has in mediating genetic influence (second mark);</p> <p>Chromosome abnormality is often difficult to detect in physical appearance (1 mark); so gathering a sample is extremely difficult/difficult to generalise from (second mark);</p> <p>Chromosome abnormality is very rare (e.g. those with XXY or XYY abnormalities) (1 mark); so gathering a sample is extremely difficult/difficult to generalise from (second mark);</p> <p>There may not be many criminals who are twins (1 mark); so gathering a sample is extremely difficult/difficult to generalise from (second mark)</p> <p>Criminals may not want to get themselves involved in tests etc (1 mark); so gathering a sample is extremely difficult/difficult to generalise from (second mark)</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	<p>Research into the social factors linked to criminality can have practical, ethical and other issues.</p> <p>Decide whether the statements below on social research into criminality are true or false.</p> <p>Answer</p>	Mark										
14(d)	<p>Zero marks for no correct answers or one correct answer. One mark for two correct answers, two marks for three correct answers, three marks for all correct answers.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 584 1278 981"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="300 584 1027 618">Statement</th> <th data-bbox="1027 584 1278 618">True or false</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 618 1027 685">Research into the social causes of criminality examines chromosome abnormalities.</td> <td data-bbox="1027 618 1278 685">False</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 685 1027 786">Research into the social causes of criminality examines upbringing and environmental influences.</td> <td data-bbox="1027 685 1278 786">True</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 786 1027 887">Parent questionnaires are very reliable because parents always give accurate information about their child's past behaviour and criminality.</td> <td data-bbox="1027 786 1278 887">False</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 887 1027 981">Research into upbringing has been said to have resulted in parents being blamed for the criminal behaviour of their children.</td> <td data-bbox="1027 887 1278 981">True</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Answers must be 'true/t' or 'false/f' in the correct cell. Do not accept ticks and crosses or yes/No. If more than one answer in a cell, ignore cell unless alternative answer in cell clearly crossed out.</p>	Statement	True or false	Research into the social causes of criminality examines chromosome abnormalities.	False	Research into the social causes of criminality examines upbringing and environmental influences.	True	Parent questionnaires are very reliable because parents always give accurate information about their child's past behaviour and criminality.	False	Research into upbringing has been said to have resulted in parents being blamed for the criminal behaviour of their children.	True	<p>A03 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>
Statement	True or false											
Research into the social causes of criminality examines chromosome abnormalities.	False											
Research into the social causes of criminality examines upbringing and environmental influences.	True											
Parent questionnaires are very reliable because parents always give accurate information about their child's past behaviour and criminality.	False											
Research into upbringing has been said to have resulted in parents being blamed for the criminal behaviour of their children.	True											

Question Number	Using evidence from research studies into criminality, evaluate the biological explanation of criminality. Answer	Mark
14(e)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Answers should refer to research evidence (even if not explicitly named). Research can include evidence for and against the biological approach to criminality/aggression e.g Charles Whitman, Thielgaard, Madon, Christiansen, Mednick, there are many others.</p> <p>Answers can include a critique of the research studies up to max one mark per study included.</p> <p>If no reference to research studies then max 1. The linking to biological explanations does <i>not</i> have to be explicitly made by the candidate (see examples below). Figures do not have to be exact for this question. If the candidate writes about 'aggression' take that as being linked to criminality.</p> <p>Christiansen found a higher concordance for criminality between MZ compared to DZ twins/ 52% chance that the other twin would be a criminal too (1st mark); however, twin studies cannot reliably separate genetics and shared environment effects (2nd mark); Madon found evidence for a self-fulfilling effect of parental expectation of adolescent drinking behaviour; this suggest an environmental rather than genetic basis for antisocial behaviour; Theilgaard found no reliable link between XYY males and criminality only that XYY may cause other issues that result in criminal pathways being taken; Theilgaard did find that XYY males tended to be more aggressive (than XY/XXY males) (1st mark); however not all criminals have the XYY chromosomes so it might not be a valid explanation (2nd mark); however, there were more similarities than differences between the XXY and XYY groups (alternative 2nd mark) Mednick found that adopted children who had criminal records also had biological fathers with criminal convictions; King found that when a woman's amygdala was electrically stimulated she became aggressive; Not all criminals have chromosome abnormalities/family history of criminality so other factors must cause criminality; Family studies show us that there are some criminal links in families, but equally this could be due to upbringing; Because nature and nurture are difficult to study/hard to separate, we cannot conclusively link either theories to criminality; There are other theories that could explain criminality like self-fulfilling prophecy where if you are labelled a criminal you could become one; When researching into chromosomal abnormalities/twins, studies tend to be made up of limited samples; Criminality can be down to other factors like maternal deprivation so it could be due to nurture;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	<p>The case of John Duffy is an example of the use of offender profiling.</p> <p>Describe the case of John Duffy and evaluate offender profiling as a tool to catch criminals.</p> <p>Indicative content</p>	
<p>* 15</p> <p>AO1 = 5</p> <p>AO2 = 5</p>	<p>Description of the case of John Duffy</p> <p>Case details Code-named Project Hart profiled by David Canter. Linked sex attacks and murders of women. All assaults occurred nearby London train stations. Witness reports showed that a man approached the females and attempted to talk to them before each attack occurred. The victims were often dragged to alleys or sidings to avoid public view. The attacker used various weapons and restraints.</p> <p>The profile The profile suggested that the assailant was not strong but small and unassuming. The profile suggested that the assailant was married but had problems with his marriage. The profile suggested some martial arts skills and occupational links to the railway. Canter's profile was accurate when John Duffy was arrested because the features of the profile were similar, such as marital issues, occupation and skills. The profile was based on the theory of criminal consistency. However, Canter failed to pick up on the accomplice.</p> <p>Evaluation of offender profiling Difficult to measure success as many other factors associated with good and poor outcomes/catching a criminal. It can help to narrow down the amount of suspects on a case. Depends upon the purpose of the profile as aid to catch or aid to help steer case. It has been claimed to be no more effective than guesswork. The Rachel Nickell case was highly unsuccessful compared to the John Duffy case. Can lead to victimisation/false imprisonment/entrapment. The profile may not be used by the investigating team. May cause the case to be misdirected at significant cost. The profile may be too vague or apply to many individuals.</p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
0	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-2	<p>Very limited description of the case of John Duffy (e.g. one brief point) with no reference to the evaluation of OP</p> <p>OR very limited attempt at evaluation of OP with no description of John Duffy.</p> <p>OR very limited attempt at description with a limited attempt at evaluation, or vice versa.</p>

		Writing communicates ideas using everyday language, but the response lacks clarity and organisation. The student spells and punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.
Level 2	3-4	Reasonable description of the case of John Duffy (case details or the profile) and no attempt at evaluation of OP OR reasonable attempt at evaluating OP (maybe one brief point) with no description of John Duffy OR Limited attempt at description of John Duffy and a limited attempt at evaluation OP. Writing communicates ideas using a limited range of psychological terminology and showing some skills of selection and organisation of material, but passages lack clarity and organisation. The student spells, punctuates and uses some of the ideas of grammar with general accuracy.
Level 3	5-6	Reasonable description of the case of John Duffy (case details and/or the profile) and some attempt at evaluation (not fully developed) OR a very good description of the case of John Duffy (case details and the profile) with no creditworthy evaluation OR very good evaluation of OP with little/ no description of the case of John Duffy Writing communicates ideas using psychological terms accurately and showing some direction and control in the organisation of material. The student uses some of the rules of grammar appropriately and spells and punctuates with considerable accuracy, although some spelling errors may still be found.
Level 4	7-8	A good description of the case of John Duffy (case details and the profile) and at least one developed evaluation point about OP OR more than one developed evaluation point about OP and a reasonable description of the case of John Duffy (case details or the profile) Writing communicates ideas using psychological terminology accurately and showing some direction and control in the organisation of material. The student uses some of the rules of grammar and spells and punctuates with considerable accuracy, with few spelling errors.
Level 5	9-10	Very good description of the case of John Duffy (case details and the profile) and more than one developed evaluation point about OP. Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely selected psychological terminology and organising material clearly and coherently. The student spell, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UG037253

Summer 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning