

Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2011

GCSE Psychology (5PS02) Paper 01
Social & Biological Psychological
Debates

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

June 2011

Publications Code UG028569

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Unit 2: Social and Biological Psychological Debates

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

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(a)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D aggression	A01 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B	A01 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(c)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	A01 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Outline one weakness of the biological approach	Mark
1(d)	<p>Two marks are available for one weakness – one mark per point/amplification. If more than one weakness, mark all and credit best. However, they may link two evaluation points (see below) – so go with the intention of the student. Ignore strengths. If more than one weakness mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Biological explanations include XYY, genetics, brain damage, testosterone, brain structure – need not be explicit in answer.</p> <p>0 marks No rewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Brief explanation/clear identification of a weakness</p> <p>2 marks Clear Identification and explanation/amplification of weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social learning theory says that we model the aggression from others (1 mark) role models that we identify with (2 marks)/eq; • The parts of the brain are difficult to study in humans (1 mark)/ as it would be dangerous or unethical to study them directly as it would involve surgery (2 marks)/eq; • Animal studies suggest a biological explanation for aggression but they are different to humans (1 mark)/so the effects will be different (they behave and respond differently and are simpler) (2 marks)/eq; • We don't know whether testosterone causes aggression or the other way around because we cannot reliably establish cause and effect/eq; • The biological approach does not take account of other factors (1 mark)/such as upbringing/peer influence (2 marks)/eq; • The brain can only be studied directly post-mortem (1 mark)/ which may not show a cause as other factors may have affected the brain before it was studied (2 marks)/eq; <p>Linked evaluation Animals who have had their testes removed show less aggression, although animals are different to humans so the findings may not be generalisable/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable answers.</p>	<p>A02 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Define the term 'role model'.	Mark
2(a)	<p>One mark for a definition of 'role model'. Examples can gain credit if the definition is implicit in the description.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Someone who we look up to/admire/eq; • Someone we watch and copy/learn from/eq; • A person who we would like to be like/eq; • Someone of higher status/celebrity we look up to/eq; • David Beckham is a role model because he is a celebrity/well known footballer/eq; • Someone we identify with and copy/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable answers.</p>	<p>A01 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(b)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B vicarious reinforcement	<p>A02 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark						
3(a)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Tally of aggressive acts in the old programme</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Tally of aggressive acts in the modern programme</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>OR</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"> </td> <td style="width: 50%;"> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Reject digits 5 and 9. Accept bars that go horizontally or top left to bottom right (backslash) or forward slash (right to left).</p>	Tally of aggressive acts in the old programme	Tally of aggressive acts in the modern programme					<p>A03 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>
Tally of aggressive acts in the old programme	Tally of aggressive acts in the modern programme							

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(b)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B Quantitative data	<p>A03 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(c)	<p>Two marks are available for the issue of generalisability of Michelle's sample of programmes. Ignore evaluation points that are not about generalisability/representativeness (e.g. validity issues, reliability issues or ethics).</p> <p>0 marks No rewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Brief explanation/clear identification of generalisability issue</p> <p>2 marks Clear Identification and explanation/amplification of generalisability issue</p> <p>One mark answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She only used two programmes/eq; • She only used programmes that she and her family may have been familiar with/eq; <p>Two mark answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She only used two programmes that may not have been representative of all television programmes/eq; • Her/family favourites may be biased because they could have been a particular type of programme and not generalisable to other programmes/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable answers.</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(d)	<p>Three marks for one issue other than generalisability. Take the whole answer (both parts as one/three marks). Issues may include reliability, validity, subjectivity, operationalisation, control, sample size etc. Sample size (one programme per generation) can be an issue of generalisability and reliability/validity – go with the intention of the student and ignore the repetition rule if stated as an issue not of generaliability.</p> <p>Mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>0 mark Unrewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Brief explanation/clear identification of problem</p> <p>2 marks Clear explanation of problem</p> <p>3 marks Very well explained issue.</p> <p>Levels</p> <p>1 Mark for brief explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjective interpretation/views may be a problem/bias/eq; • Her view may differ from others/eq; • She only selected a specific programme(s)/eq; <p>2 marks for clear explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjective so her interpretation may be different from others/eq; • Subjective so if someone else repeated her study they may interpret aggression differently/eq; • Only one rater so her view of aggression may be different to other raters who need to agree with her/eq; • Lack of the other raters so her view of aggression may be wrong so she would be tallying what she thought was aggressive that actually was not/eq; <p>3 marks for clear and well explained problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Her interpretation may differ from others, so if repeated they may come to a different conclusions so unreliable data/eq; • Her view may be different to others so she should get agreement from others to be more objective/inter-rater reliability/eq; • Her view of violence may differ from others or not be accurately measuring violence, so other raters would need to analyse the programmes/eq; • Because she might have a different view of aggression others may pick different acts as aggressive so her findings may be invalid/inaccurate/eq; 	<p>A03 = 3</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(e)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Two marks for ethical advantage(s) of content analysis over experiments into media violence. Ignore practical reasons. Descriptions of guidelines are only creditable if they add to the description in the answer (see marking point 3). One point elaborated or one mark per point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A content analysis does not use real participants/eq; • Media violence experiments may cause distress/embarrassment/eq; • It avoids the need to consider and apply BPS ethical guidelines/eq; • Exposing people to violence can create aggression in them that is undesirable (1 mark)/ this violates protection of participants that a CA avoids (2 marks)/eq; • There are no lasting affects of violence on participants as in experiments (1 mark)/eq; as only the researcher is exposed to the media violence (2 marks)/eq; 	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(a)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B Education authority	<p>A01 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(b)	<p>One mark for each distinctive role.</p> <p>If more than two roles, mark all and credit the best. The first marking point is max 1 even if listed as separate issues.</p> <p>Ignore 'helping/working with a child/teacher' or 'in an education authority' on its own.</p> <p>Max 1 for a list of problems issues identified (marking point 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation/eq; • Intervention/eq; • Working with a child in a school (<i>minimum</i>)/eq; • Helping a child with an issue/anger management/ADHD/Dyslexia/behavioural problems/eq; (LIST) • Observing children at home and school/eq; • Assessing individual children/testing/eq; • Liaising with teachers to uncover patterns in a child's behaviour/eq; • Identifying behavioural signs of learning/behavioural problems/eq; • Treating children by teaching relaxation techniques/eq; • Advising teachers on how to enable a child's learning/eq; • Listen to a child's problems/issues empathetically/eq; • Advising parents on the best way to manage their child/eq; • Write reports on children/eq; • Statementing of children/eq; • Advising educational policy/eq; • Undertaking postgraduate research/eq; 	<p>A01 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(c)	<p>One mark per point/clear elaboration of experience, concerning post graduate <u>qualification</u> and/or relevant <u>experience</u> for the role of ed psych.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masters degree • Educational psychology doctorate/chartered status • Educational experience (teacher or related)/eq; • Experience of educational setting to develop understanding not only of teacher role but also of children's development and thinking/eq; 	<p>A02 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(d)	<p>Two marks for one strategy. One mark for brief and/or basic outline of strategy and a further the strategy and a further mark for explaining the strategy. No ID mark.</p> <p>Max 1 mark if no reference to DEALING with such issues as anger management.</p> <p>If more than one strategy, mark all and credit the best.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask the child questions/keep a diary/observe them at school/ect/eq; • Anger management is used to help a child identify and respond more appropriately to angry feelings/eq; • Involves supporting the child so they feel they have someone to turn to that understands their feelings/eq; • Teaching relaxation techniques to enable the child to keep anger under control/eq; • Using reinforcement to encourage good behaviour (1 mark) and ignore aggressive behaviours/anger so as not to reinforce bad behaviour (2 marks)/eq; • To train teachers to recognise and deal with triggers that cause anger/behavioural issues with children (1 mark)/ and teach them strategies to deal with outbursts (2 mark)/eq; 	<p>A02 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(a)	<p>One mark for identifying role of watershed (to censor) and further credit for reasoning/elaboration/explanation (protection).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To censor inappropriate viewing/programmes from children/eq; • To ensure that programmes that are not appropriate for child are shown later at night/eq; • It ensures that violence, sex and other inappropriate viewing is not shown before 9pm when children are likely to be awake/eq; • Because children may copy the violence they have seen/eq; 	<p>A01 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
*5(b)	<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>Consider only for and against arguments in your levels.</p> <p>For</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children learn through observing, so not exposing them to violence prevents inappropriate learning/eq; • Bandura, Ross and Ross found that children copy violent role models, which suggests that the watershed is a good idea/eq; • Violence and aggression can cause fear, which is a good reason why we should protect young children • Adult viewing may confuse children who do not understand/eq; <p>Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Censorship violates civil liberty/eq; • Restriction can limit legitimate expression of views and ideas/eq; • Children’s viewing is claimed to contain more aggressive acts that adult viewing, in such case the watershed is not effective/eq; • Aggressive children seek out aggressive TV, so censorship is not the issue/eq; • Censorship regulations can be violated by parents, children, peers, so is not effective anyway at preventing inappropriate viewing by children/eq; 	<p>A02 = 5</p> <p>(5)</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1	One sided comment(s) that may not be expressed well.
Level 2	2	Limited outline or one sided argument of the role of the watershed and/or censorship. One point made well or two basic points not well explained/expressed.
Level 3	3-4	Reasonable outline of both the ‘for and against’ argument. One comment must be well expressed.
Level 4	5	Accurate and detailed for both the ‘for and against’ argument. More than one comment must be well explained/expressed.

Topic D: Why do we have phobias?

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(a)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	A03 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(b)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B	A03 = 1 (1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(c)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 1 for generic description of preparedness without reference to scenario. 'Passed down through generations' could be SLT (modelling) so ignore until genetic transmission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snakes were harmful in our evolutionary past/eq; • Cats and dogs were not harmful in our past/eq; • We are programmed to be scared of them today because of our past probability of harm/eq; • This makes us more prone to be conditioned to fear certain animals more readily than the ones that did not have the potential to harm us/eq; • This means we may be genetically predisposed for snake phobia/to aid survival/eq; • Phobia of snakes passed through generations due to survival of fittest/genes survived as snake avoidance/eq; 	A02 = 2 (2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(d)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Two marks for the results and/or conclusions of Bennett-Levy and Marteau (1984). No credit for aims and procedure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants rated rats, cockroaches, jellyfish, spiders as most feared/eq; • They saw the same animals as most ugly/eq; • The spider was seen as most ugly and slimy/eq; • The findings did not vary between males and females when rating ugliness, sliminess etc/eq; • Females were less likely to pick up or approach 10 of the species than males eg jelly fish and slug/eq; • Participants were more fearful of ugly, slimy and sudden animals/eq; • They concluded that we are more prepared to learn phobias of some animals (slimy, ugly, sudden) than others even if they were harmless/eq; • This is evidence for preparedness as animals that possess these characteristics were likely to be harmful in our evolutionary past/eq; 	<p>A01 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(e)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Only credit reference to SLT. Max 2 marks if no reference to phobias in any way (pure SLT description).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We imitate other people who have a phobia/eq; • These others are likely to be role models/eq; • If another person shows fear around an object/animal we learn vicariously to also fear the object/eq; • Mineka and Cook found that isolated monkeys could learn a fear of snakes from watching a wild monkey's response of fear/eq; • Mary Cover-Jones used SLT with Little Peter to help extinguish his phobia/eq; 	<p>A01 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(f)	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C social desirability</p>	<p>A03 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(g)	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C Showing his classmates real spiders and measuring how nervous they became when holding them.</p>	<p>A03 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(a)	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D systematic desensitisation</p>	<p>A01 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(b)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. No credit for the term systematic desensitisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She tested various objects for any fear response initially/eq; • She introduced a rabbit to Peter when he was playing with other children/eq; • The rabbit was brought closer and closer to Peter when he was relaxed/eq; • The rabbit was slowly moved closer to Peter whilst he was eating and relaxed/eq; • Other children held the rabbit to role model appropriate non-fear response/eq; • He was conditioned to associate relaxation with the phobic object/eq; <p>Look for other marking points.</p>	<p>A01 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(c)	<p>Two marks for one strength (marks awarded for point and amplification). If more than one strength mark all and credit the best. No credit for descriptions of SD/CC. Must be strength of treatment of little Peter and not the study itself. Ignore weaknesses of systematic desensitisation. Candidates may use role modelling as the treatment, which is acceptable and fine as other children were used in the study.</p> <p>Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SD causes less distress than other treatments such as flooding/eq; • This is because the person has control over their exposure/eq; • They have to be relaxed before they continue which is ultimately up to the patient/eq; • Very little harm was caused and Peter remained relaxed/eq; • The treatment is gradual which causes less distress than flooding as not so immediately distressing/eq; • They have a right to withdraw, unlike flooding/eq; • As they are not forced into the reality of the situation without means of escape/eq; <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult clients have control over the course of the treatment and not the therapist/eq; • They draw up their own hierarchy which gives them a sense of control and control how they progress through it/eq; • Food created relaxation which is more suitable for children/eq; • Lots of clinical evidence to suggest SD is effective with phobias/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>A02 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(d)	<p>The ethical guideline should be named. Ignore tautological answers.</p> <p>Confidentiality Privacy Protection of participants</p>	<p>A03 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(e)	<p>One mark per point/amplification. Credit generic case study evaluation and/or evaluation specific to generalisability of Little Peter's case study/findings (not stimulus generalisation).</p> <p>0 mark No rewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Brief and/or basic generalisability point</p> <p>2 marks One generalisability point elaborated or more than one generalisability point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The findings may be a one-off/eq; • We cannot generalise the findings to other children/eq; • Case studies are only about one individual or group/eq; • We may not be able to generalise the findings from one case/eq; • Only one child was used (1 mark)/He may have been different from other children (2 marks)/eq; • Only one child was used (1 mark)/ we cannot say that other children would respond in the same way (2 marks)/eq; • He may be different from other children (1 mark)/ so we cannot generalise the findings (2 marks)/eq; <p>Look for other marking points</p>	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<p>8(a)</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 20px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> Loud noise Unconditioned stimulus (UCS) </div> = <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> Fear Unconditioned response (UCR) </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 20px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> SPIDER(S) Neutral stimulus (NS) </div> + <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> Loud noise Unconditioned stimulus (UCS) </div> = <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> FEAR Unconditioned response (UCR) </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> SPIDER(S) Conditioned stimulus (CS) </div> = <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> FEAR Conditioned response (CR) </div> </div> <p>1 mark for 2 correct answers 2 marks for 3 correct answers 3 marks for 4 correct answers</p> <p>Answers must be placed in the correct answer space for credit. Ignore crossed out/deleted answers that have been replaced with an answer, if deleted and not replaced do you best to read and credit the deletion. If more than one answer in each box credit the first response only – the first in the list/closest to the answer line – if both answers are indistinguishable as the ‘first response’ no credit can be given.</p>		<p>A01 = 3</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8(b)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration for identification of ethical issue and further mark for elaboration. Ignore practical reasons. Can be one or more reason explained. Credit for ethical issues only and expansion of an ethical issue (eg distress caused... that may have lasting effect on family/other too). If more than one clear ethical issue, mark all and credit the best. Relevant examples can gain credit if the ethical issue is made clear or relevant procedure used as ethical elaboration. Ignore human ethical guidelines.</p> <p>Ignore – ‘you can do what you like to animals’. Ignore citation of animal ethical guidelines without reference to why we use animals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is more ethical to test animals because humans may suffer distress/eq; • Conditioning studies use animals because they can be ethically isolated/deprivation from social situations/conditions/eq; • Humans suffer more distress when socially isolated/deprived than animals such as lab mice/eq; • Humans may suffer more than animals, so it is more ethical to use animals in isolated conditions/eq; (2 marks) • It is possible to permit damage under animal guidelines if benefit of research outweighs cost, physical damage would not be permitted at all on humans/eq; (2 marks) 	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
*9	<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>Consider theory, concepts and/or research in terms of phobias and the nature – nurture debate in your levels.</p> <p>Nature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparedness explains that some objects/animals are more likely to become phobias over others/eq; • This is due to our evolutionary past/eq; • The objects that we are more ready to develop phobias of are likely to have caused us harm in our past/eq; • His suggests that we have a biological/innate readiness for certain phobias/eq; • This supports the nature side of the debate/eq; • We have a genetic inbuilt preparedness to fear danger/eq; <p>Nurture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social learning says we learn phobias by observing others with phobias/eq; • Role models such as parents we identify with are modelled/eq; • If we see a role model frightened of an object we learn vicariously and avoid the object too/eq; • Cook and Mineka showed how monkeys model wild monkeys fear response to snakes/eq; • Townsend showed how a fear of the dentist is more likely if a parent also shares the fear/eq; • Classical conditioning can explain how we learn a phobia through association of the object with a fear response/eq; • Bennet-Levy and Marteau show how we are more ready to fear certain animals that we perceive as ugly and slimy/eq; • Watson and Raynor conditioned Little Albert’s fear of a white rat which supports learning of phobia’s/eq; • This supports the nurture side of the debate/eq <p>Both</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phobias running in families could be either nature or nurture/eq; • We may learn a phobia through imitation or there could be a genetic link/eq; 	<p>A02 = 5</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(5)</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	1-2	Brief or basic comments that may be limited or one-sided.
Level 2	3-4	Both the nature and nurture debate referred to in the answer. One point made well or two basic points not well explained/expressed for BOTH the nature and nurture argument. May be unbalanced.
Level 3	5	Good outline of both the nature and nurture argument. One comment must be well expressed for both sides of the debate. Answer should be balanced.

Topic E: Are criminals born or made?

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10(a)	<p>One mark per correct answer in the correct answer space. Be sympathetic with phonetic spellings.</p> <p>A variable that is manipulated by the researcher is known as the ...independent variable/IV/Independent.... The variable measured by the researcher is known as the dependent variable/DV/Dependent All other variables are ...controlled/constant/eliminated/kept the same/standardised/held ... to ensure reliable and valid results. The researcher tests a prediction called a ...hypothesis/hypotheses/experimental hypothesis/directional hypothesis/non-directional hypothesis/one tailed hypothesis/two tailed hypothesis... that states what they think the results are likely to be.</p> <p>If an incorrect answer is in the answer space alongside a correct answer no credit can be given for that answer space.</p>	<p>A03 = 4</p> <p>(4)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10(b)	<p>Ignore aims and findings/conclusions. One mark per point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The photographs were controlled so only one group saw one photo/eq; • Participants were randomly allocated into one of six conditions/eq; • Gender was controlled to make sure an equal number of males (10) and females (10) were in each condition/eq; • Participants were only shown a photograph of an attractive and unattractive offender/eq; • The IV was the attractiveness of the photograph/type of crime which was controlled /eq; • The DV was the decision making/sentence given measured by a questionnaire /eq; • The description below the picture indicated the crime which was controlled for each group and photograph/eq; • Barbara was guilty of either fraud or burglary, no other crimes were introduced/eq; • Some participants were not show the photograph, just the description as a control group/eq; • Participants were asked to give the offender Barbara a sentence term in years as a control for the possible answers given/eq; • The participants were tested under controlled/lab based conditions to control for extraneous variables/eq; • An independent measures design was used to prevent demand characteristics/order effects/eq; 	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10(c)	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B Independent groups</p>	<p>A03 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11(a)	<p>Any social explanation of criminality can be credited. One mark per point/elaboration. Credit a contextualised or non-contextualised answer. Ignore purely sociological or economic explanations – social-psychological explanations are required.</p> <p>Possible explanations can include: child rearing strategies, deprivation, self fulfilling prophecy, family size, SLT, family patterns, divorce, there may be others.</p> <p>If more than one explanation (some may be legitimately linked – work with the intention of the candidate) mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Watch for repetition of the stem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children/boys raised in single parent households are twice as likely to become criminal/eq; • Bowlby thought that maternal deprivation which could be an outcome of divorce could lead to criminal behaviour/eq; • The absence of a male role model may explain why boys turn to criminal behaviour/eq; • The 44 juvenile thieves study showed how boys who suffered maternal deprivation were more likely to be delinquent/affectionless/eq; • Larger families are lower income, which financial deprivation could lead to criminality/eq; • Larger families give less attention to all children which may account for criminality/eq; • Blue collar mothers occupationally has been linked to criminality in sons/eq; • Labels can be made such as saying they are criminal/eq; • People treat them different according to the label/eq; • They might live up to the prophecy/eq; • Rosenthal and Jacobsen found that expectation can have negative effects on educational attainment so this could be used to explain crime/eq; • Madon found that negative parental expectations of drinking can lead to alcohol abuse/eq; 	<p>A01 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11(b)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore practical or methodological issues/ reasons for using criminals/offenders. <u>If more than one ethical issue mark all and credit the best.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prisoners may feel pressured to take part in research/eq; • This is because they are in a vulnerable situation and do not want to appear negative/eq; • They may fear reprisal if they do not co-operate/eq; • The findings of research may have issues, such as parent/individual blaming/eq; • This could have negative implications for the individual or family such as victimisation of prison inmates or their families/eq; • As prisoners have the same rights as participants in any psychological study/eq; 	<p>A03 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B Sandeep's father smacked him and sent him to room threatening to do the same if he misbehaved again.</p>	<p>A02 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
13	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B self-fulfilling prophecy</p>	<p>A02 = 1</p> <p>(1)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
14(a)	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B suggests suspect characteristics to help police narrow their search</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D offers interview techniques to use on suspects</p>	<p>A01 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
14(b)	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. The question concerns effectiveness and not moral/ethical issues – these should be ignored unless an elaboration of effectiveness. Some issues cross over so go with the intention of the student.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to judge whether offender profiling works because the police may not catch the offender/eq; • Profiling is not an exact science and could simply be wrong/eq; • Information from the police may be inaccurate creating an inaccurate profile/eq; • Without corroborating evidence the profile itself cannot lead to conviction so is not an effective tool alone/eq; • This means the profile may be correct but the failure to catch the criminal could be due to other reasons/eq; • It may be just guesswork and commonsense/eq; • This can lead to mistakes that may misdirect the investigation/eq • Misdirection is costly in terms of time and money spent on an investigation/eq; • The real perpetrator may be lost and never caught/eq; <p>2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to judge whether offender profiling works because the police may not catch the offender which means the profile may be correct but the failure to catch the criminal could be due to other reasons/eq; • It may be just guesswork and commonsense, which can lead to mistakes that may misdirect the investigation/eq; 	<p>A01 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
*15	<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>The biological explanations of criminality include hormones, neurological or genetic links. The candidate does not have to cover all explanations to gain full marks in this question.</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hormone testosterone has been implicated in aggression/eq; • High levels of aggression can explain violent crime/eq; • The limbic system is the emotional centre of the brain and aggression can be caused by the brain having problems with emotional responses to situations/eq; • The amygdala is responsible for registering and eliciting an emotional response which may be malfunctioning/eq; • They may interpret something harmless as a threat and/or respond aggressively/eq; • The XYY gene pattern has been studied as a cause of super male characteristics/eq; • Family studies indicate a genetic basis for criminality as it tends to run in families/eq; <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thielgaard found an insignificant association between XYY and criminality/eq; • She did find that XYY are educationally slower which may explain criminal career pathways in the absence of occupational opportunity/eq; • Animals studies have shown that removal of testes results in lower aggression/eq; • Reintroduction of testosterone increases aggression/eq; • Some of the most famous serial murderers were XYY/eq; • However small numbers of such a rare condition is not real evidence/eq; • Social explanations such as maternal deprivation say that lack of a primary caregiver can cause emotional problems associated with criminality/eq; • Harsh parenting has also been linked to criminality (Baumrind)/eq; 	<p>A02 =10</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-2	Candidates offer a very limited answer that offers a brief AND basic account of the biological explanation(s), the answer is not focused on the question and is not explained clearly. There is no attempt to evaluate or any attempt is not worthy of credit (lay explanation).
Level 2	3-4	A brief or basic outline of the biological explanation(s) of criminal behaviour (outline may be evidence based). Very limited or no evaluation (excluding evidence based description).
Level 3	5-6	Candidates express some knowledge of the biological explanation(s) of criminality. The answer may have limited but clear explanation of one or more explanations. Limited other evaluation.
Level 4	7-8	Candidates have outlined the biological explanation of criminality well. There is a good attempt to evaluate in at least one way, or vice versa. Candidates can offer explanation(s) of alternative theory.
Level 5	9-10	Candidates offer an answer that is focussed on the requirements of the question and clearly outlines the biological explanation(s) of criminality. Candidates evaluate in more than one way. Including good comparison with another explanation.

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 UG028569 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

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

