

Dealing with Offending Behaviour - Mark Scheme

Q1.

[AO2 = 4]

Content:

- Median is 34.5 for Group A ($32 + 37/2$) and 50.5 for Group B ($45 + 56/2$)

1 mark for each accurately calculated median

Plus

2 further marks for explaining that the median is used because the level of measurement is not interval – ratings data with units of variable size.

Q2.

[AO1 = 6 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 6]

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

Possible content:

- anger management – cognitive therapy involving three stages – cognitive

- preparation / restructuring / appraisal to understand cause; skills acquisition, e.g. use of relaxation, mantra; application practice - using new skills in role play
- behaviour modification – behavioural therapy based on principles of operant conditioning; systematic use of reinforcement for desired behaviours; tokens as secondary reinforcers to be exchanged for primary reinforcers
- restorative justice – rehabilitation through reconciliation and collaboration; offenders made aware of effect of their actions; supervised meetings with victim; pay reparation to victim / society
- custodial sentencing – aims are deterrence, incapacitation, retribution and rehabilitation
- knowledge of ways of dealing with offending behaviour embedded in evidence.

Possible application:

- anger management involves cognitive awareness / understanding - talking about what makes him angry
- anger management involves acquisition of skills / strategies to control own anger – teach him how to calm himself down
- behaviour modification involves use of reinforcement for good behaviour – points for TV time as tokens / secondary reinforcement (could be applied in custodial setting); seeing the link between behaviour and consequences
- restorative justice involves making reparation – something to help the victim, seeing the consequences for the victim.

Possible discussion points:

- use of evidence for effectiveness / lack of effectiveness / effects on recidivism
- whether the intervention has any long-term beneficial effects, e.g. anger management offers transferable skills, life enhancement
- whether there is a need for trained personnel, e.g. anger management
- whether the intervention can be used in different settings, e.g. behaviour modification can only be used in controlled environment
- victim effects – whether the victim will co-operate, will benefit etc
- restorative justice as an easy way out – no real remorse
- attitudes of wider society and societal demand for retribution
- negative effects of custodial sentencing e.g. brutalisation, effects on mental health etc
- comparison of different ways of dealing with offending.

Credit other relevant material.

[16]

Q3.

[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge of the psychological effects of custodial sentencing is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.

3	9 – 12	Knowledge of the psychological effects of custodial sentencing is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.
2	5 – 8	Knowledge of the psychological effect(s) of custodial sentencing is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 4	Knowledge of the psychological effect(s) of custodial sentencing is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- institutionalisation – leads to lack of autonomy, conformity to roles and a dependency culture
- brutalisation – prison acts as school for crime, reinforces a criminal lifestyle and criminal norms, leads to high recidivism rates, approx 70% of young offenders re-offend within 2 years
- prevalence of psychological problems and psychiatric disorders in prison populations, eg higher incidence of mental illnesses such as depression, anxiety, self-harm, suicide, low self-esteem, eg Zimbardo's study demonstrating psychological effects of imprisonment
- labelling leads to loss of social contacts, reduced employability, all affecting recidivism rates
- answer could offer positive psychological effects resulting from opportunities, treatment, rehabilitation, remorse etc.

Credit other relevant psychological effects.

Possible discussion points:

- problem of cause and effect – difficult to show that problems are due to imprisonment, eg prisoners with psychiatric conditions may have problems before they are institutionalised
- prevention is better (Harrower 2001) avoids labelling and negative consequences of prison
- need for selectivity – only 8–10% of criminals commit 50% of crimes (Peterson 1981)
- alternatives, eg community sentence better for low-risk offenders (keep job and social contacts)
- counter-arguments re usefulness of custodial sentencing, eg justice is seen to be done, limits danger to public, possible reform, opportunity for new skills / training
- general arguments against custodial sentences, eg do not deter, given to appease public, simply acts as retribution.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the psychological effects.

Q4.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	9 – 12	Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.
2	5 – 8	Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 4	Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list.

AO1

Marks to be awarded for knowledge of recidivism and ways of dealing with recidivism. Credit any of the following: information about recidivism rates / recidivism data; custodial sentencing and its aims; alternatives to custodial sentencing eg restorative justice programmes, tagging, community service etc; treatments for offending eg anger management, behaviour modification etc. Credit knowledge of relevant evidence eg anger management (Feindler et al 1984; Ireland, 2000) and behaviour modification (Hobbs and Holt, 1976; Cohen and Filipczak, 1971; Cullen and Seddon, 1981); studies of effects of custodial sentencing (Zimbardo (1971, 1973); alternatives to custodial sentencing eg restorative justice (Sherman and Strang, 2007; and tagging (Cassidy et al, 2005).

AO2/3

Marks are to be awarded for discussion of ways of dealing with recidivism and engagement with the issues raised in the stem. Content will vary according to information used for AO1 but may include issues such as the following: effectiveness of custodial v non-custodial approach; strengths and limitations of custodial and non-custodial approaches; treatment generalisability beyond the treatment situation; ethical issues eg treatment as control rather than reform; suitability and appropriateness of the treatment / method of dealing with for varying types of offender; how well the treatment or way of dealing with the offender meets the aims of punishment (ie reform, deterrence, retribution, incapacitation); discussion of the needs of the individual and the needs of wider society; use of recidivism statistics; practical implications such as the need for / availability of trained personnel; use of evidence; comparison between the different strategies for dealing with offenders.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to discuss ways of dealing with recidivism.

Q5.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Evidence is clear. Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	9 – 12	Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Evidence is presented. Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.
2	5 – 8	Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 4	Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a

bulleted list.

AO1

Credit knowledge of anger management as a treatment for offending – reference might be made to: a type of cognitive therapy devised by Novaco (1975); involves three stages; cognitive preparation where offender learns to recognise anger and recognise triggers to anger; skills acquisition where techniques are learnt to control / reduce anger response eg self-talk, deep breathing etc; application practice where anger situations are roleplayed and new skills are used.

Possible studies include: Ireland (2000); Ireland (2004); Feindler (1984); Law (1997); Loza & Loza-Fanous (1999).

AO3

Possible content includes: effectiveness of anger management eg rates of improvement whilst in custody and / or effect on recidivism; appropriateness for different types of crime – offenders are not all angry; likelihood of generalisation outside controlled environment; only suitable for individuals who will maintain a level of effort and commitment – many will not; can only be used where trained specialists are available and they often are not; this type of treatment can be usefully continued outside of custody eg on probation; may result in enhanced personal effectiveness; comparison with other ways of dealing with offenders eg behaviour modification, restorative justice etc.