

## Scheme of work: Forensic psychology (Option 3)

---

The following is a scheme of work for the second year of the A-level. It has been created on the basis that students choose Forensic psychology as their optional topic from 7182/3 Option 3. It is based on the spring term, teaching for 6 weeks. In addition, the number of teaching hours per week is four and a half.

The specimen exam papers are referred to in this scheme of work. The first and second set of sample exam papers are available on our [website](#). The third set of sample exam papers is located on [eAQA](#). These can be used as mock exams.

To find out more about our A-level Psychology specification, visit [aqa.org.uk/7192](http://aqa.org.uk/7192)

### Option 3 (Aggression or Forensic psychology or Addiction)

#### Forensic Psychology 4.3.9

Teach after Approaches 4.2.1, Biopsychology 4.2.2, Research methods 4.2.3, Issues and debates 4.3.1

Specification content	Subject-specific skill development	Learning outcomes	Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)
<p>Week 21</p> <p>Offender profiling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top down application of general principles, eg Ressler</li> <li>• Organised v disorganised eg Turvey (2002) false dichotomy, eg Canter (2004), Alison (2002)</li> <li>• Bottom-up approaches data driven statistical profiling Canter Geographical profiling Goodwill &amp; Alison (2006), Davis (1997), eg of bottom-up profiling in Pake &amp; Pake</li> </ul> <p>Usefulness of profiling, eg Gudjonsson &amp; Copson 1997.</p> <p>Experimental research into profiling, eg Alison et al (2003).</p>	<p>Use ICT to research measuring crime</p> <p>Independent learning skills</p> <p>Locating evidence for a specific purpose</p> <p>Weighing evidence</p> <p>Developing lines of argument</p> <p>Exchange ideas/having a view – ownership of knowledge and skills</p> <p>Mathematical skills -interpreting percentages</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explain top down approaches to profiling</li> <li>• distinguish between organised and disorganised type of offender</li> <li>• explain bottom up approach to profiling, investigative psychology and geographical profiling</li> <li>• use research evidence to evaluate the usefulness of offender profiling</li> </ul>	<p><b>A1</b> Introduce concept of offender profiling, definition and main approaches top-down and bottom-up. Students then read the Guardian article.</p> <p>Students have to research profiling and describe the main approaches, their strengths and limitations. Describe research into the usefulness of profiling. Based on their assessment of the evidence students post on Moodle/VLE a 150 word justified challenge or justified support for the view presented in the article.</p> <p><b>A2</b> Students to read the article Psychology Review, Volume 16, 4 April 2011 on Criminal Profiling. Working in pairs students:</p>

<p>Overview evaluation of offender profiling, eg Pinizzotto &amp; Fenkell (1990).</p>			<p>1. Analyse how Canter's research illustrates the steps in scientific method, eg Select and existing theory. Generate a testable hypothesis. Carry out research to test the hypothesis. Either accept OR reject your hypothesis support or modify your theory.</p> <p>2. Imagine you were trying to investigate/solve a murder. Outline how a top-down approach to investigating the crime might differ from a bottom-up approach? Which of these two approaches do you think is most scientific and why?</p> <p><b>A5</b> Investigating crime statistics - AQA Research methods, Activity 14.</p>
---	--	--	--

Resources
<p><b>A2</b> Extension <a href="#">Slideshare: Street Lighting Study</a></p> <p><b>A3</b> Guardian article <a href="#">The Guardian: Psychological profiling 'worse than useless'</a></p> <p><b>A4</b> Psychology Review article <a href="http://magazinesonline.philipallan.co.uk/issuehome.aspx?search=1/">http://magazinesonline.philipallan.co.uk/issuehome.aspx?search=1/</a> Requires log in</p>

**A5** AQA Research Methods Activities – Activity 14

[AQA: Teaching resources](#)

Specification content	Subject-specific skill development	Learning outcomes	Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)
<p>Week 22</p> <p>Biological explanations of offending behaviour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lombroso's atavistic form, Sheldon's somatotype, eg Glueck &amp; Glueck 1956, West and Farington 1973.</li> </ul> <p>Genetic explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Twin study, eg Grove (1990), Christiansen (1977)</li> <li>Adoption study, eg Mednick (1984) - Focus on gene environment interaction, eg Plomin &amp; Asbury 2005</li> <li>Brunner et al (1993) Family study genetic abnormality affecting monoamine metabolism</li> </ul> <p>Neurological explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maturation retardation, hemispheric dysfunction, eg Raine et al (1997) (2000) PET study, MRI, brain volume and GSR in APD compared with controls.</li> </ul>	<p>Applying existing knowledge to new topic</p> <p>Independent learning skills</p> <p>Self-assessment</p> <p>Group work</p> <p>Use of evidence to evaluate explanations</p> <p>Using issues and debates to evaluate</p> <p>Extended writing skills</p> <p>Judging and providing feedback</p>	<p>Develop understanding of biological explanation for offending behaviour.</p> <p>Students should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline and evaluate physiological theories - Lombroso's atavistic form, Sheldon's somatotype.</li> <li>Explain the role of twin and adoption studies in investigating genetic contribution.</li> <li>Describe and evaluate research into genetic explanation.</li> <li>Describe and evaluate neurological explanations.</li> <li>Use knowledge of methodology, issues and debates (confounding variables, sampling control of variables, limitations of correlational research, inferences, nature v nurture, reductionism, determinism,</li> </ul>	<p><b>A1</b> Starter activity developing an overview picture. Students to work in pairs and to discuss/suggest how biological, cognitive, behavioural, psychodynamic and humanistic approaches might explain offending behaviour. Whole class IWB activity to gather suggestions, ie what do they already know about explanations.</p> <p><b>A2</b> Flipped classroom in preparation for class session - students to investigate biological explanations for offending behaviour. Each student to produce a summary of early physiological, genetic, neurobiological explanations. In class, working in groups students use internet/texts etc, to collect and summarise research evidence for and against the explanations.</p> <p>A summary description of studies/evidence is then exchanged with another group who evaluate the evidence in</p>

		<p>social sensitivity, policy implications of biological determinism) to evaluate explanations.</p>	<p>terms of its methodology and the conclusions that can be drawn from the research.</p> <p>Students write exam style essay - "Outline and evaluate biological explanations for offending behaviour" for home work.</p> <p><b>A3 Peer Assessment Activity.</b> The essays from A2 are to be anonymised and each student to be randomly allocated an essay completed by one of their peers for assessment using a mark scheme. The student has to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highlight material showing knowledge of biological explanations</li> <li>2. Highlight material showing knowledge of relevant research</li> <li>3. Highlight material showing use of evidence to evaluate explanations</li> <li>4. Other evaluative material, eg use of issues (methodological, social sensitivity, cultural bias), debates (nature nurture, determinism reductionism) implications for policy practices</li> </ol>
--	--	---	--

			<p>5. Allocate a mark in accordance with the mark scheme</p> <p>6. Provide detailed feedback on how the essay could be improved</p> <p>A copy of the highest achieving essay (checked by teacher) to be posted on VLE. All students to identify from feedback two or three things they can do to improve and to make those changes to enhance their own essay.</p>
--	--	--	--

Resources
<p><b>A2</b> Alison et al (2003) Psychology crime and law, Vol 9 pp185-95</p> <p><b>A2</b> Davis 1997 in Pakes &amp; Pakes, Brain abnormalities in murders, indicated by PET.</p> <p>Raine et al 1997, summary of study and evaluative analysis.</p> <p><b>A2</b> Lombroso</p> <p><a href="#">Prezi: Theories of Offending</a></p> <p><b>A2</b> Sheldon</p> <p><a href="#">Prezi: Sheldon's somatype theory</a></p> <p>Genetic explanations</p> <p><b>A2</b></p> <p><a href="#">Prezi: Biological explanations for criminal behaviour</a></p>

**A2** Bio explanations + Eysenck

[YouTube: Origins of Criminal Behavior: Biological Factors](#)

Specification content Week 23	Subject-specific skill development	Learning outcomes	Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)
<p>Psychological explanations of offending behaviour.</p> <p>Personality factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eysenck's theory – the role of extraversion &amp; neuroticism in offending.</li> </ul> <p>Limitations of correlational research, self-reports and meta-analysis.</p> <p>Psychodynamic explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate (weak deviant harsh) super ego.</li> <li>Defence mechanisms – denial and rationalisation v displacement and sublimation.</li> <li>Maternal deprivation.</li> </ul> <p>Learning explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the role of conditioning, reinforcement and social learning.</li> </ul>	<p>Using knowledge of research methodology, reliability, validity, issues and debates to judge explanations</p> <p>Use understanding of research methodology to evaluate studies</p> <p>Reading more complex psychological material</p> <p>Presentation skills</p> <p>Analytic and creative/transformational skills</p> <p>Developing lines of argument</p>	<p>Develop understanding of psychological explanations of offending behaviour.</p> <p>Students should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline key features of Eysenck's personality dimensions and the role of extraversion and neuroticism in offending.</li> <li>Outline research into the relationship between personality and criminality.</li> <li>Explain methodological limitations of research into the relationship between personality and criminality.</li> <li>Evaluate personality factors in explaining criminality.</li> <li>Outline key features of psychodynamic explanation for offending behaviour.</li> <li>Evaluate psychodynamic explanation for offending behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A1</b> Teacher introduction to psychological explanations. Outline of Eysenck's theory.</p> <p>Students work in groups to research evidence to support and challenge Eysenck's theory. Each group presents description of one study to the class. Whole class activity to evaluate the reliability and validity of the methods, confidence in the conclusion and so strength of support the study provides for the theory. Points recorded and posted on VLE.</p> <p>Possible studies A2, eg Farrington et al (1982), McGurk &amp; McDougall (1981).</p> <p>Correlational research, Eysenck &amp; Gudjonsson (1979), Blackburn (1993), Meta analysis *Miller &amp; Lynham (2001), Gottfredson &amp; Hirschi (1990).</p> <p><b>A2</b> Provide students with definitions/descriptions of catharsis and of denial,</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sutherland (1939) differential association theory. Exposure to social acceptance of criminal norms and values, eg Farrington et al (2006) Cambridge study inappropriate role models, dysfunctional reward systems.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline the role of association, reinforcement and consequences of actions. Observation, imitations and identification in explaining criminal behaviour.</li> <li>Outline and evaluate differential association theory.</li> <li>Use research evidence to evaluate learning explanation for offending behaviour.</li> <li>Use a range of criteria and knowledge of methodology, issues and debates to evaluate explanations.</li> </ul>	<p>rationalisation, displacement, sublimation.</p> <p>Students to create a criminal character and some detail of what the character did/thinks/feels/says to illustrate each of the defence mechanisms.</p> <p>These are then shared with rest of the class and discussed to check understanding.</p> <p><b>A3</b> Outline the Cambridge study of delinquent development, Farrington 2006 - method and results. Students then read Ch 10 (Springer pdf). Family influences on delinquency by Farrington and undertake some of the end of chapter tasks. Differentiate in terms of selecting which/how many family influences students should focus on and the tasks to be completed.</p>
--	--	--	--

## Resources

- A1** Pennington and McLoughlin, Psychology for A2 Hodder 2009, ch 8 pp 230-231
- A1** Pakes & Pakes, Criminal Psychology, Willan Publishing 2009

239-242

**A1** extension resource

[Crime and Personality: Personality Theory and Criminality Examined](#)

**A1** Mind Changers BBC radio 4 Eysenck

[BBC Radio 4: Mind Changers](#)

**A3**

[Slideshare: Farrington et al](#)

[Family Influences on Delinquency](#)

Specification content Week 24	Subject-specific skill development	Learning outcomes	Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)
<p>Cognitive explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kohlberg moral reasoning</li> <li>• Assumptions stages/levels</li> <li>• Use of moral dilemmas</li> </ul> <p>Research evidence relating to the relationship between moral reasoning and offending behaviour.</p> <p>Strengths and limitations of questionnaire/survey research into offending behaviour.</p> <p>Cognitive distortions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary cognitive distortion (egocentric bias)</li> <li>• Secondary cognitive distortions - attributional biases (hostile attribution bias, excessive blaming) minimalisation of consequences, eg Palmer (2005), Palmer and Hollin (2000) Sykes &amp; Matza (1957).</li> </ul>	<p>Application skills</p> <p>Using knowledge of research methodology, reliability, validity, issues and debates to judge explanations</p> <p>Use understanding of research methodology to evaluate studies</p> <p>Reading more complex psychological material</p> <p>Presentation skills</p> <p>Analytic and creative/transformational skills</p> <p>Developing lines of argument</p>	<p>Develop understanding of cognitive explanations for offending behaviour.</p> <p>Students should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe key features and processes of moral reasoning according to Kohlberg's theory.</li> <li>• Describe the use of dilemmas to investigate reasoning.</li> <li>• Outline, evaluate and use research into moral development to evaluate cognitive explanations for offending behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A1</b> Flipped Classroom - Students to investigate Kohlberg's theory of moral development, making notes on the defining characteristics of each stage.</p> <p>Students to view the interviews of children responding to Heinz dilemma and for each one state the level of reasoning and why you think it is that level.</p> <p>In class task- evaluate the theory and review evidence of its effectiveness in explaining offending behaviour, eg Ashkar &amp; Kenny (2007), Palmer and Hollin (2000), Moral reasoning in young offenders V Alexio &amp; Norris (2000) support for personality but not moral reasoning.</p> <p><b>A2</b> The findings of Palmer and Hollin (2000) and Alexio &amp; Norris (2000) are based on questionnaire and self-report data. Students work in a group to identify reasons why that is a good way of gaining insight into</p>

<p>Methodological and conceptual issues, Implications and links to issues and debates.</p>			<p>offending behaviour and limitations of these techniques.</p> <p>Class shares ideas and discussion to relate their ideas to the reliability and validity.</p> <p><b>A3</b> Teacher led introduction to cognitive distortions providing students with definitions/descriptions (but not examples) of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Egocentric bias</li> <li>• Hostile attribution bias</li> <li>• Excessive blaming.</li> <li>• Minimalisation of consequences of their actions</li> </ul> <p>Students work in pairs to create a series of dialogues between offender and interviewer that illustrate each type of cognitive distortion.</p> <p>Each pair enacts one of their dialogues. The rest of the class have to decide on the distortions being illustrated.</p> <p><b>A4</b> Present students with a fairly detailed scenario of detailing the life story/background of an offender, eg the scenario on p 9</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>of Pakes &amp; Pakes Criminal Psychology.</p> <p>Students work in groups to analyse the scenario for possible causes/circumstances and use their knowledge of psychology to explain the offending behaviour. Record details of the analysis.</p> <p>Class comes back together and each group is asked to feed back to the class on one explanation. Other groups can amend, challenge accuracy or add information.</p>
--	--	--	---

Resources
<p><b>A1</b> Pakes &amp; Pakes, Criminal Psychology, Willan Publishing 2009, pp44-46</p> <p><b>A1</b> Outline of the theory</p> <p><a href="#">Kohlberg's Stages</a></p> <p><b>A1</b> Sample responses to Heinz dilemma</p> <p><a href="#">Kohlberg's Moral Development</a></p> <p><b>A1</b> <a href="#">BBC Radio 4: Mind Changers</a></p> <p><b>A4</b> Pakes &amp; Pakes, Criminal Psychology P50-53</p> <p><b>A4</b> Pakes &amp; Pakes, Criminal Psychology P8 &amp; P50-53</p>

Specification content Week 25	Subject-specific skill development	Learning outcomes	Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)
<p>Research methods and practical for option topic 3</p> <p>Paradox of victimisation and fear of crime. Gender differences in fear of crime, holiday v home.</p> <p>Cognitive distortions and attribution bias, content analysis of TV crime dramas.</p>	<p>Using statistical tables</p> <p>Reporting outcome of statistical test</p> <p>Drawing conclusions from quantitative data analysis</p> <p>Investigation design</p> <p>Data collection and recording</p> <p>Time management</p> <p>Understanding ethical obligations</p>	<p>Develop understanding of the research methods, scientific processes and data handling.</p> <p>Students should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formulate a hypothesis.</li> <li>• Design research to investigate the hypothesis.</li> <li>• Develop appropriate materials to collect qualitative and/or quantitative data.</li> <li>• Select an appropriate sample.</li> <li>• Analyse qualitative and quantitative data.</li> <li>• Use descriptive statistics to present data.</li> <li>• Use appropriate inferential statistics to test the hypothesis.</li> <li>• Use content or thematic analysis of responses to open questions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A1</b> Students to work in pairs to design and carry out an investigation into an aspect of forensic psychology.</p> <p>Possible topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Paradox of victimisation and fear of crime, eg Gender differences in fear of crime. The Paradox of gender differences in victimisation and fear of crime, Stanko 1992 eg Comparison of fear of crime in home town compared with fear of crime when on holiday, Mawby et al 2002</li> <li>2. Cognitive distortions. Defence mechanisms, levels of moral thinking.</li> </ol> <p>Content analysis of interrogation scenes from crime dramas to identify attribution biases/cognitive distortions or defence mechanisms. Focus could be on gender differences</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw conclusions and discuss findings.</li> <li>• Identify strengths and limitations of research and suggest improvements.</li> </ul>	<p>or comparison of innocent v guilty.</p> <p>The investigation should involve collecting and analysing data.</p> <p>Targets to be set in relation to preliminary search for background, submitting design for check on practicality and <u>ethics</u>, developing tools/materials, collecting data, analysing data and drawing conclusions, preparing presentation covering hypothesis, method, results, discussion and conclusions.</p> <p><b>A2</b> Presentation session(s) - each student to briefly present their investigation to the class. Teacher and peer Q&amp;A.</p> <p>Develop critical thinking by posing questions specifically related to their study –</p> <p>What would you have done differently and why?</p> <p>What further research should be done in relation to this topic?</p> <p>How do your findings relate to ... theory?</p>
--	--	--	---

## Resources

**A1** BPS Ethical guidelines [Ethics & standards](#)

ATP Ethics guidance. [Ethics Guidance](#)

**A1** Pakes & Pakes, Criminal Psychology, Willan Publishing 2009,

victimisation and fear of crime p25 -28

Fear of crime holiday v home p29

Mawby, R.I., Brunt, P. and Hambly, Z. (2000). Fear of Crime among British Holidaymakers British Journal of Criminology, 40, 468–479

[Gender, fear of crime, and self-presentation: an experimental investigation](#)

Robbie M. Sutton, et al.

Volume 17, Issue 5, 2011

Reid 2011 Personality Theory and Criminality Examined Vol. 3 No. 01 | pg. 3/4

[Crime and Personality: Personality Theory and Criminality Examined](#)

Specification content Week 25	Subject-specific skill development	Learning outcomes	Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)
<p>Dealing with offending.</p> <p>Role of custodial sentencing, reform, incapacitation, deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation, eg Davies and Raymond (2000).</p> <p>Recidivism reduction.</p> <p>Reintegration in the non-criminal community.</p> <p>Self-efficacy and commitment to change, and have stronger social support networks.</p> <p>Scottish Govt report 2011.</p> <p>Effects of custodial sentences - Zimbardo prison study</p> <p>Skill development</p> <p>Assessing effectiveness of different methods of treating offending behaviour</p>	<p>Making links between theory, evidence and policy/practices</p> <p>Making judgements about the effectiveness of policies and practices</p> <p>Appropriate use of terminology</p> <p>Selecting, shaping and structuring information to answer specific questions</p>	<p>Develop understanding of ways of dealing with offenders.</p> <p>Students should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline the purposes and psychological effects of custodial sentences.</li> <li>• Explain how the effectiveness of different methods of treating offending behaviour can be assessed.</li> <li>• Outline strategies for reducing recidivism.</li> <li>• Describe the use and evaluate the effectiveness of behaviour modification in a custodial setting.</li> <li>• Describe the use and evaluate the effectiveness of anger management programmes.</li> <li>• Describe the use and evaluate the effectiveness of restorative justice programmes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A1</b> Starter activity - Discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the purpose of custodial sentencing?</li> <li>• Do prisons work?</li> </ul> <p>Students then research the effects and effectiveness of custodial sentencing (recidivism and desistance).</p> <p>Follow up activity - bring in practitioner(s) to explain what prison is really like and the psychological effects of custodial sentencing.</p> <p><b>A2</b> Students to work in pairs to review explanations for offending behaviour and suggest the implications of different explanations/approaches for dealing with offenders. How would proponents of each explanation suggest we deal with offending behaviour?</p>

<p>Use and effectiveness of behaviour modification in custodial setting, eg Cohen &amp; Filipczak (1971), Andrews &amp; Bonta (2006)</p> <p>Use and effectiveness of anger management, eg national anger management package Ireland (2000)</p> <p>Use and effectiveness of Restorative Justice, eg Sherman &amp; Strang (2007), Hayes (2005)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider social and economic implications of sentencing in relation to ethics, social sensitivity, issues and debates policy and practices.</li> </ul>	<p>Whole class IWB activity to gather their suggestions on dealing with offending behaviour.</p> <p><b>A3</b> Selecting, shaping and organising material to develop a coherent line of argument. Students to be provided with a series of pieces of information describing behaviour modification, anger management and restorative justice research evidence and evaluate these techniques, measuring effectiveness, evaluative commentary relating to social sensitivity, ethics, nature nurture, determinism. AND a series of essay titles, eg “Discuss the effectiveness of anger management for dealing with offending behaviour”, “Outline and evaluate one or more ways of dealing with recidivism.” Students work in pairs to choose an essay title, select the information they will include, organise it into a coherent sequence then add in phrases to link the ideas. Give the “essay” to another pair who have to read it and decide on the title of the essay. Repeat for a different title.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>This is best done on computer and demands of the task can be varied by including distractor material and by providing subtly different titles.</p> <p><b>A4</b> End of unit review and sample exam. Mind-Map Relay - students to build a mind-map of the forensic unit on the whiteboard. All students must participate – all students to stand up, one student begins and passes the pen to another student who must add additional information. If the student cannot add then they must sit down. The activity continues until the students can no longer add additional information. The last student standing should receive a small prize. Photograph of mind-map to be uploaded to the VLE. Timed exam style questions – using the past papers and mark schemes available on the AQA website.</p>
--	--	--	---

## Resources

**A1** Pakes & Pakes, Criminal Psychology 136-142

**A1** [The Independent: Reoffending rate increases](#)

**A1** [BBC News: Reoffending rates reach record level](#)

**A1** Government reports on recidivism and reducing reoffending

[What Works to Reduce Reoffending: A Summary of the Evidence](#)

[Transforming Rehabilitation](#)

Revision/Summary materials:

[Simply Psychology – summary of forensic psychology](#)