### Specification Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 21</th>
<th>Subject-specific skill development</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
<th>Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining crime.</td>
<td>Use ICT to research measuring crime</td>
<td>Develop understanding of the crime, measuring crime and offender profiling.</td>
<td>A1 Starter activity - what is a crime? Students brainstorm in groups to identify things that used to be but are no longer crimes, things that are crimes elsewhere but not here, things that are not crimes but should be things that are anti-social. Groups share ideas. Whole class discussion focusing on content of lists to develop the idea that crime is a dynamic construct dependent on historical, social, cultural, political context. The concept of age, intent, causes (determinism). Teacher to note main points on IWB, resulting notes to be loaded to VLE. Students to work in pairs to plan an essay on 'What is crime?' Planning should entail researching examples and evidence and developing a line of argument locating research to justified points made. Homework to produce written discussion essay. Possible ref - Historical differences, eg Stalking, Pakes &amp; Winstone 2007. Internet and identity fraud, eg Wall 2007. Cultural issues, eg honour killings, Welchman and Hossain 2006. Age and intent in relation to defining crime. Conscious rule breaking, eg Blackburn 1993. Criminal and antisocial behaviour, eg Hatcher &amp; Hollins 2005.</td>
<td>Stanko 1992 paradox of gender differences in victimisation and fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime as a social construct - social, cultural, historical, political influences on the definition of crime and the concepts of age intent and causes in defining crime.</td>
<td>Independent learning skills Locating evidence for a specific purpose Weighing evidence Developing lines of argument Exchange ideas/having a view – ownership of knowledge and skills Mathematical skills - interpreting percentages</td>
<td>Students should be able to: explain how crime is a dynamic construct outline social, cultural, historical political influences on the definition of crime and the concepts of age intent and causes in defining crime explain methods of measuring crime, their strengths and limitations explain top down approaches to profiling distinguish between organised and disorganised type of offender explain bottom up approach to profiling, investigative psychology and geographical profiling use research evidence to evaluate the usefulness of offender profiling</td>
<td>A1 Pakes &amp; Pakes, Criminal Psychology, Willan Publishing 2009, pp 19-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
Usefulness of profiling, eg Gudjonsson & Copson 1997.
Experimental research into profiling, eg Alison et al (2003).

Offending crime and justice survey (young people).

**Extension activity** - investigate and report back to class on the paradox of gender differences in victimisation and fear of crime.

**A3** Introduce concept of offender profiling, definition and main approaches top-down and bottom-up. Students then read the Guardian article.

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.

**A4** Students to read the article Psychology Review, Volume 16, 4 April 2011 on Criminal Profiling. Working in pairs students:

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.
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?

**A5** Investigating crime statistics - AQA Research methods, Activity 14.
### Specification Content

**Week 22**

| Biological explanations of offending behaviour:  
- Genetic explanations:  
  - Twin study, eg Grove (1990), Christiansen (1977)  
  - Adoption study, eg Mednick (1984)  
  - Focus on gene environment interaction, eg Plomin & Asbury 2005  
- Neurological explanations:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject-specific skill development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Applying existing knowledge to new topic | Develop understanding of biological explanation for offending behaviour.  
Students should be able to:  
- Outline and evaluate physiological theories - Lombroso’s atavistic form, Sheldon’s somatotype  
- Explain the role of twin and adoption studies in investigating genetic contribution  
- Describe and evaluate research into genetic explanation  
- Describe and evaluate neurological explanations  
- Use knowledge of methodology, issues and debates (confounding variables, sampling control of variables, limitations of correlational research, inferences, nature v nurture, reductionism, determinism, social sensitivity, policy implications of biological determinism) to evaluate explanations. | A1 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.  
A2 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. A summary description of studies/evidence is then exchanged with another group who evaluate the evidence in terms of its methodology and the conclusions that can be drawn from the research. Students write exam style essay - “Outline and evaluate biological explanations for offending behaviour” for home work.  
A3 Peer Assessment Activity. 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:  
1. Highlight material showing knowledge of biological explanations  
2. Highlight material showing knowledge of relevant research  
3. Highlight material showing use of evidence to evaluate explanations  
4. Other evaluative material, eg use of issues (methodological, social sensitivity, cultural bias), debates (nature nurture, determinism reductionism) implications for policy practices  
5. Allocate a mark in accordance with the mark scheme  
A2 Lombroso Prezi: Theories of Offending  
A2 Sheldon Prezi: Sheldon’s somatotype  
A2 Bio explanations + Eysenck YouTube: Origins of Criminal Behavior: Biological Factors |
| Independent learning skills  
Self-assessment  
Group work  
Use of evidence to evaluate explanations  
Using issues and debates to evaluate  
Extended writing skills  
Judging and providing feedback | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification Content</th>
<th>Subject-specific skill development</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
<th>Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 23</strong></td>
<td><strong>Psychological explanations of offending behaviour.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Using knowledge of research methodology, reliability, validity, issues and debates to judge explanations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop understanding of psychological explanations of offending behaviour.</strong> Students should be able to: <strong>Outlining key features of Eysenck’s personality dimensions and the role of extraversion and neuroticism in offending.</strong></td>
<td>A1 Pennington and McLoughlin, Psychology for A2 Hodder 2009, ch 8 pp 230-231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality factors:</strong></td>
<td>- Eysenck’s theory – the role of extraversion &amp; neuroticism in offending.</td>
<td><strong>Use understanding of research methodology to evaluate studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outline research into the relationship between personality and criminality.</strong></td>
<td>A1 Mind Changers BBC Radio 4 Eysenck BBC Radio 4: Mind Changers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of correlational research, self-reports and meta-analysis.</td>
<td><strong>Reading more complex psychological material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explain methodological limitations of research into the relationship between personality and criminality.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A2 Provide students with definitions/descriptions of catharsis and of denial, rationalisation, displacement, sublimation. Students to create a criminal character and some detail of what the character did/thinks/feels/says to illustrate each of the defence mechanisms.</strong></td>
<td>A1 extension resource Crime and Personality: Personality Theory and Criminality Examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychodynamic explanation:</strong></td>
<td>- Inadequate (weak deviant harsh) super ego.</td>
<td><strong>Presentation skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluate personality factors in explaining criminality.</strong></td>
<td>A1 Mind Changers BBC Radio 4 Eysenck BBC Radio 4: Mind Changers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of correlational research, self-reports and meta-analysis.</td>
<td>- Defence mechanisms – denial and rationalisation v displacement and sublimation.</td>
<td><strong>Analytic and creative/transformational skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outline key features of psychodynamic explanation for offending behaviour.</strong></td>
<td>A1 extension resource Crime and Personality: Personality Theory and Criminality Examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of correlational research, self-reports and meta-analysis.</td>
<td>- Maternal deprivation.</td>
<td><strong>Developing lines of argument</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluate psychodynamic explanation for offending behaviour.</strong></td>
<td>A1 extension resource Crime and Personality: Personality Theory and Criminality Examined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specification Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject-specific skill development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cognitive explanations:  
- Kohlberg moral reasoning  
- Assumptions stages/levels  
- Use of moral dilemmas |
| Application skills  
Using knowledge of research methodology, reliability, validity, issues and debates to judge explanations  
Use understanding of research methodology to evaluate studies  
Reading more complex psychological material  
Presentation skills  
Analytic and creative/ transformational skills  
Developing lines of argument |
| Develop understanding of cognitive explanations for offending behaviour.  
Students should be able to:  
- Describe key features and processes of moral reasoning according to Kohlberg’s theory.  
- Describe the use of dilemmas to investigate reasoning.  
- Outline, evaluate and use research into moral development to evaluate cognitive explanations for offending behaviour. |
| A1 Flipped Classroom - Students to investigate Kohlberg’s theory of moral development, making notes on the defining characteristics of each stage.  
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.  
A2 The findings of Palmer and Hollin (2000) and Alexio & 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 offending behaviour and limitations of these techniques. Class shares ideas and discussion to relate their ideas to the reliability and validity. |
A1 Outline of the theory  
Kohlberg’s Stages  
A1 Sample responses to Heinz dilemma  
Kohlberg’s Moral Development  
A1 BBC Radio 4: Mind Changers  
A4 Pakes & Pakes, Criminal Psychology P50-53 |

Research evidence relating to the relationship between moral reasoning and offending behaviour.  
Strengths and limitations of questionnaire/survey research into offending behaviour.  
Cognitive distortions:  
- Primary cognitive distortion (egocentric bias)  
- Secondary cognitive distortions - attributional biases (hostile attribution bias, excessive blaming)  
minimisation of consequences,
Methodological and conceptual issues, Implications and links to issues and debates

A3 Teacher led introduction to cognitive distortions providing students with definitions descriptions (but not examples) of:
- Egocentric bias
- Hostile attribution bias
- Excessive blaming.
- Minimalisation of consequences of their actions

Students work in pairs to create a series of dialogues between offender and interviewer that illustrate each type of cognitive distortion.

Each pair enacts one of their dialogues. The rest of the class have to decide on the distortions being illustrated.

A4 Present students with a fairly detailed scenario of detailing the life story background of an offender, eg the scenario on p 9 of Pakes Pakes Criminal Psychology

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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification Content</th>
<th>Subject-specific skill development</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
<th>Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 25</td>
<td>Research methods and practical for option topic 3</td>
<td>Using statistical tables</td>
<td>Develop understanding of the research methods, scientific processes and data handling.</td>
<td>A1 BPS Ethical guidelines for teachers and students of psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                       | Paradox of victimisation and fear of crime. Gender differences in fear of crime, holiday v home. | Reporting outcome of statistical test | Students should be able to:  
- Formulate a hypothesis  
- Design research to investigate the hypothesis  
- Develop appropriate materials to collect qualitative and/or quantitative data  
- Select an appropriate sample  
- Analyse qualitative and quantitative data  
- Use descriptive statistics to present data  
- Use appropriate inferential statistics to test the hypothesis  
- Use content or thematic analysis of responses to open questions  
- Draw conclusions and discuss findings  
|                       | Cognitive distortions and attribution bias, content analysis of TV crime dramas. | Drawing conclusions from quantitative data analysis | Possible topics:  
2. Cognitive distortions. Defence mechanisms, levels of moral thinking. | Fear of crime holiday v home p29 |
|                       |                                                 | Investigation design | Content analysis of interrogation scenes from crime dramas to identify attribution biases/cognitive distortions or defence mechanisms. Focus could be on gender differences or comparison of innocent v guilty. | Mawby, R.I., Brunt, P. and Hambly, Z. (2000). Fear of Crime among British Holidaymakers British Journal of Criminology , 40, 468–479 |
|                       |                                                 | Data collection and recording | The investigation should involve collecting and analysing data. Targets to be set in relation to preliminary search for background, submitting design for check on practicality and ethics, developing tools/materials, collecting data, analysing data and drawing conclusions, preparing presentation covering hypothesis, method, results, discussion and conclusions. | Gender, fear of crime, and self-presentation: an experimental investigation Robbie M. Sutton, et al. Volume 17, Issue 5, 2011 |
|                       |                                                 | Time management | A2 Presentation session(s) - each student to briefly present their investigation to the class. Teacher and peer Q&A. | Reid 2011 Personality Theory and Criminality Examined Vol. 3 No. 01 | pg. 3/4 |
|                       |                                                 | Understanding ethical obligations | Develop critical thinking by posing questions specifically related to their study –  
What would you have done differently and why?  
What further research should be done in relation to this topic?  
How do your findings relate to … theory? | Crime and Personality: Personality Theory and Criminality Examined |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification Content</th>
<th>Subject-specific skill development</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
<th>Suggested learning activities (including reference to differentiation and extension activities)</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dealing with offending. | Making links between theory, evidence and policy/ practices | Develop understanding of ways of dealing with offenders. | **A1** Starter activity - Discussion of:  
- What is the purpose of custodial sentencing?  
- Do prisons work?  
Students then research the effects and effectiveness of custodial sentencing (recidivism and desistance).  
Follow up activity - bring in practitioner(s) to explain what prison is really like and the psychological effects of custodial sentencing.  
**A2** 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?  
Whole class IWB activity to gather their suggestions on dealing with offending behaviour.  
**A3** 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.  
This is best done on computer and demands of the task can be varied by including distractor material and by providing subtly different titles. | **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 |
| A4 | 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. |