



---

# **EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**LEVEL 3 CERTIFICATE AND DIPLOMA IN  
CRIMINOLOGY**

**SUMMER 2018**

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:  
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en>

### **Online Results Analysis**

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

### **Annual Statistical Report**

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Page</b>
Unit 1 Changing Awareness of Crime	1
Unit 2 Criminological Theories	7
Unit 3 Crime Scene to Courtroom	11
Unit 4 Crime and Punishment	16

# **CRIMINOLOGY**

## **Level 3 Certificate**

**Summer 2018**

### **UNIT 1 CHANGING AWARENESS OF CRIME**

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

In the second year of awarding for this new specification for Level 3 Criminology it was pleasing to see such high quality work produced by centres. The sample assessments demonstrated meticulous preparation by the vast majority of centres this year, with a clear focus on the new specification. This year, there was no confusion evident between the new specification and the old QCF Level 3 Criminology qualification.

The purpose of this report is to help centres identify areas for improvement for future moderation series. Comments made are not to be taken as applying equally to all centres and certainly do not detract from the overall good performance of many candidates and centres.

For the majority, the sample assessments showed a high level of understanding and engagement by the candidates. It was encouraging to see that candidates were well-prepared for the internal/controlled assessment and were able to interpret the new specification well. Evidence of good practice was observed by centres who had thoroughly engaged with the revised assessment criteria by exploring both the content and amplification section of the specification.

For some centres, the level of engagement with the specification should be developed for future series. Centres should directly address both the content and amplification column for each assessment criteria outlined in Unit 1. In some instances, candidates were not thoroughly addressing criteria and assessment decisions made by the centres were not accepted. Please refer to the specific guidance below for more detail regarding the specific learning outcomes.

Most candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to draw on relevant sections of the assignment brief/scenario to enhance their application throughout. All centres should be mindful to encourage the use of the assignment brief/scenario as and when relevant throughout Unit 1.

The assignment brief/scenario is designed to assist and should not become the sole focus of the internal/controlled assessment. In some instances, candidates relied solely on the assignment brief and missed opportunities to engage with both the assessment criteria or additional examples often limiting marks. This was largely the case when candidates were using Mr Brian Williams as the assignment brief/scenario. In such cases, candidates were only addressing crimes discussed in the Brian Williams brief, failing to engage with the specification. This will significantly limit marks, making it difficult for assessment decisions to be accepted. General concerns were expressed with centres using the Brian Williams brief in this respect as candidates failed to follow the specification for many ACs. This needs to be addressed in future series.

Despite Unit 1 providing centres with some choice with regards to the assignment brief/scenario, the most popular choice was Mr & Mrs S. The best examples were those

candidates who embedded references throughout their internal/controlled assessment where relevant. Centres should not penalise students for failing to engage with the assignment brief/scenario in every assessment criteria.

The organisation of candidates' work was well presented for the purpose of moderation. Centres must ensure that assessment documentation is completed appropriately. The better examples provided detailed comments on the mark record sheet to justify the mark band awarded for each AC. Those centres highlighted the relevant mark band, inserted the mark and outlined focused comments in support of the performance on all mark record sheets submitted. It is pleasing to see assessors engaging with key terminology found in both the specification and on the mark record sheet. Best practice was evident in centres where assessors provided concise justifications as to why the candidate had achieved high level performance or alternatively, reasons why the candidate could not achieve high level performance with improvement points listed.

Good practice was also evident in those centres who included annotations throughout the internal assessment. Annotations are expected within the main body of work to show the location of each assessment criteria. This does significantly assist the moderation process and is an approach all centres should adopt for future series, particularly as centres can credit various assessment criteria where it appears in the assessment.

However, in some cases, centres merely noted the mark for each AC without providing any justification or comment on the mark record sheet and annotations were also omitted throughout the assessment. Centres are reminded about the expectations of the marking process which supports not only the assessor's decision but also assists in the moderation process. Failure to adhere to this makes the process very challenging for moderators as there is no justification behind assessment decisions. In few cases this year, some assessors were awarding marks for particular assessment criteria, yet failing to write this down on the mark record sheets leading to clerical errors. Centres are reminded to take care when completing mark record sheets and when entering marks to avoid such errors.

Most centres included evidence of internal verification which is considered good practice. Where centres have more than one assessor, internal verification should be completed to ensure consistency and adherence to standardised procedures across all assessors. This series, there were several cases where assessment decisions lacked consistency due to a variety of assessors in one centre.

All centres should be reminded of the significance of inserting candidate names and numbers on the required documentation. During the moderation process, the declaration forms and mark record sheets are removed. It is therefore vital that candidates' details also appear on all pages of the submitted work. This should be addressed in the future by all centres and was omitted by some centres this series.

The presentation of the Unit 1 sample assessments were impressive and visually appealing, especially with regard to the design of campaign materials. Candidates usually set out the work in a report format addressing the required tasks. Use of headings and sub-headings which followed the assessment criteria wording were particularly useful and did greatly assist the moderation process.

In several cases the lack of sub-headings/division between ACs did mean that candidates missed opportunities to develop knowledge. This was particularly evident across AC3.2 and AC3.3. Some candidates briefly annotated campaign materials in AC3.2 in an attempt to address the justification required for AC3.3. In this case, the annotations failed to develop the justification in the detail required to access the top mark band for AC3.3. The most

impressive assessments were those who divided AC3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 ensuring that all three ACs were capable of accessing the top mark band as all were sufficiently detailed.

Centres must ensure that the candidates' campaign materials for AC3.2 are of an appropriate size. At times, campaign materials were reduced in size, making it particularly challenging to read some text. Best practice was evident by candidates who created materials of an appropriate size which were printed separately and simply attached to the report. Candidates can adjust the size of materials should they wish to embed a smaller image in the report alongside written text. However, it should be advised that the original (larger) size is also attached to ease the moderation process. There were some very creative campaigns and candidates should be commended for this.

Some centres submitted assessments using video evidence, however it was particularly challenging to moderate as additional documentation will also be required to support this video evidence. In some instances, centres failed to send this additional evidence (documentation).

Finally, it is of great importance that all centres follow the guidance for internal/controlled assessments. The internal assessment should be completed by candidates on an individual basis at all times; group work is not permitted. It should be stressed that this also applies to the design of the campaign materials, this is an individual assessment.

## LEARNING OUTCOMES

### LO1: Understand how crime reporting affects the public perception of criminality

The ACs covered under this learning outcome were generally addressed with depth and clarity. Most centres thoroughly engaged with the new specification and considered issues regarding: under-reported crimes, examples, reasons and consequences.

AC1.1 was largely done well, with candidates offering an extremely detailed analysis of a wide range of crimes, supported by appropriate examples. For the most part, it was excellent. However, candidates should be reminded to consider the marks available for each AC when considering time management skills. Often AC1.1-1.3 were so detailed that larger ACs in other learning outcomes were not given adequate time.

Throughout this learning outcome, ACs were applied appropriately to the assignment brief/scenario to enhance the standard of work. However, centres should be reminded to follow the specification during preparation for this internal assessment. Some centres relied too heavily on the assignment brief when addressing AC1.1 - 1.3 as some crimes and reasons lacked relevance to the specification or failed to analyse the crimes using the suggested amplification as outlined under AC1.1. This was particularly the case for those candidates using the Brian Williams assignment brief.

Candidates generally achieved high marks when addressing AC1.4 and 1.5 and it was pleasing to see candidates embed recent issues when discussing the media representation of crime. This was highlighted as good practice.

Assessors should be reminded to credit a particular AC even if the candidate addresses it in another AC. At times, assessment decisions were regarded as severe for AC1.4 as assessors were not crediting appropriate descriptions and examples which were found in AC1.5. In other instances, marks for AC1.5 were often deemed to be generous as assessors were awarding full marks when the impact on the public perception of crime was implicit, rather than explicit.

A small number of candidates failed to address AC1.6 in sufficient detail to access the higher mark band, however this may be due to time constraints. Centres should be reminded to follow the specification for AC1.6 as it outlines the sources of information to be used and the evaluation criteria which should be embedded.

### LO2: Understand how campaigns are used to elicit change

This section appeared to be the most challenging for candidates. However, it was pleasing to see that centres had adopted advice for AC2.1 based on the feedback provided in the Principal Moderator Report in 2017. AC2.1 was largely addressed very well by candidates this year.

It is vital that centres, and candidates alike, are aware of the difference between AC2.1 and 2.2. At times, candidates did not separate these sections with sub-headings, an aspect that despite making it more difficult to mark, will not limit marks as such. However, this became a concern as some assessors were not able to confidently distinguish between AC2.1 requirements and AC2.2 requirements, often meaning that marks were not accepted due to being too generous.

The focus of AC2.1 should be a comparison between campaigns for change. As outlined in the specification, the content should focus on comparisons which can be linked to the following

- change in policy
- change in law
- change in priorities of agencies
- change in funding
- change in awareness
- change in attitude

Some centres were very well prepared for this AC and sample assessments did demonstrate a high understanding from candidates. The best examples were those where candidates selected a range of appropriate campaigns for change and compared the campaigns in depth, addressing key aspects such as purpose, success, aims and methods used etc. As outlined in the amplification section, campaigns could include, for example, classification of drugs, euthanasia, abortion, smoking, etc. There is no expectation that candidates should only use campaigns for change surrounding the crimes featured in AC1.1 when drawing comparisons in AC2.1. Often, it was good practice when candidates used criminal campaigns alongside a range of other existing campaigns for change as it allowed for excellent comparisons to be drawn. A range of campaigns in this AC also ensured comparisons covered campaigns which aim to change policy, law, funding and awareness etc.

The best examples also included comparisons between existing campaigns for change and the campaign designed by the candidate. This approach should be adopted by all centres in future series. When referring to AC2.1, mark band 3 states:

*'Clear and detailed comparison of a range of relevant campaigns for change. Explicit links to planned campaign with reference to specific and appropriate sources to support conclusions.'*

In this moderation series, it was expected that candidates include explicit comparison to their designed campaign for change, whilst also comparing a range of relevant existing campaigns for change with sources to support such conclusions. This was a requirement to

access mark band 3. For the most part, it was very pleasing to see centres follow the mark band criteria appropriately in this instance. In some cases, centres marks were not agreed as this approach was not adopted and full marks were awarded despite having no links to the candidates' planned campaigns.

AC2.2 was largely approached with ease and accuracy by candidates. Evidence of good practice was observed in sample assessments where candidates evaluated a wide range of media methods with clear links to existing campaigns, which offered supportive evidence and well-reasoned judgements. In some instances, candidates had a tendency to merely describe media methods used in existing campaigns, achieving limited marks.

Candidates should be encouraged to separate AC2.1 and AC2.2. AC2.1 requires a comparison between campaigns for change, whereas AC2.2 requires candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of media used in campaigns for change. The campaign examples used across both AC2.1 and 2.2 need not be the same. Centres are reminded that these ACs are worth 25 marks and are entirely different, AC2.2 should not merely be treated as an extension of AC2.1. Marks were limited where this was the case.

### LO3: Plan campaigns for change relating to crime

This learning outcome largely offered the most thorough and well-thought out responses by candidates with clear evidence of effective preparation by most centres. Overall, the quality of the campaigns which were planned, designed and justified under this section was impressive.

The most significant feedback linked to this learning outcome to come from this moderation series is the relevance of the chosen campaign for change. Candidates must be mindful when selecting a campaign for change. In some instances, candidates were creating campaigns which were not appropriate for changing behaviour or were not in line with the Unit 1 assessment task. As part of the task, candidates are asked to create a campaign for an 'unreported or hidden crime'. It is vital that candidates do so as marks will be significantly limited. This year, some assessors did acknowledge this and deduct marks as appropriate, however other assessors failed to do so and assessment decisions were not accepted as they were deemed generous.

Candidates addressed AC3.1 in depth, creating a comprehensive plan of action for an appropriate campaign for change. Candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of the AC requirements and were clearly well prepared by centres. This enabled most to access high marks. The best examples addressed the following:

- aims and objectives
- justification of choice of campaign
- target audience
- methods to be used
- materials to be used
- finances
- timescales
- resources needed.

Candidates should be reminded to set the context of the campaign for change during the planning process and ensure that actions are planned in an appropriate time sequence. Some campaign plans lacked actions in a relevant time sequence, this is a key aspect of the mark band criteria and often meant candidates were limited in marks. This should be addressed for future series.

In most instances, the campaign materials which were designed as part of AC3.2 enabled candidates to achieve significantly high marks for this task. Evidence of excellent practice was observed by candidates who had designed several materials and demonstrated creative ability with the use of persuasive language, powerful imagery to stimulate interest and relevance to the appropriate campaign. Some candidates had devoted a significant amount of time to this section and used research to create appropriate materials which would engage the target audience.

In some weaker examples, candidates designed 1 form of media (for example: one poster) which was often limited in relevance and accuracy to the chosen campaign for change. Centres should be reminded that for a 20 mark AC, the expectation will be that candidates produce a range of campaign materials, suggestions are outlined in the specification.

Centres are reminded again that the assignment brief/scenario is there to assist and candidates can design campaign materials which may not be directly applicable to the chosen assignment brief/scenario. However, it is good practice to link to the assignment brief/scenario where relevant. The most popular campaigns for change are centred around the following crimes: domestic violence, hate crime, honour crime, cyber crime and white collar crime (crimes listed under AC1.1).

The justification required under AC3.3 came with little issues. The majority of candidates justified their campaign in line with the specification requirements and in such depth that many responses achieved high marks. It should be noted that several candidates attempted to annotate the materials with justifications or in fact to include justifications as part of the plan, essentially merging AC3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Whilst this will still be credited and may prove to be a useful approach, the majority of these responses were limited as the justification lacked sufficient detail to access the higher mark band. However, some students opted to annotate their materials as part of AC3.2, offering justifications, yet still go on to produce a very detailed response for AC3.3, still allowing candidates to access high marks.

# CRIMINOLOGY

## Level 3 Certificate

Summer 2018

### UNIT 2 CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORIES

#### Question 1

- (a) (i) A standard definition of deviance was required with the vast majority of answers stating that deviance was against social norms. Very few answers were unable to provide comments along these lines. However given the fact that 3 marks were available for this question an extension of the definition was expected and was very often forthcoming. This could include a reference to crime in comparison to deviance or a reference to the typical sanctions for deviance. An example of deviant acts would ensure full marks were awarded.
- (ii) Many candidates were able to access band 2 by providing a range of examples from the scenario that demonstrated behaviour that was criminal, deviant or both. The best answers gave several examples from the scenario and highlighted the relationship between the two concepts such as pointing out that illegally downloading music is a crime but is now so common place that it may not be perceived as deviant. Some answers lacked sufficient detail and examples to access the higher mark band.
- (b) This question was answered well by nearly all candidates. Answers showed understanding of the fear of potential repercussions if the actions were reported. For instance further name calling or even violence would result. Other answers included fear that the police would not take Edna's concerns seriously or fear that her cats would be harmed.
- (c) (i) For this question any sociological theory, as per the specifications, would be credited. However candidates would be well advised to read ahead to consider all remaining questions, under part (c), as they will all be linked to the theory selected. There was evidence of candidates changing their mind after starting the answer and changing the theory selected when they realised questions on analysis and evaluation followed. There were a variety of theories provided and they included Marxism, Rights Realism, Functionalism, Merton's Strain Theory and Labelling. This question also allowed specialist terminology to be credited. Examples included proletariat and bourgeoisie for Marxism and self-fulfilling prophecy and master status for Labelling. It was important to describe the theory with reference to criminality and failure to do so would result in the mark being restricted. Unfortunately some candidates failed to correctly identify a sociological theory referring to the social learning theory, for example, and were therefore unable to gain any credit. Centres should ensure that candidates are aware of the category that each

criminological theory falls under. Finally if more than one theory was provided only one can be credited.

- (ii) It was expected that the sociological theory described in the previous question would be developed by analysis and application to Edna's situation. Here the facts in the text were important and reference to Edna's situation was expected. The Labelling theory was often analysed well with candidates able to explain how Edna had been labelled as mad and therefore this became her master status and she became a self-fulfilling prophecy when she murdered Sidney. The application of Marxism was also done well, with the connection made between Edna in poverty as a member of the proletariat, Sidney as the more wealthy and powerful bourgeoisie and the related exploitation, selective law enforcement and frustration that led to the situation in the text. Candidates found it more difficult to apply other theories as competently. Hence a reminder of the importance to read ahead and select the most relevant theory. Again, specialist terminology associated with the theory was rewarded.
- (c) (iii) The third part of this question required the selected sociological theory to be evaluated. Some candidates were able to provide clear, accurate and relevant evaluation of the theory providing both strengths and weaknesses for top marks. However again the focus on the evaluation needed to be linked to criminality and not merely whether the theory was reliable generally. The weaker scripts tended to provide descriptive answers without any evaluation and hence could not access the top mark band. Evaluation is a higher order skill but its place in the specification means that Centres must prepare candidates to expect to display their ability in this area.

## Question 2

- (a) Whilst it is accepted that decriminalisation can be a difficult term to define the majority of candidates were able to provide some explanation of this term together with comments on the process that occurs. The best answers were able to convey the process where society refuses to accept that an action is criminal and a reduction in punishment may follow or a reluctance of formal action being taken by the police. Many scripts conveyed the concept of legalisation which of course may occur at the end of the decriminalisation process. A significant number of candidates limited their response to the example of homosexuality which was provided in the text, whilst others also used the examples of cannabis and prostitution. Answers were expected to have more than one example as requested in the question. A small number of candidates failed to appreciate the concept of decriminalisation and confused it with discrimination.
- (b) This synoptic question required knowledge from unit 1 regarding campaigns for change. Overall candidates managed this requirement very well. The highest mark band could be achieved by answers where evaluation was evident with discussions of both strengths and weaknesses from a range of campaign methods. Examples of methods used included social media, television and radio advertisements and

publicity stunts. Answers would be enhanced with references to particular named campaigns that used the identified methods. Some candidates failed to engage with the question and provided descriptive accounts of either campaign methods or of campaigns themselves with no explicit reference to an evaluation of the methods used.

- (c)** This proved to be a difficult question for many candidates. Answers were often of a low standard. The better candidate appreciated that they had to explain how social change (social values, norms, and mores) had led to specific changes in policy or law. Strong answers were able to show how changing social attitudes had influenced policies on homosexuality, same sex marriage, women's rights, smoking and domestic abuse and so on. The best answers referred to actual laws or policies that have been changed. References were also made to the declining influence of religion in society. Some candidates focussed on cultural differences in general terms. The terms social values, norms, mores seemed unfamiliar to some candidates and Centres should ensure that those they teach are familiar with all terminology included in the specifications.
- (d)** This was a well answered question and one which allowed many scripts to achieve at the top mark band level. Weaker answers provided a description of campaigns without explicitly focusing on the legal change that occurred as a result. Popular references included Sarah's Law, Clare's Law, Lilian's law campaigns and Ann Ming's double jeopardy campaign. To access the top mark band and for the very top marks, candidates were expected to name the law that was changed or introduced. This could include the Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme 2011 (Sarah's law), the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (Ann Ming's double jeopardy campaign). The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (Clare's Law) and Drug Driving (Specified Limits) (England & Wales) Regulations 2014 (Lilian's Law).

### Question 3

- (a)** This question required candidates to select a physiological theory of criminality. Many selected either Lombroso or Sheldon and were able to reach the top mark band. The answers that failed to do this lacked detail or terminology linked to the theory. No application to Jimmy and his situation was required in the answer. However there were a significant number of scripts which focused on non-physiological theories and therefore failed to gain any marks. Centres must ensure they make candidates fully aware of the categories of theories as per the specifications and the various specialist terms.
- (b)** The expected theory for this answer was Jacobs XY theory. Many candidates provided this in their answers and therefore received the appropriate credit. Some included Patricia Jacob's research and her findings. Whilst many candidates could adequately describe the theory it was not always applied to Jimmy and his situation. However those candidates who were able to make the potential link with aggression and Jimmy's situation regarding his second charge of grievous bodily harm were given credit. Evaluation was not required but some candidates did comment on the

worth of the theory as part of their analysis. As well as credit being provided for the XYY theory other genetic theories were also acknowledged with the most popular being twin and adoption studies and the MAOA 'warrior gene'.

- (c)** This question required candidates to describe an individualistic theory of criminality and many chose to outline the social learning theory with reference to Bandura. Better answers referred to behaviour being learnt through the observation of role models and vicarious reinforcement and successfully applied these concepts to Jimmy's situation, who learnt criminal behaviour from his abusive adult role models as he grew up and his criminal peer group. Freud's personality theory, Bowlby, Eysenck and Kohlberg also appeared in some answers. Again, answers that failed to apply the theory to Jimmy could not score highly. Also there was a notable number of candidates who selected a non-individualistic theory and failed to achieve any marks.
- (d)** This final question was acknowledged to be challenging as it required the skill of evaluation only. Many candidates simply provided a description of psychodynamic theory, usually Freud, with some also making reference to Bowlby. Better answers did not provide an unnecessary summary of the theory but simply and explicitly discussed the strengths and weaknesses. There were again candidates who failed to understand which theories count as psychodynamic, discussing, amongst others, Eysenck or Kohlberg or the case of Phineas Gage, none of which could gain any credit. Centres are again strongly urged to ensure candidates are clear which category each theory of criminality falls under as per the specifications.

## **CRIMINOLOGY**

### **Level 3 Diploma**

**Summer 2018**

#### **UNIT 3: CRIME SCENE TO COURTROOM**

##### GENERAL COMMENTS

Overall, the sample of Unit 3 work this year was impressive. Once again, it is clear that centres have largely interpreted the new specification with ease and accuracy and prepared candidates well.

One of the purposes of this report is to help centres identify areas for improvement for future cohorts. It is therefore necessary to include comments of a constructive nature. Such comments are not to be taken as applying equally to all centres and certainly do not detract from the overall high standard of work from many candidates and centres this year.

For the majority, the sample assessments for Unit 3 were of a high standard with many centres showing excellent practice this year. It was pleasing to see centres adapting teaching and advice given to candidates based on comments made in the Principal Moderator report last year (2017). However, centres need to be reminded of the importance of reading the Principal Moderator report and engaging with the feedback provided. For the minority of centres, areas for improvement that were highlighted last moderation series (2017) were not addressed in this moderation series, which subsequently limited marks for candidates.

The presentation of this sample was great with centres adhering to procedures by including all necessary documentation. All centres must ensure that assessment documentation is completed appropriately for moderation, this includes declaration sheets, mark record sheets and internal verification documentation (if relevant). Centres should ensure that all declaration sheets are signed by candidates and assessors. Best practice was observed by assessors who provided detailed commentary on the mark record sheet to justify the mark band awarded for each AC. Those centres highlighted the relevant mark band box, inserted the mark and outlined focused comments in support of the performance on all mark record sheets. This does significantly assist the moderation process and is an approach all centres should adopt to inform moderators of assessment decisions. Outstanding practice was also observed by assessors who justified high level performance to explain why candidates achieved the top mark band, or alternatively what was missing which restricted top mark band performance in some cases.

In some instances, other centres merely noted the mark for each AC without providing any justification or comment on the mark record sheet. In very few cases, some assessors also failed to insert a mark for some ACs on the mark record sheet. Centres should be reminded about the expectations of marking, which supports not only the assessor's decision but also assists in the moderation process and ensures the moderator understands the reasoning behind the marking.

Excellent practice was evident through the additional feedback provided through the annotations by some centres. Annotations are expected within the candidates' body of work to show the location of the assessment criteria. This is necessary as some centres were awarding marks for ACs which were embedded throughout other ACs, therefore to ease the process, the location of ACs should be identified as a minimum expectation. Centres should be aware that assessors can credit ACs regardless of the location in the overall report. In a number of cases, annotations were simply omitted from the candidates' reports.

All centres should be reminded of the importance of inserting candidate names and numbers to the documentation submitted within the sample. During the moderation process the declaration forms and mark record sheets are removed. Therefore it is vital that candidates' details also appear on all pages of the submitted work.

The structure of candidates' work was also very pleasing with most completing their assessment in a report format. Use of headings and sub-headings which followed the assessment criteria wording were particularly useful and should be encouraged in future series.

Centres are still advised to refer to the new specification in greater depth to ensure candidates are directly addressing the assessment criteria outlined in Unit 3. In some cases this year, candidates were still not thoroughly engaging with the content or amplification of the relevant ACs, thus limiting marks in some cases. Please refer to the specific guidance below for detail regarding specific learning outcomes.

Once again, candidates displayed excellent application of knowledge to the assignment brief/scenario of Gareth Hughes or John Smith. The best practice were those assessments where concise application was embedded throughout the main body of work where relevant. Centres should not penalise candidates for not including application to the assignment brief/scenario in specific ACs.

Centres should not rely too heavily on the assignment brief throughout the internal/controlled assessment. In some instances, the reliance on the assignment brief caused some candidates to miss opportunities to enhance knowledge and understanding and often restricted marks, particularly in AC3.1 and AC3.2. This was an area for improvement raised in the Principal Moderator Report in 2017 and should be addressed in future cohorts. Centres should advise candidates to draw on a range of relevant case examples throughout and the assignment brief/scenario should be there to assist, rather than be the sole focus.

Centres and candidates should be aware of the importance of selection. In some assessments there was evidence of candidates spending too much time on ACs worth lower marks and consequently becoming limited towards the end of the internal/controlled assessment, where higher marks were available. At times, this denied candidates the opportunity to access the higher mark bands in the larger ACs.

## LEARNING OUTCOMES

### LO1: Understand the process of criminal investigations

Candidates largely demonstrated an excellent understanding when approaching this learning outcome. Overall, the ACs did not appear to cause any difficulty for candidates which was pleasing to see.

Centres need to ensure that candidates evaluate the roles of personnel covered under AC1.1 as opposed to merely describing the roles. The effectiveness should be considered in the context of potential limitations: cost, expertise and availability, as laid out in the specification. At times, this was often omitted by candidates and the response was largely descriptive. Case examples are helpful to support the evaluative points made.

Centres also need to assess a range of investigative techniques in terms of their effectiveness under AC1.2. They also need to consider how effective the techniques are in criminal investigations. The techniques and criminal investigations which ought to be assessed are outlined in the specification. It was pleasing to see that centres are engaging with the specification criteria more this series and responses were of a high standard. Again, case examples should be embedded to enhance the assessment of the various techniques. The most successful candidates structured AC1.2 by addressing various techniques with clear and detailed strengths and limitations whilst commenting on effectiveness in criminal investigations. Some candidates need to ensure the investigative techniques are assessed with reference to their use in criminal investigations, in accordance with the unit.

It should be noted that the assignment brief/scenario should be used to simply assist the application of knowledge across the internal/controlled assessment. In some instances, candidates were relying solely on the assignment brief/scenario to complete AC1.1 and 1.2, often missing valuable opportunities to explore roles/techniques or criminal cases in depth, and often missing the focus of the AC as outlined by the specification.

AC1.3 and AC1.4 was generally well-achieved and done particularly well by the majority of candidates. Regarding AC1.3, centres should engage with the specification by addressing both physical and testimonial evidence whilst making sure the focus is on the process of evidence, this includes: collection, transfer, storage, analysis and personnel involved. Centres should refer to the amplification section of AC1.3 as it states that: '*Learners should explore how different types of evidence were processed through a range of case studies, e.g. Barry George, Sally Clarke, Angela Cannings, Amanda Knox.*' This year, many centres did not include relevant case studies in this AC.

Regarding AC1.4, some centres focused on the rights of suspects only and could extend this by discussing the rights of witnesses and victims too, as outlined by the specification.

### LO2: Understand the process for prosecution of suspects

This learning outcome was well achieved by candidates again with some impressive work. It was pleasing to see most centres preparing candidates well for these tasks. There were

relevant references to criminal and legal procedures, whilst often referring to criminal cases to enhance responses.

AC2.4 was largely completed to a very high standard by most centres. The most successful examples included explicit evidence whereby candidates were demonstrating an understanding of the various factors that may influence the outcome of a criminal trial, whilst assessing the significance of their impact. The better examples included relevant criminal cases to support the assessment given such as Christopher Jefferies, Colin Stagg and Sally Clark etc. In very few cases, it is clear that some centres may need to refer to the specification for this specific AC as some responses lacked focus.

### LO3: Be able to review criminal cases

The feedback for AC3.1 and AC3.2 is largely the same as the 2017 series. Centres are reminded to address suggestions for future series.

AC3.1 largely achieved high marks as the majority of candidates showed evidence of detailed examination of a wide range of information sources and were able to confidently examine the validity using excellent case examples throughout. These candidates were clearly well-prepared as a range of sources, including evidence, trial transcripts, media reports, judgements and Law Reports were examined for validity and in depth. These candidates dealt with bias, opinion and accuracy of information with ease.

However, centres need to ensure that candidates use a range of information sources. At times, candidates were only assessing the information sources from the assignment brief/scenario. This is not sufficient for this AC and marks will be limited. Better examples embedded case examples such as Jeremy Bamber, Sion Jenkins or the Hillsborough disaster etc. Whilst application to the assignment brief/scenario is necessary and evidence of good practice, it should not be the sole focus of this AC.

Overall, AC3.2 was addressed with clarity and most candidates demonstrated excellent skills to draw objective conclusions, whilst including supporting evidence. Evidence of good practice was observed in assessments where candidates analysed a range of information to draw objective conclusions based on reasoned evidence. Examples included criminal cases such as Stephen Lawrence, Derek Bentley, Amanda Knox and Sally Clark etc. These candidates engaged with the specification to draw conclusions based on safe verdicts, just sentencing and miscarriages of justice.

Centres should be reminded that this AC requires candidates to draw conclusions on the criminal justice system and as outlined by the specification, candidates are expected to include just sentencing to gain high marks. Some candidates omitted references to just sentencing and merely focused on verdicts.

Again, centres need to ensure that candidates include a range of criminal cases when drawing conclusions. It is important to draw objective conclusions from the assignment brief/scenario. However, centres should ensure that alternative sources are also embedded.

The assignment brief/scenario should not be the sole focus of the AC otherwise marks will be limited.

Finally, candidates still need to be mindful of the difference between AC3.1 and AC3.2. In some cases, AC3.2 was merely a repetition of AC3.1.

## CRIMINOLOGY

### Level 3 Diploma

Summer 2018

#### UNIT 4 CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

##### Question 1

- (a) Given that this was worth 3 marks a brief summary of the role of the prison service is all that was needed. Most candidates were able to provide this with reference to keeping those sentenced to prison in custody, providing protection for prisoners and society and rehabilitation to allow prisoners to live law abiding lives whilst in prison and also upon release. Weaker answers lacked detail and just made brief general comments about providing protection.
- (b) The legal aspects of this question showed the diverse subject nature of this qualification. The answer focused on judge made law but some candidates wrote about parliamentary law making and hence failed to gain any marks. Strong scripts briefly outlined both judicial precedent and statutory interpretation. Whilst many answers were able to describe the common law system with reference to original precedent and the hierarchical system many failed to include the judge made law through the interpretation of ambiguous words and phrases in statutes. The omission of this second type of judicial law making restricted full marks being achieved.
- (c) The required answer to this question was expected to include a range of sentences which could be argued to provide public protection. However a large number of candidates only focused on custodial sentences and failed to include any other form of punishment. Whilst serving a term of imprisonment arguably provides a significant amount of public protection many other sentences could have been included and hence provide further credit. Examples of other sentences could include community orders especially those with a significant amount of supervision, electronic tagging and disqualification from driving. Reference to some of the voluntary castration programmes currently taking place in prisons would have also been credited.
- (d) The vast majority of candidates scored well with this question. That is apart from those who misread the question and wrote about the effectiveness of the prison service rather than the police service. To reach the top mark band a balanced argument, with strengths and weaknesses was expected. Examples of incidents which touched upon the effectiveness of the police service appeared in the better scripts. Such examples may have been included in other units and therefore became an important synoptic element of the paper. Such examples may have included negative aspects such as the Stephen Lawrence case, the Hillsborough disaster and

also the positive response by the police to terrorism cases. Some Centres had prepared their students to answer a question of this nature by providing a research methods answer. In other words by providing methods of assessing the performance of the police. For instance commenting on how statistics, including the number of successfully served crimes could be employed to consider effectiveness. However without stating the statistics there is no evaluation provided. Alternatively whilst the media reporting on the work of the police may be an appropriate way of considering their effectiveness, if examples of the media's reporting are not included again the lack of evaluation will restrict the marks awarded.

- (e) Effective revision, by candidates, was apparent in the answers to this question. Those who had researched and revised this area were able to provide many current limitations of the prison service in achieving social control. Better examples explained the impact of the limitations and consequently received higher marks. Examples included budget cuts resulting in a lack of prison officers, resources and educational provision. The use and availability of drugs such as 'spice' which negatively impacts on social control was also apparent in many answers. Credit was also given to recent examples such as riots in prison including those in HMP Birmingham. Hence Centres should ensure candidates have an awareness of current affairs in the criminal justice system.

## Question 2

- (a) This was a further synoptic question outlining the role of a jury in a crown court trial. Most candidates were able to achieve at least 2 out of the 3 marks by referencing the need to reach a verdict of guilty or not guilty after listening to all the evidence. The scripts which included any further aspect of the role of a jury were able to achieve full marks. This information may have related to unanimous or majority verdicts or comments about the role of lay people in a criminal case.
- (b) This proved to be a challenging question which meant that some answers failed to provide the required information. Knowledge of campaigns for change was key to the answer. However rather than the facts of the campaign, methods used or even the outcomes, what was required were limitations of agencies as highlighted by the various campaigns. Hence the stronger candidates were able to explain the issues encountered by the campaigns. This may have included the lack of availability of details about the whereabouts of child sex offenders, as highlighted by Sarah's law campaign. Alternatively the lack of road side drug testing by police as highlighted by Lillian's law campaign. Once this connection was made answers could reach the top mark band. Weaker candidates, who could not make this link, were only able to describe some general limitations' of agencies and failed to show how they were highlighted by campaigns. In addition some scripts focused on the limitations raised in the 'Free the Newcastle one' campaign. This would allow some credit to be achieved but further details were needed for the top mark band.

- (c) The expected model of justice given to this question was the crime control model. This was provided by many candidates and those answers achieved high marks where they also applied aspects of the model to Colin's case. The stronger scripts also included appropriate terminology such as 'assembly line' repression of a defendant's rights' and 'zero tolerance'. Also some candidates were able to make a connection between the model of justice and the right realist theory of criminality. Application to Colin's case was important and some of the facts in the question were expected to be outlined to show the connection. Unexpectedly a number of candidates stated that the due process model of justice was the most relevant to Colin's case. Whilst this provided the opportunity to describe the model of justice and therefore gain credit, it was much more difficult to apply it to Colin's case. Some answers tried to get round this by saying it was a model that should now be applied to Colin's situation. One aspect of the answer which was omitted from many scripts was case examples of the model of justice selected. However it did appear that some candidates were a little confused between the Colin Chesterton in the text of the question and Colin Stagg, a case linked to unit 3.
- (d) There were mixed responses to this question. Some were of poor quality and could only manage a brief discussion of both terms but with the use of similar information. For example a prison sentence was often included as an example of an aim of punishment for both retribution and rehabilitation. Better answers discussed in detail various aspects of both aims of punishments. Any relevant aspect would be worthy of credit. This may include an explanation of the aim itself with relevant terminology. For example as regards retribution 'revenge', 'just desserts' or 'let the punishment fit the crime'. As regards rehabilitation terms such as 'reformation' or 'changing mind set' would be relevant. Appropriate punishments which may be linked to achieving the aims also appeared. Prison and even the death penalty for murder were often included whilst discussing retribution. Rehabilitation often produced comments about community punishments such as probation, educational programmes or drug and alcohol referrals.

### Question 3

- (a) Whilst only worth one mark this question was not successfully answered by all candidates. The vast majority were able to identify the agencies in the Ministry of Justice being funded by the government through taxation. However some candidates seemed a little confused and suggested charities or voluntary contributions from the public funded the agencies. A small number of scripts failed to contain any answer for this question.
- (b) Answers to this question showed that many candidates did not have a detailed knowledge of the role of the National Probation Service. The answer focused on the role as outlined in the specifications and hence information about aims and objectives, funding, philosophy and working practices would be relevant. The vast majority of candidates were able to include the role to reform and rehabilitate prisoners. Many answers also included information about their role when prisoners are released from prison but did not seem to appreciate the role when probation is

given as a court disposal. The stronger candidates were able to discuss the role of the Offender Manager of high risk offenders and even discussed the fact that the organisation is part privatised with Community Rehabilitation Companies supervising the mid to low risk offenders.

- (c)** This question serves as a reminder to Centres that agencies can include charities as well as the typical agencies of the police, prisons and probation. If an agency is specified in the specifications then it is possible that it can form the subject of an exam question. Some candidates considered the effectiveness of campaigns rather than charities. However when charities were mentioned the most popular ones included The Prison Reform Trust and The Howard League for Penal Reform. However as well as identifying relevant charities their effectiveness in achieving social control had to be considered. Ideally both strengths and weaknesses were expected. Many of the weaknesses related to funding and the lack of government support. Or the fact that they cannot force the government to take on board their proposals. Strengths varied according to each agency but included the successful 'Books for Prisoner's' campaign by the Howard League for Penal Reform and the 'Care not Custody' programme ran by the Prison Reform Trust.
- (d)** This question went to the core of the workings of the criminal justice system and the connection between three important agencies. Weaker answers merely discussed the role of each agency independently and made no mention of the relationship between them. In such answers once one agency was considered it was never referred to again and therefore failed to show its relationship with other agencies. However the better answer covered aspects of how the agencies came together. For instance the police and Crown Prosecution Service work together over the charging of suspects. Reference to CPS Direct which is used by the police to gain advice about the evidence required in order to charge was often included. Alternatively reference to the police attending court to give evidence or make applications for arrest and search warrants appeared within the body of the answers.
- (e)** There were many pleasing answers to this last question. Whilst the question did not mention any form of internal and external social control candidates were able to work out that they were the focus of an answer. As a result of this many candidates were able to score highly by explaining both internal and external forms of control. This question also produced the use of some specialist terminology such as rational ideology, internalisation of social rules, coercion and fear of punishments. The better candidate also included theories of control such as that of Walter C Reckless and Travis Hirschi. It appeared from answers that Centres had prepared candidates well for this type of question.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)