



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**LEVEL 3 CERTIFICATE AND DIPLOMA IN
CRIMINOLOGY**

JANUARY 2022

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.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

January 2022

UNIT 1: CHANGING AWARENESS OF CRIME

General Comments

Although the number of entrants for this January series was relatively small, it was very pleasing to see that the high standards seen in past series have been maintained. We would like to acknowledge the considerable effort made by the centres to prepare their candidates for this series.

From the majority of centres, the sample assessments displayed a high level of understanding and engagement with the specification. It was encouraging to see that most candidates had been well prepared. Evidence of good practice was observed in the work of centres who had thoroughly engaged with the assessment criteria by exploring both the content and amplification sections of the specification.

Centres should be mindful of the WJEC resources available on the secure website, particularly the new handbook: 'Controlled Assessment: A complete guide for teachers' and the annotated mark scheme for Unit 3. These are invaluable resources and will provide some very useful guidance and advice for centres. The comments included in this report are not applicable to all centres and certainly do not detract from the overall high standard of work seen in this series. However, it is imperative that these issues, where they apply, are identified and addressed.

Overall, centres uploaded work that was accurately marked with clear annotation and justification throughout. Unfortunately, some centres still upload work with no annotations at all. Annotating student work is a requirement of the assessment process and centres should make use of the guidance on annotating and completing mark record sheets available on the secure website. Most centres' mark record sheets were completed as required. However, in some cases, centres merely noted the mark for each AC without providing any justification or comment on the mark record sheet. Centres who do not complete paperwork appropriately do not meet the requirements of the moderation process and may jeopardise the timely awarding of grades to their candidates. The majority of work also included, as required, a copy of the relevant Learner Assignment Brief(s) and one copy of the Quality Assurance Form. Centres must use this form to detail the internal standardisation process at the centre and to explain any use of more than one brief across the cohort. Centres may also wish to add any further pertinent information relating to the assessment process at the centre for the benefit of the moderator.

Centres are also reminded of the importance of taking great care when completing mark record sheets and when entering marks electronically to avoid unnecessary clerical errors. Far too many cases of entering incorrect marks, or the mathematically incorrect addition of overall marks, were seen this series.

The majority of authentication sheets were signed by both the assessor and candidate. Centres are reminded that this is a requirement. Moderation cannot proceed without both these signatures for each piece of work in the sample.

When completing the mark record sheet, centres often did not include the total mark for candidates on the front sheet. Similarly, centres should be aware that a mark should be recorded for each AC, even if this is a mark of zero.

Some centres included evidence of internal verification/standardisation. Where centres have more than one assessor, internal verification/standardisation should be completed to ensure consistency and adherence to standardised procedures across all assessors. Where there is only one assessor conducting the marking within a centre this process becomes more challenging, but we still encourage, where necessary, the involvement of a line manager or senior colleague in overseeing the marking of a sample of the work to maintain consistency.

This series also highlighted a few issues relating to plagiarism within candidate work. Centres should be mindful of the resources that they use during lessons as these resources can be used during the assessment. Candidates should always be encouraged to conduct individual research and to produce their own notes written in their own words where possible. If lesson resources are consistently identical to the textbook, candidates must understand that they cannot reproduce these resources directly in the assessment. Plagiarism, when discovered, is taken extremely seriously. Centres may wish to make their candidates aware of the following JCQ [student guidance on plagiarism](#) in non-exam assessments and should read the further JCQ [guidance for teachers/assessors](#).

Comments on individual assessment criteria

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

The Assessment Criteria (ACs) covered under this Learning Outcome were generally addressed with depth and clarity. However, candidates should be reminded of the marks available for each of these ACs and should plan their time accordingly.

Task 1, which now includes AC1.1 and AC1.2, requires candidates to use the brief and analyse two crimes evident within it before explaining reasons why those crimes (analysed in AC1.1) go unreported. Some candidates tackled this well while others simply described the crimes and failed to analyse them, often omitting whether it is evidence of deviant or criminal behaviour. This element (alongside all others listed in the amplification section of the specification) must be included to gain full marks. Likewise, when explaining the reasons why those crimes may go unreported, some candidates did not link these ACs and wrote about other crimes, thus ignoring the instruction. Answers should also cover both personal and social and cultural reasons within the response. Personal reasons seemed to be covered far more effectively than social and cultural ones.

Task 2 responses, which cover AC1.3, were of mixed quality. While most completed this well, there are still centres who do not follow the consequences listed in the specification. Centres are reminded that it is these listed consequences that should be discussed for credit. Examples of each are to be encouraged in order to score highly.

Task 3, which covers AC1.4 and AC1.5, is where issues of plagiarism are becoming increasingly evident. Centres must discourage candidates from over-reliance on the textbook. Many are regurgitating the content of these textbook pages and cannot be given credit for it. Centres must ensure that candidates do not take this approach. Also, when discussing impact for AC1.5, centres are reminded to follow the impacts highlighted in the spec.

LO2: Understand how campaigns are used to elicit change

This Learning Objective seems to be the most challenging for candidates; however, it was pleasing to be able to note an improvement in the work seen during this series. AC2.1 requires candidates to compare campaigns for change. In order to reach the highest mark band, they must make that explicit link to their own campaign as part of this comparison. Without this explicit link, they cannot reach the highest mark band. As outlined in the specification, the content should focus on comparisons between campaigns linked to changes in policy, law and attitude etc., but centres should be aware that there is no requirement to cover each one listed.

Some centres were very well prepared for this AC and the work seen demonstrated a high-level understanding from candidates. The best examples were those where candidates selected four/five (including their own) 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 of the specification, campaigns could include, for example, classification of drugs, euthanasia, abortion and smoking. Weaker responses did not show an ability to compare, instead, simply describing the campaigns. Teaching candidates how to compare using appropriate terminology is hugely beneficially when delivering AC2.1. Where candidates gave a detailed comparison, but did not explicitly link to their own campaign, they failed to reach Mark Band 3. In order to overcome this issue, where/if possible, centres can have candidates complete Task 6 before Task 5.

AC2.2 was largely approached with accuracy by candidates. Evidence of good practice was observed in samples where candidates evaluated four media methods with clear links to existing campaigns, offering supportive evidence and well-reasoned judgements. There are still some candidates who are missing out on achieving full marks by not including a measurement of success with regards to the campaign example that they have chosen to support their judgements. This AC is worth 15 marks, therefore the amount written should reflect that. Centres are also reminded that there is no requirement for AC2.2 to link with AC2.1.

LO3: Plan campaigns for change relating to crime

This Learning Outcome largely offered the most thorough and well-thought-out responses from candidates with clear evidence of effective preparation by most centres. Overall, the quality of the campaigns planned, designed and justified in this section were impressive. The most significant issue is the relevance of the chosen campaign for change. In some instances, candidates were creating campaigns which were not appropriate for changing behaviour or raising awareness. As part of the task, candidates are asked to create a campaign for change related to one of the crimes in the brief. It is vital that candidates do so as marks will be significantly limited if this is not the case. Campaigns chosen do not necessarily have to follow the exact same content as the crimes in the brief, but they must fall into one of the clear categories marked in red on the brief. It was pleasing to see that some centres did recognise this issue of not linking adequately to the brief and that they adjusted the marks accordingly. Centres should refer to the new handbook: 'Controlled Assessment: A complete guide for teachers', available on the secure website, for further guidance on this issue.

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. The best examples addressed all points listed in the specification.

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. A clear time sequence must be evident in order to gain marks beyond Mark Band 1.

In most instances, the campaign materials designed as part of AC3.2 enabled candidates to achieve high marks. Evidence of excellent practice was observed by candidates who had designed several materials and demonstrated creative ability with the use of persuasive language and powerful imagery to stimulate interest relevant 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 one form of material e.g. one poster, which was often limited in terms of accuracy and relevance to the chosen campaign for change. Centres are reminded that for marks in the highest band, the expectation is that candidates produce a range of campaign materials: i.e. a minimum of three different types. Three different examples of social media material would be classed as one type only – social media. Centres should make sure that candidates are absolutely clear on the range required prior to the controlled assessment. Centres can use any software they feel appropriate for their candidates to produce these materials, however, please be mindful of online applications that can be accessed outside controlled assessment sessions. This must be very carefully managed to ensure that the high levels of control required remain in place throughout. If candidates are starting and finishing LO3 in one session, this is more easily managed.

AC3.3 requires full justification for the need for the chosen campaign. The majority of candidates did well here, achieving very high marks. Stronger responses were able to justify the materials created in AC3.2 via the use of statistics and reference to real life cases. At times, justification was also seen in AC3.1: this can and should be credited. Weaker responses simply justified their materials in a superficial way and lacked evidence to support the need for their campaign via statistics and relevant cases.

Summary of key points

- **Task 1** – Crimes that are analysed must be evident in the brief. Once analysed, candidates must explain the reasons why these two crimes go unreported, covering both personal and social/cultural reasons.
- **Task 5(b)** – Candidates must fully evaluate four types of media. They should include an example of a campaign that used that media type, and explain whether it was successful or unsuccessful – by including a measure of some sort. For example, the *Help for Heroes* campaign successfully used merchandise as part of their campaign. Candidates could point to a financial measure of that success via the money raised through sales.
- **Task 6** – The campaign focus chosen must be related to one of the crimes evident in the brief (but not necessarily in the exact same context).

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

January 2022

UNIT 2: CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORIES

General Comments

Most candidates seemed well prepared for this externally assessed unit, consequently, there were some excellent, clear, and detailed answers that showed a good knowledge of the specification. However, there were many answers that showed an unequal knowledge of the material for the unit, and some answers were less detailed than others. It should be remembered that, over time, question papers will cover the whole of the specification content.

Overall, candidates were able to interact well with the source material and used it effectively when answering the questions. This was an improvement on previous years. Higher-achieving candidates were able to support their answers with relevant information, such as examples, to explain the points made. This was particularly evident in the high-tariff questions. Lower-achieving candidates tended to provide brief answers without extended material to develop points made. This obviously reduced the range of marks that could be awarded.

It was always pleasing to see the use of specialist terminology in an answer, and this allowed increased marks to be awarded. Centres are reminded that specialist vocabulary and its use is a feature of the mark bands.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

- a. Clear references to actions from the source material were required for this question. There were several potential areas for discussion relevant to both criminal and deviant actions. Candidates often spent too long explaining these terms and omitted important actions from the answer. Candidates frequently failed to refer to Albert and his potential criminal act of murder. Alternatively, answers grouped Albert and Barbara together when considering any action, and this had the impact of suggesting he committed theft, when this was purely down to Barbara. Finally, errors by lower-achieving candidates included only considering one type of action, as in only deviant or only criminal behaviour. Where this happened, it was considered that the question was only partially addressed and therefore marks were restricted.
- b. (i) Candidates were familiar with this style of question and the vast majority were able to describe a sociological theory. It is pleasing to note that the number of incorrect theories produced was reduced even further from previous exam series. Candidates who described either a biological or individualistic theory were in a small minority. Some of the most popular sociological theories included Merton's Strain theory, Marxism, and Interactionism. The quality of the answers usually depended on three things: (i) use of detail; (ii) use of specialist vocabulary; and (iii) linking the theory to criminality.

While all three are required to access the top mark band, it is noted that the third aspect, emphasising the link between the theory and criminality, could be improved in many answers. In other words, developing the reason, according to the theory, why crime is committed. Failure to include this important aspect of the answer would result in the mark being restricted. There was no requirement to consider Barbara in this question, but some answers sought to apply the theory to the scenario. Also, some scripts insisted on writing about more than one theory. Such techniques should be discouraged by Centres.

- (ii) This question provided the opportunity to analyse the theory described in the previous answer in relation to Barbara's situation. Some scripts also insisted on including Albert in the answer, despite this not being required. Answers to this style of question could be improved with reference to detail present in the scenario. For example, the reference to Barbara's inability to work, due to her caring for her mother, was often omitted. In addition, any specialist vocabulary included in the previous answer should also appear in this answer. A common error relating to Merton's Strain theory was a failure to indicate which type of 'strain' could be relevant to Barbara's situation or, for Marxism, the social class that Barbara may have identified with.
- c. This question produced some clear and detailed responses which contained high quality evaluative comments. However, one of the main errors with this style of question is to fail to notice that the word *theories* is plural. Hence, it is important to evaluate at least two theories. Where only one theory is evaluated, the mark awarded would be restricted, no matter how detailed and complex the evaluation provided. A further way to improve an answer to an evaluation of theories question is to avoid providing a summary of a theory at the start of the answer. This takes up time that should be spent on providing solid evaluation. It will also support the candidate to appreciate the higher order skill that is expected. Many weaker responses only included a description of theories or included a statement that they are effective because they explain why crime is committed. There was no evaluation of the theory in explaining the causes of criminality. Finally, as stated in previous examination series, to reach the top mark band both strengths and weaknesses of the theories are expected.

Question 2

- a. Candidates responded well to this question and provided many answers that were able to access full marks. Many candidates managed the demands of a 'briefly describe' question, which carried 4 marks. One of the most popular areas selected was the law relating to homosexuality. Strong answers briefly described changes over time and included a reference to the reason(s) for change. Weaker responses failed to address the 'why' in the question.
- b. This question provided an opportunity for definitions and specialist vocabulary. There were many good responses which showed how well Centres had prepared candidates for a question concerning this area. Strong approaches to the question included both a legal and social definition of the term criminal behaviour. In addition, many answers included comparisons with the word deviance to help explain the term. Stronger answers included reference to the Latin terminology *actus reus* (guilty act) and *mens rea* (guilty mind). A small number of responses were able to include a reference to strict liability and its link to criminal behaviour.

- c. This was, overall, a well-answered question and one which allowed candidates to include synoptic aspects relating to campaigns for change from Unit 1. Again, the nature of the question meant candidates needed to be aware of its requirements, this time emphasising examples of campaigns (note the plural – more than one was required to fully meet the demands of the question). The focus of the question was how campaigns had affected policy making. However, weaker candidates homed in on the story behind a campaign, reciting copious facts about how and why the campaign started. Often, such responses failed to state the final policy development that was introduced because of the campaign. Further, weak responses failed to name campaigns and provided a general area that has been subject to numerous campaigns over the years, for example the fight for LGBTQ+ rights, or campaigns relating to the cessation of smoking cigarettes. Relevant examples of specific campaigns included Sarah’s Law and Claire’s Law, but it was interesting to see examples of more recent campaigns such as Harper’s Law or Finn’s Law. Stronger responses stated the name of the law or policy introduced, as well as a brief description of the change it implemented.
- d. Despite the request in the question – to refer to the scenario – some candidates choose not to do so. An explanation relating to social changes concerning cigarette smoking or the use of cannabis was expected within the answer. When it was included, it was clear that candidates knew much more than the material provided in the source, for example material related to the banning of cigarette smoking in enclosed spaces or in vehicles in the presence of minors. However, “other examples” were required by the question, again noting the plural; as such, the scenario plus at least two other examples were expected. Scripts that provided the scenario example and one other social change could not access the top mark band as they only provided a partial response to the question. Examples of social changes varied, with changes in homosexuality, women’s rights, wearing of seat belts and attitudes to drink driving being considered. Higher-achieving candidates showed how society’s attitude had changed and how policy developed because of that. Weaker responses considered campaigns that affected policy development rather than social changes.

Question 3

- a. (i) This was a successfully answered question with candidates providing a description of either Lombroso or Sheldon’s physiological theory of criminality. The detail provided in the answer varied with some responses confusing the two theories. This question also allowed candidates to show their knowledge of specialist vocabulary, for which they were rewarded. Nevertheless, despite many candidates producing successful answers, the link to criminality could be developed a little further. It should also be noted that in a question that asks for a description of a theory no analysis of the scenario is expected. Nor is any evaluation of the theory expected. Where such skills are required by the examination, they will be in questions where the requirement is explicit in the command term.
- (ii) While analysis of either Profile 1 or 2 was expected, the vast majority selected Profile 1. Weaker responses insisted on providing analysis to both profiles. Such an answer would only receive credit for analysis of one profile. Overall, responses were good, but the detail provided could be improved. For instance, Profile 1’s hobbies were not always considered, or if they did appear, were not always related to the physiological theory. This also applied to the previous convictions, of assault and actual bodily harm. Not all scripts

were able to spot that they were violent convictions, and this too could relate to the theory.

(iii) In this question, candidates successfully considered the weaknesses relating to the same theory described in the previous question. Most answers also adhered to the request to describe two weaknesses. While acknowledging this was a “briefly describe” question, answers were still expected to provide a brief description of the weakness. For instance, if a weakness – such as the theory being deterministic – is provided, a development is expected, perhaps “the theory ignores free will and does not allow for a person to decide to follow a non-criminal pathway in life.”

b. This was a challenging question as it included the higher order skill of assessment. Weaker responses contained description only. Often, the description concerned biological theories and failed to mention any specific policy development. Stronger answers focused on specific policies and offered evidence to support a judgement as to whether they worked in producing crime control. Policies included the death penalty, eugenics, and several types of neurochemicals.

Summary of key points

- Candidates must read the question carefully and note the number of examples requested. Look out for plurals and ensure that the minimum number is provided. Failure to do so indicates that the question is not fully understood or answered, and this is likely to result in the mark awarded being restricted.
- Candidates should use specialist vocabulary where possible. Indications of these terms are included in the mark scheme.
- Where the description of a criminological theory is required, it is important to link the description of that theory to criminality.
- Detailed support of an answer helps to increase a mark, this is especially important with the high-tariff questions.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

January 2022

UNIT 3: CRIME SCENE TO COURTROOM

General Comments

Despite challenging circumstances in recent years, the submitted work was completed to a high standard and it appears that centres are engaging well with the changes made to the Unit 3 controlled assessment tasks. It should be noted that the volume of work in the January series was small and is not reflective of the volume of work that will be submitted during the Summer series. Nonetheless, the hard work evident on the part of candidates and centres is appreciated. It was clear from the samples submitted that centres have prepared candidates well for the new controlled assessment tasks, particularly as the assignment brief now remains unseen.

Centres should be mindful of the WJEC resources available on the secure website, particularly the new handbook: 'Controlled Assessment: A complete guide for teachers' and the annotated mark scheme for Unit 3. These are invaluable resources and will provide some very useful guidance and advice for centres. The comments included in this report are not applicable to all centres and certainly do not detract from the overall high standard of work seen in this series. However, it is imperative that these issues, where they apply, are identified and addressed.

Overall, centres uploaded work that was accurately marked with clear annotation and justification throughout. Most centres' mark record sheets were completed as required. The majority of work also included a copy of the relevant Learner Assignment Brief(s) and one copy of the Quality Assurance Form. Centres must use this form to detail the internal standardisation process at the centre and to explain any use of more than one brief across the cohort. Centres may also wish to add any further pertinent information relating to the assessment process at the centre for the benefit of the moderator.

The majority of authentication sheets were signed by both assessor and candidate. Centres are reminded that this is a requirement. Moderation cannot proceed without both these signatures for each piece of work in the sample. When completing the mark record sheet, centres often did not include the total mark for candidates on the front sheet. Similarly, centres should be aware that a mark should be recorded for each AC, even if this is a mark of zero.

The samples moderated showed that candidates were able to apply their knowledge and understanding well to the new assignment briefs. The best examples were able to apply their understanding of AC3.1 and AC3.2 very well to the assignment brief, as required for the highest mark band. When this was done well, the application to the brief was adequately detailed and relevant.

Excellent practice was demonstrated when clear assessor annotation and justification of the marks awarded were recorded throughout the body of work and within the mark record sheets. Centres should continue to highlight relevant parts of the work if it is worthy of credit elsewhere in the mark scheme. Most candidates structured their work clearly and coherently, completing their assessment in a report format that followed the structure of the tasks. The

best examples used headings and subheadings that clearly identified the tasks and assessment criteria. This is particularly useful for the moderator and is appreciated.

Comments on individual assessment criteria

LO1: Understand the process of criminal investigations

AC 1.1 was marked accurately and consistently for the most part and centres are clearly engaging with the specification, particularly when discussing limitations linked to cost, availability and expertise. A key point to note is that this AC requires an evaluation of each role in terms of its impact on the investigation.

AC 1.2 showed evidence of consistent marking and candidates' work was largely of a high standard. The best examples were seen when candidates applied the assessment points to types and situations of crime, as per the amplification section in the specification. Centres should be mindful that for the highest mark band (16–20 marks) the required range of investigative techniques is necessary. Centres should be mindful that “profiling techniques” will be regarded as one technique, even if, for example, candidates address both geographical and typological elements. This is also applicable to interview techniques as there are a number of examples that candidates may choose to discuss. The bullet pointed list of techniques in the specification are regarded as separate techniques, therefore assessors must ensure that candidates are addressing the required range to be given a mark in the highest band. The quality of the assessment also takes priority here and candidates should avoid being overly descriptive of the techniques.

AC 1.3 should focus on how evidence is processed; centres and candidates should avoid confusing this with AC2.3 which covers the rules of evidence in a courtroom. At times, this AC was marked generously. Candidates are expected to cover the processes outlined in the specification for both physical and testimonial evidence. At times, answers lacked reference to the collection, storage or transfer of evidence. This can be rectified through a general discussion at the outset of how evidence is collected, stored, analysed and so forth; this may then be followed by specific examples to support points. Often, the discussion of testimonial evidence also missed some of these crucial components. The best examples successfully used case studies to support points.

AC1.4 requires the discussion of all three individuals (suspects, witnesses and victims) from investigation through to appeal. At times, centres marked this AC generously when candidates had made the common error of not discussing appeals or primarily focusing on suspects, lacking detail for the other two. Considerably more detail is expected and seen for suspects, but discussions of victims and witnesses (with at least one of these through to appeal) **must** be present and detailed to qualify for full marks.

LO2: Understand the process for prosecution of suspects

One thing to note for **AC2.1** is the necessity to include reference to the Prosecution of Offences Act 1985 and the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Both are clearly listed in the specification and are required in the answer.

Most candidates demonstrated a cogent understanding of the tests used by the CPS when prosecuting suspects. In the best examples, cases were used in support.

AC 2.2 and **AC 2.3** are well understood by candidates and consistently marked by assessors. It is important to note that for AC2.2 all stages covered in the specification should be included for full marks. However, assessors should be mindful that if appeals are covered as part of AC1.4, then this should be acknowledged and highlighted with annotations.

AC 2.4 demonstrated good understanding from candidates on how key influences affect the outcome of criminal cases. For the highest mark band, centres should note that the required range of key influences is necessary. Centres should also be aware that juries are not listed on the specification as an influence and, therefore, cannot be credited. The best examples used cases well to illustrate the impact.

AC 2.5 shows evidence of clear and consistent marking across centres. Both magistrates and juries were covered well with a focus on strengths and weaknesses. The best examples referred to case examples or statistical evidence to support points.

LO3: Be able to review criminal cases

Candidates are showing better understanding of both AC 3.1 and AC 3.2, and they are increasingly using key terminology to examine and evaluate. At the lower end, some candidates are still merely explaining cases as opposed to critically analysing them for validity or drawing conclusions.

For **AC3.1**, candidates, should aim to examine a range of information sources, including the assignment brief. Candidates often focus on validity but do not address the other criteria outlined in the specification: bias, opinion, currency etc. This emphasis on range and the other criteria should be encouraged by centres. Some candidates continue to describe cases and do not include a detailed examination.

For **AC3.2**, centres are reminded to encourage candidates to address all points in the specification if they are to be awarded the highest marks. Discussion of the assignment brief is also required for the highest mark band, as noted by the task set.

Summary of key points

- Centres are reminded that all candidate notes (files/folders) must be stored securely between controlled assessment sessions.
- Candidates cannot augment their notes once the controlled assessment has begun.
- Samples for moderation must be sent via the deadlines published by WJEC/Eduqas.
- All samples must meet the requirements outlined by the specification and must include a copy of the Learner Assignment Brief(s) used, a completed Quality Assurance Form and fully completed and signed authentication sheets for each piece of work in the sample.
- Assessor annotations must be clear, with justification for the marks awarded supplied clearly in the body of work and via the mark record sheet.
- Centres must be prepared to supply further samples of work at once should WJEC/Eduqas request them.
- Centres should refer to the specification and ensure the content covered is relevant to the assessment criteria each time.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

January 2022

UNIT 4: CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

General Comments

Many candidates were well prepared for this Diploma examination unit and as a result they received high scores. Examples to support points made were indicative of good responses. This could include case examples, criminological theories, legislation, or areas of law concerning the subject matter in the question. Centres should be pleased that they had prepared their candidates well for the demands of the examination. One area that could be improved is an increased awareness of the marks available for a question and the related length of an answer. For instance, candidates should be aware of the difference between a 4-mark *briefly describe* question and a 6-mark *describe* question: the latter would contain more information than the lower-tariff question. While this is a challenging task, it does form part of the examination skillset and should be considered during the teaching of the specification.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

- a. Most candidates selected the appropriate model of justice – due process – and were able to provide additional detail about it. However, the quality of the answers varied considerably. At their best, responses described the model in detail, and included information such as a criminological theory that encompassed due process and examples of a legal case, or piece of legislation that showed the model in action. At the opposite end, weak responses produced little more than the information in the scenario, merely repeating, in a different order, the detail already provided. This was a 6-mark question and hence more than a brief description was expected. A small number of candidates provided an incorrect model of justice, but by using the supplied information were able to obtain some credit. At times, this was an answer that would have benefitted from further detail: often, candidates wrote the equivalent of a 4-mark ‘briefly describe’ answer rather than that which would be expected from a 6-mark question. Marks were awarded accordingly.
- b. This was a well-received question which produced some detailed responses and for which many candidates achieved full marks. Responses displayed good specialist terminology such as internalisation of social norms, rational ideology, and conscience. A few candidates were confused over the terms *internal social control* and *external social control*, and such responses failed to receive any credit.
- c. Responses to this question, about the weaknesses of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), fell into one of two categories: they either contained well-established reported weaknesses, or alternatively, generalised responses with comments that could be said about many agencies in the criminal justice system. The detailed answers cited examples of failed prosecutions, to provide the required detail. For example, cases such as Damilola Taylor, one or more of a number of failed rape prosecutions, and the case of Caroline Flack. Better responses would also explain the issues with these examples and why they are perceived as a weakness for the CPS.

Weaker responses contained general comments about funding not being available, or the CPS not always successfully applying the Full Codes Test. Such comments can be valid but need to be enhanced with further explanation. Quite often, candidates insisted on an introduction to the question to explain the role of the CPS. While this doesn't reduce the marks available, it wastes time that would be more fruitfully spent answering the set question and developing the examination of the weaknesses of the CPS in achieving social control as required.

- d. This question required knowledge of the organisation of the criminal justice system and relationships between the key agencies. Many responses discussed the process of a case as it proceeds through the legal system. Such answers were credit worthy but could be enhanced by detail of the connection between the parties/agencies. This could include the relationship between the CPS and the police, with some detail provided regarding the charging position and the use of CPS Direct. There were some inaccuracies surrounding the CPS, with some responses incorrectly stating that the agency gives the punishment to the defendant if a guilty plea is indicated.

Question 2

- a. Many candidates were well prepared for this type of question and used specialist terminology such as coercion, fear of punishment and deterrence. The better-prepared candidate was able to use such vocabulary to provide an explanation of how the police are perceived as an external form of social control. Clear and detailed knowledge included an understanding of the police powers contained in the Police and Criminal Justice Act 1984 (PACE). Weaker responses did little more than suggest that a police presence on the streets stopped the public from committing crime. Whilst this is a valid point and would receive some credit further development would be expected.
- b. Overall, this was a well-answered question with candidates providing a brief description of both statutory interpretation and judicial precedent. Both types were expected, and if only one was provided it was impossible to achieve full marks. At times, some responses were too detailed for a 4-mark question (not an issue in itself, but on many of those scripts there appeared to have been a scramble to complete later questions). Having the ability to produce both a 4-mark and a 6-mark answer on the same topic is a skill that could be developed by candidates.
 - (i) This question required the aims (note the plural) of the suspended sentence to be considered. As such, answers that considered one aim only were deemed to have partially addressed the demands of the question. It is always important to be aware of the need to consider at least two examples if called upon to do. Overall, most answers considered several aims, and the better responses linked those aims to the conditions of a suspended sentence. Deterrence was usually considered along with retribution and rehabilitation, but weaker responses failed to show the link with the punishment and contained information about aims generally.
 - (ii) This higher-order skills question of evaluation elicited some particularly good responses. Many were well structured, considering the positives and negatives of both agencies. Candidates managed their time well with such a demanding question and considered some relevant points. Weaker responses contained creditable, even if general, comments.

This was another question where candidates were rewarded for providing evidence in support of their arguments, such as case examples or recent problems with the named agencies, for example, the impact of the Sarah Everard case appeared during discussion about the police.

The issues surrounding part privatisation of the probation services also appeared. The best answers provided statistics in support of the evaluation and were very impressive. Weaker answers explained the role of the agencies and suggested that, because of their role they must be effective.

Question 3

- a. (i) As an *identify* question, a straightforward simple response was all that was expected. Hence stand-alone words such as *government* or *tax* were credited. Few answers failed to gain the one mark available, and that was because the incorrectly asserted that funding was drawn from charities.
- (ii) This was another straightforward question with the two aims being all that was required. No explanation or definition of the aim was required. Any recognised aim would be relevant with retribution, rehabilitation and public protection being popular.
- b. This question allowed for a flexible approach: either a named charity could be considered, or the role of charities in general could be provided if they were related to penal reform. There was evidence of specialised knowledge of charities, including, the Howard League for Penal Reform and the Prison Reform Trust, and their personalised aims. In addition, more general aims such as supporting those released from prison to help reform their lives or provide support on employment, education and housing were also appropriate.
- c. Many candidates seemed very capable of answering this question. Most responses were detailed and included a range of environmental tactics and measures used to achieve social control. Examples included crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED), gated lanes, CCTV, and the panopticon prison design. The higher-achieving candidates supported their answers with examples of the tactics in operation, such as the Birmingham Bull Ring Market or areas throughout the country using gated lanes. This type of supporting information helped reach the top mark band.
- d. This final question was mostly successfully answered, with candidates being able to make a judgement concerning the two punishments and the aims they could achieve. While the quality of the answers varied, the majority considered both prison sentences and community orders against a range of aims. Judgements about whether the aims were achieved varied in their detail, but candidates tried to explain their reasoning. Stronger responses were able to fully justify comments with statistics, for example those on re-offending rates or the length of life sentences for a murder conviction.

Summary of key points

- To reach the higher mark bands it is important to develop key points. This may include further information, cases, data, or examples of the area under consideration.
- Candidates should respond with an appropriate length of an answer, according to the marks available for the question. This includes being aware of the difference between a *briefly describe* question and a *describe* question.
- The use of specialist terminology and the use of examples always helps to increase the credit awarded to an answer.



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