



---

# **EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**LEVEL 3 CERTIFICATE AND DIPLOMA IN  
CRIMINOLOGY**

**SUMMER 2019**

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:  
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=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	6
Unit 3 Crime Scene to Courtroom	10
Unit 4 Crime and Punishment	14

# **WJEC LEVEL 3 APPLIED CRIMINOLOGY**

## **Level 3 Certificate**

**Summer 2019**

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

#### **General Comments**

Once again this year, particularly as so many centres were completing these units for the first time, it was very pleasing to see such high quality work produced and presented for moderation.

We would wish to take this opportunity to remind centres of the new requirements for Unit 1 from September 2019 onwards. Please ensure that all candidates completing Unit 1 for awarding in 2020 must use the new briefs and tasks for Unit 1 published on the WJEC secure website. Full guidance on the administration of the controlled assessment tasks is available within the brief documents and within our fully updated FAQ document available on both WJEC and Eduqas Criminology homepages.

The comments made in this report refer to the old style of brief and task, should not be taken as applying equally to all centres, and 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, for the most part, were well-prepared for the controlled assessment. Evidence of good practice was observed in samples from centres who had thoroughly engaged with the assessment criteria by exploring both the content and amplification sections of the specification. For some centres, the level of engagement with the specification should be developed for future series.

#### **Comments on individual questions/sections**

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.

Most candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to draw on relevant sections of the assignment brief in order to enhance their application throughout. All centres should encourage the use of the assignment brief as and when relevant. The assignment brief is designed to assist and should not become the sole focus of the controlled assessment. In some instances, candidates relied solely on the assignment brief and missed opportunities to engage with both the assessment criteria and additional examples. This often limited marks and was largely the case when candidates were using the Brian Williams assignment brief. In such cases, candidates were only addressing crimes discussed in the Brian Williams brief, failing to engage fully with the specification.

In most cases, moderation samples were well-organised. On occasion, work was stapled together wrongly or attached together with unsecured paperclips. Treasury tags are highly recommended in order to avoid sample work becoming mixed-up. 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 that included annotations throughout the internal assessment. These need not be lengthy.

Some centres still submit work without any form of annotation. Where centre reports on moderation raise this as an issue, it would be greatly appreciated if it could be addressed in time for the submission of the 2020 sample. 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. In the most extreme cases, candidate work carried no annotation and the centre merely noted the mark for each AC without providing any justification or comment on the mark record sheet.

Most centres included evidence of internal standardisation where more than one assessor had worked on marking the sample. This is considered best practice. Where centres have more than one assessor, internal standardisation should be completed to ensure consistency and adherence to standardised procedures. This series, there were a few cases where assessment decisions across a cohort lacked any form of consistency due to a variety of assessment strategies being adopted by one centre. Where centres have registered as a consortium, one sample should be submitted across the consortium centres and where more than one assessor is involved in the marking process, internal standardisation across centres must be organised. Consistency is key.

All centres should be reminded of the significance of inserting candidate names and numbers on the required documentation. Likewise, please ensure that all documentation is signed by both the assessor and the candidate. Each candidate at a center, regardless of whether they are included in the sample or not, should have a signed cover sheet containing assessor and candidate signatures. Please be aware that, where inconsistencies in marking are found, WJEC/Eduqas may request a further sample of work at any time.

The presentation of the Unit 1 samples for moderation were impressive and visually appealing, especially with regard to the design of campaign materials. Most candidates set out the work in a report format addressing the required assessment criteria one at a time. Use of headings and sub-headings which followed the assessment criteria wording were particularly useful and did greatly assist the moderation process. In few cases the lack of sub-headings/division between ACs did mean that candidates missed opportunities to develop knowledge.

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. While it does help the moderation process if these materials are printed in colour, it is not a requirement. However, where centres are able to do so, for sample scripts only, this would allow the moderator to see the full effect of the campaign materials as they were intended to be seen.

Finally, it is of great importance that all centres follow the guidance for internal/controlled assessments. All Criminology controlled assessments are summative assessments and must be taken once all teaching for the particular unit has ended. It is not permissible to complete parts of the controlled assessment at intervals throughout the teaching of the unit. The internal assessment should be completed by candidates on an individual basis; 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.

During the 2019 series, a small but concerning number of issues relating to plagiarism were identified during moderation. Please note that candidates are not permitted to use the textbook during the assessment. Bearing this in mind, centres should be mindful of the resources that are used and shared during lessons. If teacher notes rely too heavily on the content of the textbook, students may re-produce this content in the assessment as their own work. If lesson resources or teacher notes are re-produced during the assessment, centres should not be rewarding candidates. The work produced in the controlled assessment environment and presented for assessment must be the candidate's original work. To this end, centres should use the textbook as a guideline only and candidates should be made fully aware of the consequences of copying teacher notes or textbooks verbatim. They should be encouraged at every possible opportunity to complete their own research and prepare their own notes on the assessment criteria.

### **Comments on individual questions/sections**

#### **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 specification. AC1.1 was largely done well, and it must be noted that there is a general improvement in the way centres are tackling this AC, with candidates offering an extremely detailed analysis of a wide range of crimes, supported by appropriate examples. However, candidates should be reminded to consider the marks available for each AC when considering time management. We are still seeing very detailed examples of AC1.1, AC1.2 and AC1.3 when these ACs are only worth 4 marks. Time management is key during the first part of the task.

Throughout this learning outcome, most candidates were able to apply their discussion to the assignment brief, where appropriate. However, centres should be reminded to follow the specification. 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.

Assessors should be reminded to credit a particular AC even if the candidate addresses it in another AC. This is particularly pertinent to ACs 1.4 and 1.5. At times, assessment decisions from a centre on AC1.4 were seen as severe by moderators as assessors were not crediting appropriate descriptions and discussion evident in AC 1.5. 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 and not explicit.

A small number of candidates fail 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 seems to be the most challenging for candidates; however it was pleasing to see an improvement with regards to the way that AC2.1 and AC2.2 were tackled by candidates. It is important for centres to note the difference between these two ACs and to note that they should not be connected. Centres that did try to connect them and attempt them as one were limiting the marks achieved. In some instances, centres focused on the brief only when tackling these two AC's and this limited candidates ability to show wider knowledge and understanding.

AC2.1 requires candidates to compare campaigns for change. In order to reach the higher mark band; they must make that explicit link to their own campaign also. Without this explicit link they cannot reach the top band. 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 showed a high level of 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. A range of campaigns in this AC also ensured comparisons covered campaigns which aim to change policy, law, funding and awareness etc.

AC2.2 was, for the most part, approached with accuracy by candidates. Evidence of good practice was observed in sample assessments where candidates evaluated a wide range of media methods and made clear links to existing campaigns, offering supportive evidence and well-reasoned judgements. Centres should be reminded that AC2.1 and AC2.2 are separate. AC 2.2 requires candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of media used in campaigns for change. Candidates should be looking at a range of media types, for example, television, leaflets or social media and should be evaluating their effectiveness within campaigns for change. These evaluations should be supported with reference to relevant campaign examples to show how successful/unsuccessful that particular media has been in that particular campaign.

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

This learning outcome produced the most thorough and well-thought out responses from candidates, showing clear evidence of effective preparation by most centres. Overall, the quality of the campaigns which were planned, designed and justified in this section was impressive. However, 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 to create a campaign for an 'unreported or hidden crime'. It was pleasing to see that many centres did recognise this and candidates were able to fully justify their choices as a result.

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 the following areas found in the specification:

- 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 a context for 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 limiting the marks the assessor was able to award. A clear time sequence must be evident to meet the demands of AC3.1.

In most instances, the campaign materials designed as part of AC3.2 enabled candidates to achieve high marks. Evidence of excellent practice was observed where candidates had designed a range of appropriate materials and were able to show their creative ability with the use of persuasive language and powerful imagery to stimulate interest. Some candidates 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 a single 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 of this nature, the expectation will be that candidates produce a range of campaign materials.

In 2019, most centres chose unreported crime relating to hate crime and domestic violence. AC3.3 required full justification for the need for the chosen campaigns. The majority of candidates did well here, achieving very high marks. Stronger candidates justified their materials in AC3.2 and included stats and real life cases in AC3.3 to help justify the need for their campaign.

## Summary of key points

- Centres should ensure that all teachers and candidates are fully aware of the changing guidance concerning the administration of the Unit 1 controlled assessment in 2019-20. Newly published briefs and tasks must be used, and the brief cannot be shared with students prior to controlled assessment
- Centres should despatch organised samples, including all required paperwork, to the moderator by 15<sup>th</sup> of May 2020
- Each piece of work in the sample must be accompanied by an authentication sheet, signed by the assessor and learner in each instance
- Centres should encourage students to manage their time effectively during the controlled assessment, devoting a proportionate amount of time to each AC
- Centres should ensure that candidates are producing original work in the controlled assessment environment and that they are not over-reliant on notes re-produced from the textbook. Candidates should not be rewarded for simply re-producing their class notes or extracts from the textbook.

# WJEC LEVEL 3 APPLIED CRIMINOLOGY

## Level 3 Certificate

Summer 2019

### UNIT 2: CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORIES

#### General Comments

Many of the candidates sitting this externally-assessed unit were well prepared and were able to achieve at a high level. However, it was noticeable that some candidates were unfamiliar with the content of some questions. Centres are reminded of the need to ensure that candidates are familiar with all aspects of the specification. This particularly includes the content section as this forms the basis of any question that appears on the examination paper. Higher-achieving candidates were able to use a range of specialist terminology, and used relevant and appropriate examples to support their responses. One very pleasing aspect of this examination paper during this series was the much less frequent occurrence of candidates selecting incorrect theories, when a question specifically asks, for example, for a biological, individualistic or sociological theory. Centres must ensure that candidates use the source material which appears in the stem of the question to provide guidance to the answer. At times this appeared to be ignored and hence relevant links were omitted.

#### Comments on individual questions/sections

1. (a) (i) It was pleasing to note that most candidates were able to correctly identify a sociological theory of criminality. However, there was a small minority who failed to appreciate the varying types of theories and described either a biological or an individualistic theory. Responses in this category would fail to achieve any credit. Those who did select a sociological theory had the ability to describe it in clear detail. There was a good indication of interaction with the source material as the most common theories were Marxism and strain theory. However, the labelling theory and left and right realism were also used. It was important in this section to relate the theory to criminality as opposed to just describing the workings of a theory. In other words how does the theory account for people committing crime?
- (ii) This question showed the importance of reading all the linked questions to ensure the previously selected theory could be analysed against the source material. Hence those who selected Marxism or strain theory usually provided good responses by making reference to Tony's unemployment and domestic abuse of Martha. However, few candidates achieved full marks because while Tony's theft offences were included, often the link to domestic abuse was omitted. At times, candidates seemed to struggle with the analysis of other theories and often had to provide hypothetical additions to the scenario to be in a position to address this question.

- (iii) This was a challenging question as it involved the higher order skill of evaluation. Centres should discourage candidates from starting the answer with a summary of the theory. It is more appropriate to start with immediate evaluation. To reach full marks an answer would be expected to include both strengths and weaknesses of the theory, albeit not in equal proportion. Weaker responses demonstrated very little evaluation, often containing the theory followed by weak evaluation, such as a reference to determinism without developing the significance or meaning. Such an approach obviously limited marks. Higher-achieving responses provided clear, accurate and relevant evaluation of the sociological theory, providing both strengths and weaknesses for top marks. Centres should be reminded that the evaluation relates not just to the theory in general but as to the value, or otherwise, in the theory accounting for criminality.
  - (b) On the whole, this was a well answered question. Fear and shame were the two most regularly identified reasons. Some development of the reasons was needed to gain full credit. The responses to this question was pleasing as it showed that Centres are ensuring candidates are aware of the synoptic aspect of the specification.
  - (c) This question requires candidates to use synoptic material from unit 1, and they produced a mixed response. Some were able to provide accurate and clear explanations of a range of consequences including the ripple effect, decriminalisation, police prioritisation and cultural change, which was often linked to the broken windows theory. However, many responses were generalised and lacked reference to specific concepts, citing things such as 'crime will continue and offenders will get away with it'. Such responses were not as highly rewarded as those that make specific reference to the unit 1 concepts. This question did give higher-achieving candidates the opportunity to include both key terminology and use of examples.
- 2.
- (a) While appearing to be straightforward this question was often not answered correctly. The everyday interpretation of formal and informal would have been acceptable. In order to be awarded both marks, it was expected that responses would indicate a reference to the official nature of a formal policy. Often a connection to policy being created by the Government appeared in an answer, whereas informal could relate to other institutions such as family and schools. While not essential, better responses included examples, such as laws made by parliament changing sentencing to grounding of a child by parents
  - (b) The majority of the candidature was able to correctly identify at least one crime control policy. Many used the prompt in the source material as support for this answer by referencing penal populism to help describe the crime control policies that Alan might propose. Measures included zero tolerance, use of CCTV and development of penal populism policy. Better scripts also made connections to the Right Realist approach to criminality. To access the upper band, candidates were expected to provide some elaboration, such as explaining what is meant by penal populism, and occasionally—responses referred to the James Bulger killing. The lower-scoring responses failed to make a connection to the idea of harsh punishments and described policies that were inappropriate for the situation. Centres must ensure that candidates use the source material in the stem of the question to guide the content required.

- (c) This question required candidates to apply knowledge from Unit 1 in order to explain the impact of media representations of crime on the public perception of it. A wide range of responses appeared with some containing highly generalised comments about the media, which were often restricted to mark band 1 and others with clear and detailed information addressing the content of the question. The highest-scoring responses were able to explain more than one way in which the media affects public perception. Such responses utilised concepts such as moral panic, deviance amplification, stereotyping, changing concerns and attitudes. Many responses were focused on moral panic and the impact it has on the public perception of crime. A number of scripts included evidence such as Stan Cohen's study and others made appropriate links to contemporary societal examples such as knife crime and the Manchester Arena bombing. At times candidates referred to moral panic but failed to fully develop their explanation and restricted their answer to this one concept. The weaker responses only considered how the media represents crime discussing aspects such as the glamorisation and exaggeration of it, but neglected to consider the impact on the public. Again this type of response would limit marks.
- (d) This was a challenging question for candidates and one that elicited a range of responses. There was no need to explore the individualistic theory such as Freud's personality theory which led to psychoanalysis. The highest-scoring responses referred to policies such as token economies and psychoanalysis and incorporated clear assessment and not just a description of the relevant policy. Judgements on the policy were needed to access the higher mark band. There were a significant minority of responses that failed to identify an appropriate policy, and their authors did not appreciate the nature of individualistic policies, often referring to those relating to sociological theories of criminality or omitted to provide any answer. Centres such remind candidates that any aspect of the specification may feature on an examination paper.
- (e) A well-answered question, and one for which candidates seemed prepared. However, some candidates failed to fully appreciate that the question asked for laws changing overtime and wrote about changes due to place and culture. While there is some overlap, attention is drawn to the need to focus on the wording of the question. A significant number of responses were focused on campaigns for change and this restricted the marks awarded. Candidates were expected to tell the story of the steps towards the change in the law. The topics of smoking, women's rights and homosexuality frequently appeared and enabled high marks to be awarded. The question did ask for examples of laws that have changed overtime and so only discussing one example meant that full marks could not be awarded. Full marks were reserved for those responses that outlined the actual legislative change. Hence a sign of good practice would be to include the actual name of the act of parliament that changed the law. For example the Marriage (Same-sex couples) Act 2013 or the Health Act 2006.

- 3. (a) (i)** This proved to be a challenging question for some candidates, who theorised about biology and criminality but failed to mention any policy development. This resulted in some candidates simply describing a biological theory without a policy. Those that successfully addressed the question made reference to neurochemical theory and its influence on the diet of violent offenders. Or genetic theory's influence on policies such as eugenics and the death penalty. To obtain full marks only a small amount of development of the policy was required.
- (ii)** This question generally produced good responses and allowed candidates to select a biological theory of criminality. The most popular appeared to be Lombroso, Sheldon and XYY theory. Others included twin and adoption studies and Raine's work on brain structure. Candidates were largely able to provide accurate accounts and use at least some specialist terminology. As with this type of question it is very important that a link to criminality is made. Unfortunately there were some cases where an inappropriate theory was selected meaning no marks could be awarded. This was less common than last year.
- (iii)** Another evaluation question and again too many candidates are providing descriptive responses which significantly restrict the marks awarded. Some provide both description and some evaluation but centres should again reiterate that no background is needed, just the strengths and weaknesses of, in this case, one physiological or genetic theory. Lombroso, Sheldon and XYY theory proved to me the most popular choices here. A small number of candidates showed their confusion with psychological and physiological theories/
- (b) (i)** Candidates were required to describe an individualistic theory of criminality and many chose to outline social learning theory with reference to Bandura. Better responses referred to behaviour being learnt through the observation of role models and vicarious reinforcement and successfully applied these concepts to criminality. This was essential to achieve the higher mark band. Candidates should be reminded that the theory is not the Bobo doll experiment and that it should be used to support or illustrate the social learning theory. Many candidates limited their answer to a description of the study rather than the theory. Freud's personality theory as well as those put forward by Bowlby and Eysenck were also used by candidates.
- (ii)** This final question was an evaluation of the individualistic theory described in *b (i)* and again, many found this skill challenging. This led many candidates to give descriptive responses but the highest-scoring responses were able to explicitly discuss both strengths and weaknesses of the theory without providing an unnecessary summary of it. For the top mark band both strengths and weaknesses would be expected, albeit not in equal proportion.

## Summary of key points

- centres must ensure coverage of every aspect of the content specification
- candidates are encouraged to practise evaluation and assessment questions
- candidates are encouraged to have a clear knowledge of specific factual information related to criminological theories. Focus on this is already paying dividends, as there was less selection of an incorrect type of theory of criminality in comparison to previous years
- candidates are encouraged to make better use of the source material in the stem of the question. Failure to do so often resulted in guidance being ignored and relevant material omitted.

## **WJEC LEVEL 3 APPLIED CRIMINOLOGY**

### **Level 3 Diploma**

**Summer 2019**

### **UNIT 3 CRIME SCENE TO COURT ROOM**

#### **General Comments**

The aim of the report below is to reflect on the quality of work and assessment seen during the 2019 moderation series and to offer advice to centres wishing to identify areas for development and improvement. Centres need to be reminded of the importance of reading the Principal Moderator reports each year. For a minority of centres, areas for improvement highlighted in this report in 2018 were not addressed adequately, and this subsequently limited marks for candidates. Centres should also refer to the guidance published on the WJEC website in order to determine how to conduct and organise the controlled assessment, and also how to mark and standardise the samples sent.

The majority of centres adhered to the strict regulations laid out for conducting the controlled assessment, but some centres did not. One area that caused an issue for some centres was the use of the endorsed textbook within the controlled assessment environment. Candidates should not be using the textbook or extracts from within it when in the controlled assessment environment and teachers must bear this in mind when producing notes for candidates. All work produced in the controlled assessment environment must be the candidate's own and candidates should not be re-writing paragraphs verbatim from textbook or from teacher notes. Where this occurs, the centre concerned should take appropriate action when awarding marks to said candidate or candidates.

Excellent practice was seen from the majority of centres in terms of internet restriction. The guidance clearly states that candidates should not have access to the internet during the Unit 3 controlled assessment. As a result, no hyperlinks or images would be expected within candidate work. Centres should discuss with their exams officer how to disable internet access or monitor students within the controlled assessment to ensure this high level of control is adhered to.

Centres should take every care to ensure that samples are sent to the moderators by 15<sup>th</sup> May and that the sample is carefully organised to facilitate the moderation process. All coversheets must be signed by an assessor and learner and should carry centre and candidate numbers. If the centre has more than one assessor, a lead assessor should be appointed and they too should sign the front sheet. Each sample should be accompanied by one printed copy of the assignment brief chosen and a completed Quality Assurance Form (available on the WJEC/Eduqas Criminology website) to confirm details of the internal standardisation process at the centre (where applicable). Centres should be aware that a further sample may be requested at any time and where this is the case, all further sample work must also be sent including coversheets signed by both candidate and assessor. Centres are advised to complete the paperwork at the time of controlled assessment. Please be aware that sample work sent without the necessary paperwork will not be moderated. Please be advised that we do not accept work presented on USB devices. Work that is sent on USB devices will be returned directly.

Overall, administration of samples was of a high standard. Best practice was exemplified by clear, not necessarily lengthy, teacher annotation that offered clear justification for the marks awarded. Please note that when marking, centres should identify evidence for awarding marks clearly on the candidate's work and then note their justification for awarding marks in the marking band box. Assessors should not simply copy the marking criteria if a candidate has not achieved full marks, reasoning should be clear and justified throughout.

On the whole, candidate work was suitably structured and coherent with most completing their assessment in a report format. Use of headings and sub-headings related to the assessment criteria wording were particularly useful and should be encouraged. Centres should also ensure that the work is organised in candidate number order when it is dispatched and that the pages of each sample are secured together. The candidate number should be clearly identifiable on each page and centres are encouraged to advise candidates to place their name and candidate number in the header or footer of their document when a word processor is being used.

Once again this year, candidates engaged well with the assignment brief/scenario of Gareth Hughes or John Smith. Stronger responses showed evidence of application to the brief throughout the main body of work, where relevant. This is best practice and should be encouraged by all centres. Centres should not penalise candidates for not referring directly to the assignment brief/scenario in specific ACs where the mark scheme does not direct that reference to the brief must be made. Conversely, candidates should also be discouraged from referring to the assignment brief if it is not relevant to the point being made.

## **Comments on individual questions/sections**

### **LO1: Understand the process of criminal investigations**

Candidates largely demonstrated an excellent understanding when approaching this learning outcome and it was evident centres have been delivering this AC to a high standard. However, some issues, similar to those highlighted within this report last year were seen within work. These issues are identified below.

Centres need to ensure that candidates don't simply describe roles of personnel covered under AC1.1 as the emphasis is surrounding the limitations of these roles. Effectiveness should be considered in the context of potential limitations: cost, expertise and availability, as laid out in the specification. Often, this was omitted by candidates or the attempt made at discussion largely superficial. Case examples can be included to further develop points and expand evaluation.

When considering AC 1.2, candidates should assess a range of investigative techniques in terms of their effectiveness in criminal investigations. Some centres continue to discuss the trial process, which is not necessary for this AC. Case studies should be included to enhance the assessment of the various techniques, but candidates should be mindful to include only relevant aspects of these case studies. It is not necessary to describe all key aspects of a case. Please note that the assignment brief should be used to enhance and broaden discussion and should not be the sole emphasis of AC 1.1 and A.C 1.2. The majority of candidates also discussed the effectiveness of investigations in terms of situations and types of crime. This is good practice in order to further develop their response in accordance with the specification. The most successful candidates structured AC1.2 by describing techniques and then examining the strengths and limitations of said techniques whilst commenting on effectiveness in criminal investigations with case studies applied throughout to support points.

AC1.3 and AC1.4 were generally well-done. Centres should continue to consult the specification by addressing both physical and testimonial evidence ensuring the focus is on the process of evidence, including: collection, transfer, storage, analysis and personnel involved. Often only one type of evidence was discussed or only the collection aspect was identified. Candidates should refrain from typing up a list of how different types of evidence are collected, as shown in the textbook. Centres should consult the amplification section of AC1.3 as it identifies 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.' Last year and this year, many centres did not include discussion of relevant case studies within this AC.

In AC1.4, many candidates tend to discuss all three individuals but do not structure the discussion from arrest through to appeal (as identified in the specification), thus limiting marks.

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

Much excellent practice was seen where centres had fully engaged with the specification to include the amplification section of this LO. It should be noted that some candidates (and some whole centres) were over-reliant on the textbook, often re-producing textbook passages verbatim. This is not acceptable practice and candidates should not have access to the textbook or notes that re-produce textbook content during the controlled assessment. Where direct re-production of textbook content was identified by the moderator, marks were limited.

Although often done well, candidates should ensure they include relevant case law in their discussions for AC 2.1 and AC 2.3. Candidates should resist the urge to bullet point as this can affect the clarity and depth of what is being described. Criminal and legal procedures were often embedded within AC 2.2, however the roles of personnel involved in trial processes should be discussed in order to access the highest marks.

In AC 2.4 the primary focus should be on the significance of the impact of each stakeholder listed in the specification and how this may influence a criminal trial. Candidates should assess these impacts and use relevant case studies to enhance responses. Stronger responses included reference to relevant criminal cases f.e. Christopher Jefferies, Colin Stagg and Sally Clark. Once again, candidates should select key information to support discussion points and not describe full cases.

## **LO3 Be able to review criminal cases**

Feedback remains consistent with 2018 and centres must address these issues if candidates are to earn the highest marks. Centres should be aware of the difference between AC 3.1 and AC 3.2 and of the advantages of discussing these two ACs separately. Some centres continue to overlap discussion where this is not appropriate.

Responses to AC3.1 showed considerable consistency but centres should ensure that candidates are engaging with more than one information source. The assignment brief scenarios alone is not a large enough basis for discussion. Stronger responses embedded case examples such as Jeremy Bamber, Amanda Knox, the Hillsborough disaster, Christopher Jefferies and Roy Meadows etc. The majority of candidates were clearly well-prepared as a range of sources, including evidence, trial transcripts, media reports, judgements and Law Reports were examined. Many candidates also dealt well with bias, opinion, currency, circumstance and accuracy. The weakest responses were exemplified by a general description of cases with very little use of key terminology.

Overall, AC3.2 was addressed with clarity and most candidates demonstrated the ability to draw objective conclusions, whilst including supporting evidence. Centres should be aware of the necessity to refer to a range of sources, and candidates should not solely rely on the assignment brief. Good practice was shown by candidates who were able to analyse a range of information to draw objective conclusions based in fact. Candidates should draw conclusions based on safe verdicts, just sentencing and miscarriages of justice. Weaker responses could only describe case studies and were unable to show clearly why a case could be considered, for example, a miscarriage of justice.

### **Summary of key points**

- Centres should ensure they read the guidance on how to conduct, mark and standardise the controlled assessment sample and note that candidates should not have access to the internet or textbooks within the controlled assessment time.
- All required paperwork should be sent to moderators on time and should be organised appropriately.
- Candidate work should be annotated clearly throughout to justify the marks awarded.
- Centres and candidates should work to ensure that candidates are not directly re-producing passages from a textbook in the controlled assessment. Work of this nature should not be given credit.
- Careful reference should be made to the content and amplification sections of the specification in order to determine whether candidates have met the needs of each individual AC.

## WJEC LEVEL 3 APPLIED CRIMINOLOGY

### Level 3 Diploma

Summer 2019

#### UNIT 4: CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

##### General Comments

As was the case with Unit 2, this externally assessed component for the diploma qualification demonstrated many candidates' preparedness and their ability to achieve at a high level. Nonetheless, some candidates are still not as conversant with the whole range of material as outlined in the specification. It is imperative that all candidates are able to achieve the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria while dealing with the content outlined in the specification. However, it was again noted that some candidates were unfamiliar with the content of some questions. Again, centres are reminded of the need to ensure that candidates are familiar with all aspects of the specification – especially the *content* column, as questions in the examination paper will reflect the material that is outlined here. Higher-achieving candidates were able to use a range of specialist terminology, and used relevant and appropriate examples, for example references to court cases and the implementation of specific Acts of Parliament to support their responses. Finally, and to reiterate the point made for Unit 2, centres must ensure that candidates use the source material that appears in the stem of the question to provide guidance to the answer.

##### Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1 (a) (i)** Most candidates were able to provide the correct answer for this and the subsequent short 1 mark questions. Some candidates suggested the judge was responsible for the verdict and as it is technically possible, such as answer received one mark.
- (ii)** While the majority of candidates indicated that the judge would have imposed the prison sentence, other responses included the Crown Prosecution Service or the defendant's lawyer. Some candidates produced a list of several agencies, showing a lack of understanding of the criminal system and received no marks.
- (b)** The vast majority of candidates scored well with this question. They were able to correctly explain the crime control model of justice. The better responses linked this model to case studies such as Colin Stagg or areas of law such as abolition of the double jeopardy rule. This question allowed better candidates to display specialist terminology and gain the appropriate reward. A small number of candidates showed confusion by describing the due process model of justice or zero tolerance.

- (c) The majority of candidates focused on token economies and provided clear and detailed responses that reached the top mark band. For this question it was pleasing to see the responses being developed to prisons with mention of rewards such as televisions and more time out of cells. This question also allowed for specialist terminology to be credited, such as negative and positive reinforcement. At times an answer would fully explain how the reward side operated but neglected the negative reinforcement aspect. A small minority failed to apply the behavioural tactic to prisons, as required by the question and some candidates lacked development with regard to how it is used for social control within prisons.
  - (d) This question was generally answered well with 2 aims of sentencing being considered. The most popular aims discussed included retribution and rehabilitation, with others such as reparation and incapacitation/protection of society also appearing. Many candidates were able to reach the top mark band by a development of the aims. A reference to Sarah or a link to the 3 year prison sentence was required. At times, full marks could not be awarded due to lack of development of the aims.
  - (e) This synoptic question proved to be challenging for some candidates, who found it difficult to connect the aims of sentencing to the criminological theories studied in unit 2. Some responses were able to explain the aims of sentencing without any connection to theory, and others explained the theory with few—or only implied—links to aims. However, other responses were very detailed and were deserving of full marks. Both left and right realism, with their connection to rehabilitation and retribution respectively, often appeared.
- Q.2**
- (a) This question provided a wide variety of responses. Weaker responses failed to demonstrate comprehension of the role of the Crown Prosecution Service, suggesting that it determined the sentence in court cases. Candidates would benefit from engaging more with the specification to appreciate what it says about the role of the various agencies. At times responses were limited to the full code test and failed to include other aspects such as aims and objectives, funding, philosophy, working practices, types of criminality, types of offenders or reach (local, national).
  - (b) The responses to this question provided many similar issues as those from the CPS question in (a) above, many responses offered only general, common-sense comments about the police, without displaying evidence of studying the course. The areas, from the specification, outlined above also apply to this question. Often, responses were very narrow focusing solely on police powers or how this agency helps to keep the community safe.
  - (c) There was a mixed response to this question and some candidates were unable to engage with it. A significant number of candidates were confused by the term moral imperatives and failed to appreciate why it was a limitation in achieving social control. A large number of scripts suggested that those with moral imperatives did not have any internal social control or morals and so did not appreciate they were committing criminal offences. Such a response failed to understand that those who commit crimes, because of moral imperatives, felt it was morally correct to do so and as such would be unlikely to be rehabilitated. Better candidates included examples of criminal offences such as assisted suicide, anti-vivisection crimes and honour crimes.

- (d)** Responses to this question produced a wide variety of response. Weaker responses to this question usually followed weak responses to part (a) and (b). Both agencies were usually considered but at times the evaluation was too basic and followed the line of the 2 agencies work together and therefore they were effective. Better responses developed into detailed evaluation and contained a number of examples such as the cases of Stephen Lawrence, Hillsborough and Damilola Taylor. It was also pleasing to see statistics in support and more modern examples including the discontinuance of cases involving allegations of rape, by the CPS, as a result of a failure to disclose evidence.

- Q.3 (a)** Despite the probations services and their issues featuring regularly in the news the majority of candidates struggled to achieve full marks in this question. Being government funded by taxation regularly appeared but there was little knowledge of part privatisation of the probation services. This is despite the fact that the source material in the stem of the question included this fact.
- (b)** This answer was expected to use the information from the text, as instructed, and also develop the answer with the candidate's own knowledge to evaluate the effectiveness of the probation service in achieving social control. However, responses to this question showed that many candidates did not have a detailed knowledge of the role of the Probation service and were therefore unable to provide much by way of an evaluation. A number of responses merely focused on the text and provided no additional knowledge. Likewise some responses failed to make reference to the information in the text. Weaker responses merely focused on the idea of the reform and rehabilitative aspect of the services and hence this meant a positive contribution to social control. Many responses also included information about the 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 recent criticisms of the organisation being part privatised with Community Rehabilitation Companies supervising the mid to low risk offenders. Stronger responses that were supported by examples such as the killing of Connor Marshall by David Braddon or the murder of 5-year-old Alex Malcom by Marvyn Iheanacho were highly rewarded.
- (c)** All that was required by this question was a relatively straightforward answer of 2 aims of punishment. The most popular appeared to be rehabilitation, retribution and reparation. While the majority of candidates could identify the aims of a probation order, other responses focused, incorrectly, on the types of punishment attached to a community order such as an electronic tag or community payback.
- (d)** Candidates who were unaware of the operation and function of a probation order clearly struggled in providing an answer to this question. Reference to how the working of a probation order produced external social control was expected. This included the idea that terms of an order such as community payback coerced the offender into behaving. As an alternative, to a court probation order, could be prison then the fear of such a punishment resulted in social control. The continued threat of custody provided the desired deterrence from reoffending.

- (e) This question challenged some candidates who merely wrote about the role of agencies in the criminal justice system from an independent viewpoint and therefore failed to make the connections between them. An expected approach was to take each agency and then consider how it works with the probation service. A common misconception is that police escort prisoners to and from prison. This work is contracted out to firms such as Serco or GEOAmev. Centres would benefit from focusing more on this assessment criteria to enable candidates to have a wider picture of a multi-agency approach. Centres should consider the role of MAPPA (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements), where police, probation and prison services work together with other agencies to manage the risks posed by violent and sexual offenders living in the community in order to protect the public.

### **Summary of key points**

- Centres must ensure coverage of every aspect of the content specification.
- Candidates are encouraged to practise evaluation and assessment questions.
- Candidates are encouraged to have a cogent knowledge of specific factual information, such as court cases and legislation, to support their arguments.
- Candidates are encouraged to make better use of the source material in the stem of the question. Failure to do so often resulted in guidance being ignored and relevant material omitted.



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)