EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LEVEL 3 APPLIED CERTIFICATE IN CRIMINOLOGY

SUMMER 2022

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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.

Unit	Page
Unit 1	1
Unit 2	7
Unit 3	12
Unit 4	17

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Certificate

Summer 2022

UNIT 1: CHANGING AWARENESS OF CRIME

General Comments

We would wish to acknowledge the difficulties faced by centres delivering this unit and arranging controlled assessment sessions in difficult circumstances over the past two years. Much of the work seen this series was well-presented and assessed. We thank centres for their efforts to prepare their candidates well. The purpose of this report is to help centres identify areas of improvement for future moderation series and the comments within it are not to be taken as applying equally to all centres and do not detract from the overall good performance of many candidates and centres.

This was the first exam series where centres were required to provide sample work electronically. Whilst most centres dealt with this change effectively, others failed to comply with the requirements and delays in the moderation process were experienced as a result. We kindly request that centres familiarise themselves with the upload requirements prior to submission and consider these requirements when assessments are set, collated and marked. Samples must be thoroughly checked for clerical and administration errors. A significant number of centres uploaded incomplete or incorrect samples.

Centres must ensure that all assessment documentation is completed in full. This year saw significant issues, with centres submitting work without a mark record sheet that had been signed by the candidate and teacher. This is a requirement of the moderation process and centres must comply for every candidate entered. These signatures must be obtained and kept on file at the centre. They can be requested by the awarding organisation at any time following the publication of results. Centres are encouraged to ensure that the required paperwork is completed and signed at the time the assessments are completed and candidates are in attendance. In addition to the candidate work, mark record sheet and signatures, centres must also upload one Quality Assurance Form with their submission to detail the assessment process at the centre. Centres are reminded that they must upload one copy of the brief(s) used.

Some centres included evidence of internal verification within the centre. The Quality Assurance Form should be used for this purpose. Where centres have more than one assessor, internal verification should be completed to ensure consistency of marking across the cohort and any consortia arrangements that may be in place. If there is only one assessor conducting the marking within a centre, internal verification is not necessary, but centres are encouraged to consult with a colleague or another centre for support in applying the mark scheme correctly and consistently. Further guidance on internal verification can be found in the WJEC Instructions on Conducting Controlled Assessment.

Although many centres completed mark record sheets in detail to assist the moderator, this was not always the case. Better examples provided detailed comments to justify the mark band and mark awarded for each assessment criteria. These highlighted the relevant mark band, clearly showed the mark and provided focused comments to justify the assessment decisions. It is pleasing to see assessors engaging with key terminology found in both the specification and in the mark bands.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Better examples provide concise but clear annotations in the body of the candidate's work. However, we are still seeing too many centres submitting samples that contain no annotation whatsoever. Centres and assessors must note that annotating candidate work is not optional. Brief annotations should be placed within the main body of work to show the location of each assessment criteria and highlight areas of credit or weakness. This does significantly assist the moderation process and is an approach all centres should adopt for future series. Annotations are particularly useful where centres are cross-crediting e.g., awarding marks for one assessment criteria within another section of the complete assessment. Failure to supply annotation makes the process very challenging for moderators as there is no justification offered for the marks awarded by the original assessor at the centre.

For the most part, the sample assessments seen at the higher end of the mark range showed a high level of engagement with the specification. It was encouraging to see that candidates were well-prepared for the controlled assessment in most instances. Best practice was seen in the work of 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.

Four briefs are now available for centre use on the WJEC secure website. This summer, we saw rare incidences of the old Mr and Mrs S brief being used. This brief was withdrawn in 2020 and must not be used in any future exam series. A small number of centres continue to use outdated mark schemes that does not directly relate to the new briefs. The updated version of the specification and mark scheme have been available for the past two years. Centres must engage regularly with the content and guidance provided by the WJEC to ensure they are adhering to the course requirements. Similarly, centres are reminded that candidates are not allowed to see the chosen brief or tasks prior to controlled assessment.

Many centres allow candidates to undertake fresh attempts before marks are submitted. Centres must be clear on the rules governing fresh attempts and ensure that both the original work and the fresh attempt, along with both mark record sheets are uploaded for moderation for any candidate that has been given two opportunities to complete the tasks. These files must be clearly named as 'Attempt 1' and 'Attempt 2'. The highest mark from both attempts should be entered. Some centres were very disorganised in their approach to naming uploaded files and did not provide any form of clarity for the moderator. A detailed account of which candidate/s in the sample undertook fresh attempts would be useful to include on the Quality Assurance Form.

Centres must ensure that all candidates' work for the unit is combined into one file per candidate (using Word or PDF format wherever possible). Some centres uploaded upwards of 30 files per candidate. This is not acceptable and hinders the moderation process. In future series, the assessment must be planned with a view to considering the clear and correct upload of candidate work.

Centres are reminded that this assessment that must be completed under controlled conditions as set out in the WJEC Instructions on Conducting Controlled Assessment. Centres must follow the detailed guidance provided by the Controlled Assessment Handbook (available within the Learner Assignment Brief folders on the WJEC secure website). Candidates must use the same brief for each part of the assessment and cannot use a different brief for selected Learning Objectives (LO).

Lastly and disappointingly, this series continued to highlight issues relating to plagiarism from textbooks and the internet within candidate work.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Centres must be mindful of the resources they provide during lessons as these can be used by candidates as a basis for their notes during the assessment. Overreliance on the textbooks leads to issues of plagiarism in the assessment and centres should ensure that plenty of opportunity for independent research is provided during the course of study. Centres must make all teachers and students aware of JCQ guidelines on plagiarism and must accept responsibility for ensuring that candidates do not produce plagiarised work in the assessment. Where students plagiarise passages from the textbook or other secondary sources, marks should not be awarded for these sections and plagiarism reported to the awarding organisation if the candidate has signed the declaration to confirm this as their original work.

Where issues concerning plagiarism have been raised in individual centre reports, centres must act on this and develop their resources and approach in future to discourage dependency on any textbook. Plagiarism is most often found in relation to AC1.4, AC1.5 and AC2.2. Centres should therefore take great care with their approach to these assessment criteria in future.

Although the great majority of candidate work was marked thoroughly and accurately, many centres were over-generous when assessing the work, specifically in LO2 and LO3. It is vitally important that centres utilise the guidance and exemplar material on offer to ensure work is marked accurately and consistently at the centre. The Annotated Mark Scheme is available in the brief folders on the secure website and will provide further guidance for centres.

Finally, where candidates commit any rubric offences across the assessment criteria (include more than the required breadth as requested by the task) assessors should only mark the best elements of these responses and not credit additional marks for those candidates who include more than the required amount.

Comments on individual questions/sections

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

The assessment criteria (AC) covered under this learning outcome were generally addressed with depth and clarity.

Task 1 includes **AC1.1** and **AC1.2** and requires candidates to use the unseen brief to analyse two crimes evident within it as well as explain 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 using the full range of criteria in the amplification section of the specification often missing out whether it is deviant or criminal behaviour. Some candidates failed to link these two AC together and did not address the given task. For example, if a candidate completes an analysis of white collar and honour crime for AC1.1, we expect to see the candidate address the task and provide an explanation as to why white collar and honour crime may go unreported. The response should cover at least one personal and one social and cultural reason (not necessarily all listed). Personal reasons seemed to be covered far better by most candidates than social and cultural.

Task 2, which includes **AC1.3** generated responses of varying quality from centres. While most complete this well, some centres continue to disregard the consequences listed in the spec. It is the listed consequences that should be discussed and examples to support the discussion should be provided. Candidates must also state whether the consequence is positive or negative. This was often missing

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Task 3, which includes **AC1.4** and **AC1.5** continue to generate plagiarised content in assessments. Centres must address this issue moving forward. When discussing impacts for AC1.5, centres are reminded of the requirement to focus on the impacts listed in the specification and to cover these in full if full marks is to be awarded.

LO2: Understand how campaigns are used to elicit change

This section continues to be the most challenging for candidates; however, it was pleasing to see an improvement in the quality observed since the last full series in 2019. **AC2.1** requires candidates to compare campaigns for change. As outlined in the specification, the content of this AC should focus on comparisons which can be linked to the following changes (but not necessarily all):

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

The highest-scoring candidates were very well prepared for this criteria and sample assessments demonstrated a high level of understanding from candidates. The best examples saw candidates selecting the required range (including their own) of appropriate campaigns for change, comparing them in depth and addressing key aspects such as purpose, success, aims and methods. As outlined in the amplification section of the specification, campaigns could include, for example, change in classification of certain drugs, euthanasia, anti-smoking, etc.

The lowest-scoring candidates were unsure how to compare and simply described the campaigns. Teaching candidates how to compare campaigns successfully using key terminology is hugely beneficial. Centres should be mindful that the campaigns discussed should not be business-based campaigns e.g., to advertise products. Centres must focus on campaigns for change.

Even where candidates were able to compare in detail, many failed to reach the highest mark band due to not explicitly linking to their own campaign (LO3). To overcome this issue, where/if possible, centres can allow candidates to complete task 6 before task 5.

AC2.2 was largely approached with accuracy by candidates. Evidence of good practice was observed in sample assessments where candidates evaluated the required range of media methods by making clear links to existing campaigns. These campaigns provided supporting evidence and an opportunity to make well-reasoned judgements. As mentioned, plagiarism was an issue in some of the samples seen. The textbook should be used as a guide only and teachers are encouraged to produce original materials, supporting candidates to conduct further independent research.

There are still some candidates who are missing out on achieving full marks by not including a clear measurement of success with regards to the campaign examples discussed. This AC is worth 15 marks; the detail provided should reflect this high weighting. There is no requirement to link AC2.2 with AC2.1 and centres who teach this way should be mindful that they may be limiting the marks achievable by their candidates.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

LO3: Plan campaigns for change relating to crime

Where centres had fully engaged with the assessment criteria and requirements, the quality of planning, design and justification seen in some of the campaigns was impressive. However, it must also be noted that this learning outcome produced the majority of issues concerning over-marking, particularly in AC3.2 where one limited method/material had been produced and candidates awarded a mark in MB2/MB3. Centres must ensure they are familiar with the range and standard required to achieve the highest marks. Exemplar material is available to review on the secure website and centres should ensure that they fully engage with it prior to assessing candidate work.

The most significant feedback linked to this learning outcome to come from this moderation series is the relevance of the chosen campaign for change. In some instances, candidates were creating campaigns which were not appropriate for changing behaviour or were not in line with the crimes evident in the brief. Where candidates do not design a campaign linked to one of the specific categories within the chosen brief, they must be limited to Mark Band 1 for AC3.1. Teachers must make this very clear to their students. Further guidance is available in the Controlled Assessment Handbook.

Most 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:

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

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

In most instances, the campaign materials which were designed as part of **AC3.2** enabled candidates to achieve high marks. For this 20-mark assessment criteria, the expectation is that candidates produce a range of campaign materials to create a coherent, wide-ranging and effective campaign to engage the target audience. Evidence of excellent practice was evident where candidates had designed several types of campaign material (min of 3) and demonstrated creative ability, the use of persuasive language and used powerful imagery to stimulate interest. Centres must be aware that three different types of social media pages would constitute one type only. Centres can use any software they feel appropriate to produce these materials, but please be mindful of online applications that can be accessed outside the controlled assessment environment. If candidates complete LO3 in one session this is not an issue, but if candidates complete this task across two separate sessions, centre must be able to guarantee that candidates cannot access these materials outside the stipulated 8 hours.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AC3.3 requires full justification of the need for the chosen campaign. The majority of candidates did well here, with better candidates fully justifying the materials designed in AC3.2, including evidence in the form of statistics and real-life cases in support. At times, justification points were also seen in AC3.1 which were cross credited appropriately. Weaker candidates simply justified their materials in a simple way and lacked evidence to support the need for their campaign. Where candidates combined AC3.2 and AC3.3 e.g., as annotations on the materials, marks tended to be significantly lower as the justifications lacked detail. Centres are encouraged to tackle AC3.3 separately in order to avoid this limiting factor.

Finally, where candidates commit any rubric offences across the assessment criteria (including more than the required breadth as requested by the task), assessors should only **mark the strongest elements of these responses up to the range required**. Centres should not seek to give additional credit to those candidates who include more than the required range.

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 only four types of media, include an example of a campaign that used that media type and explain whether it was successful or unsuccessful by including a success measure of some sort. For example, the Help for Heroes campaign successfully used merchandise. We know it was successful as they raised £50,000.
- **Task 6** – The campaign must link with a crime that is evident in the brief (marked in red). The campaign should have coherence throughout i.e., methods that are stipulated in the plan in AC3.1 should be designed in AC3.2 and justified in AC3.3. A fragmented approach limits the marks that can be given.
- All centres and assessors must familiarise themselves with the controlled assessment handbook and the annotated mark scheme. Both can be found on the secure website.
- Centres must be aware of the JCQ guidance concerning plagiarism in assessments and plan their courses of study and assessment practices accordingly.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Certificate

Summer 2022

UNIT 2: CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORIES

General Comments

While this was the first full examination series since 2019, most candidates seemed well prepared for this externally assessed unit. There were excellent, clear, and detailed answers that showed a good knowledge of the specification and the required skills; however, there was also a substantial number of responses that revealed their authors' unequal knowledge of the specification.

The stimulus material in the questions covered a broad range of the content, which was indicated in the Advance Information notice published in April of this year, and the questions allowed for all abilities to access the paper. Overall, candidates were able to interact well with that stimulus material, and many used it effectively when answering the questions, suggesting a growing competence in this skill.

As in previous years the questions allowed the higher-achieving candidates to excel, and most provided clear and detailed responses to each question. These candidates were able to support their responses with relevant information and suitable examples to develop the points made. This was particularly evident in the high-tariff questions. Lower-achieving candidates tended to provide brief answers that did not support their ideas with relevant knowledge to develop the points they were aiming to make. Nevertheless, it was pleasing to see so many candidates utilize specialist terminology in their responses, and this frequently enabled the examiners to increase the marks to awarded in line with the requirements of the mark bands.

Candidates should remember that at the outset of the examination they should familiarise themselves with all the part questions under the scenario to ensure that they: firstly, choose the theories or examples that will give them the best chance across all those questions; and secondly, do not waste time writing superfluous material that would better be used in a subsequent question. Unfortunately, there were many instances where candidates offered this unnecessary material and ended up repeating themselves in subsequent answers where it was more useful to the response: it was evident that several candidates realised this as they proceeded to answer each part question.

There is a serious issue with the legibility of some candidates' handwriting, which may have been exacerbated by the COVID pandemic and online learning. Legible handwriting gives candidates the best opportunity to clearly convey the point they are trying to make. Sadly, at times, handwriting was illegible and made assessment of the work extraordinarily difficult. Further to this, a substantial number of candidates exceeded the space provided for an answer in the examination paper, and then failed to use the additional sheets provided at the back of the paper. Instead, they tended to use separate additional sheets, at times, using a new sheet for each extension of an answer. This caused significant logistical issues, which were compounded by many of those candidates failing to correctly number – and sometimes failing to number at all – the response, making it difficult to discern to which question the extension material related. We ask centres to please remind candidates of the importance of this prior to the examination period.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 **(a)** **(i)** This was a short and straightforward question with most candidates scoring the one mark available. The most popular answers were Bandura's social learning theory and Skinner's theory of operant conditioning. Any variation of the name of the theory or the theorist secured the one mark. As the question specifically required a learning theory, theories not considered as such – for example those credited to Bowlby and Eysenck as well as some biological theories – were not acceptable.

(ii) The theory to be described in this part question had to be the same as the one named in Q.1(a)(i). There were excellent answers, which produced the content expected for a 6-mark question. However, where full marks were not awarded there were a multitude of reasons. Firstly, the theory had to be a learning theory, and so if the theory in Q.1(a)(i) was not a learning theory, the explanation of it would inhibit the attainment of all 6 marks. One of the common faults when describing Bandura's social learning theory was to focus too much on the Bobo doll experiment. At times, the response solely featured on the facts of how the experiment was carried out with nothing on the theory itself. To reach the top mark band there had to be a substantial link to criminality. Specialist vocabulary was also expected to be used effectively. At times, despite the question requiring only a description of the learning theory, reference to the scenario and/or an evaluation of the theory was evident. This should be discouraged as such content did not meet the demands of the question.

(iii) For this question, analysis to Daria and the scenario was required. Unfortunately, many candidates had included such information in the previous answer and ended up repeating themselves or referring to prior content. Nonetheless, most responses offered an analysis of a learning theory, even if for a few candidates, this was an incorrect one that followed on from an error in the first question and as such limited their marks here. Finally, while many answers detailed all the story in the scenario and linked it to the theory, the link to other young offenders in care was omitted.

(b) This question was done well by many candidates, with most responses containing an appropriate theory. Occasionally, a biological or sociological theory appeared, but they were very much in the minority. There was a noticeable improvement in the quality of this type of evaluative question. Candidates are much better at omitting description and focusing on evaluation. As is usual practice in this subject both positives and negatives were expected to reach the top mark band. Weaker responses contained only description and could only access limited marks.

(c) This question produced some very pleasing answers. Whilst the focus was on the crime control policy, the linked theory was often included to help support the explanation of the policy. The most popular policy was token economies, but others such as aversion theory and psychoanalysis also appeared.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Stronger answers also linked the policy to a crime situation such as use of token economies in prison. Weaker answers failed to focus on the demands of the question and included biological or sociological crime-control policies. Occasionality answers discussed campaigns such as Sarah's Law.

Q.2 **(a)** This was a well-answered question with some good examples of laws changing from culture to culture. Popular answers included laws regarding homosexuality, adultery, female genital mutilation, honour crime and drug use. It was important to note that two examples were requested, but some candidates only provided one. At times, some responses drifted towards place rather than culture: there is some overlap in these areas, but that should be pointed out in the response to make it specific to the question asked.

It is important to note that a significant number of candidates offered stereotyped responses to this question. Centres are requested to challenge these attitudes: too many candidates simply asserted that non-western cultures are inferior to western culture(s), without any, or very limited, knowledge of those cultures. Candidates are expected to have a much more nuanced – and informed – view on such matters.

(b) There was a distinct difference between this and the previous question. This focused on why crimes differed between cultures, but many answers continued to answer on how they differ. This was clearly a limited response. Religion, differing values and norms and the status of women often appeared. However, at times such reasons were merely stated and needed development for the top mark band. Again, as with the previous question there was a reliance on generalised and uninformed stereotypes.

(c) This question produced some clear and detailed answers with intelligent examples of how laws can be applied differently according to the circumstances in which actions occur. The authors of such answers clearly appreciated what was required. Common responses considered partial defences to homicide, the age of criminal responsibility, and the impact of jury equity on a decision. There were also some impressive references to examples of moral panics and the varying sentences that can occur. At times, answers drifted into responses about laws changing over time, such as changing drink driving laws, which was not the focus of the question. Finally, when discussing age of responsibility, several scripts contained the mistaken belief that the defendants in the case of Jamie Bulger, Thompson and Venables, were too young to stand trial and that this case set the age of criminal responsibility. Weak answers were very generalised with little more than common sense comments.

(d) This question, written in the plural form, required examples, and so candidates who only wrote about one campaign/pressure group were restricted in their mark. In addition, some answers focused on campaigns by individuals and not by pressure groups, which again was not the focus of the question. Popular responses included smoking campaigns such as those from the British Lung Foundation, Protection Against Stalking, the women's suffragette movement, the Howard League for Penal Reform, and the work of Inquest. There were some very impressive answers filled with detail on campaign methods and the successful legislation of policy changes.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

A small number of responses discussed pressure groups in general, without any examples. These could not score well as examples had been explicitly requested.

Q.3 **(a)** **(i)** Overall, this was a well-answered question. Candidates wrote in equal measure about either Lombroso or Sheldon's physiological theory of criminality. Generally, the amount of content was appropriate to a 4-mark "briefly describe" question. It was also important to include a brief link to criminality and this was usually included. Only occasionality was an incorrect theory, such as Eysenck included.

(ii) & (iii) These were comparable questions, each relating to one character from the scenario. Their strengths, weaknesses and development areas are similar, and as such it was vitally important to comprehend which character was the focus of which question. There were many instances of the wrong person being considered and then attempts by candidates to ensure the answers were swapped between the two questions. While the tolls of exam pressure are understandable, it is an important skill to focus on the demands of the question. Candidates tended to write too much description on the theory and omitted valuable information from the scenario that could be used to show analysis. For example, for Toby it was important to link Sheldon's theory to his gym activity, use of weights and use of protein supplements. With George, his characteristics listed in the scenario and reference to tattoos should have been included but was often omitted. At times, evaluation of the physiological theory appeared but seldom added anything to the required analysis. Only a small number of responses referred to an inappropriate theory, an error that is less frequent than in recent years. Good answers included the use of specialist terminology, which enabled marks to reach the top band.

(b) There were many detailed and some outstanding answers, with a review of the social change and consequential policy development. Popular areas included the law relating to smoking of cigarettes, homosexuality, drink driving, and discrimination. The question required two examples, hence those that contained just one example could not access the full range of marks. Candidates should be aware that even with the high-tariff questions (9 marks), there is no requirement for an introduction and conclusion. Weaker answers included references to campaigns generally but failed to focus on social or policy change. Such responses also tended to drift from social change answer to a time, place, and culture answer.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Summary of key points

- When the description of a criminological theory is required, a link to criminality should always be included.
- To reach the higher mark bands, detailed support, including examples, is required in a response.
- Specialist vocabulary is a significant part of a satisfactory answer and should be included wherever possible.
- Candidates should pay attention to the command word in the question and ensure it is addressed.
- Handwriting should be as clear and legible as possible, and all parts of questions should be clearly and accurately numbered.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Certificate

Summer 2022

UNIT 3: CRIME SCENE TO COURTROOM

General Comments

Firstly, WJEC would like to acknowledge the considerable effort made by the centres to effectively prepare candidates for this summer series. With such a large volume of work this series, it was very pleasing to see that the high standards seen in the past have been maintained and centres are engaging well with the changes made to the Unit 3 controlled assessment tasks.

For the majority of centres, the sample submitted displayed a high level of understanding and engagement with the Unit 3 specification. It was encouraging to see that most candidates had been well prepared for the new controlled assessment tasks, particularly as the assignment brief now remains unseen until the start of the controlled assessment. Evidence of good practice was observed in the work of centres who had thoroughly engaged with the assessment criteria (AC) 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 available in the Learner Assignment Brief folder on the secure website. 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 this summer. However, it is imperative that these issues – where they apply – are identified and addressed moving forward.

Overall, centres uploaded assessments that were accurately marked with clear annotation throughout the main body of work. Annotations are particularly useful to highlight where a specific assessment criterion is credited in the work, especially if the candidates do not approach the assessment in task order and/or do not use subheadings. Unfortunately, some centres uploaded assessments with no annotations, this must be addressed moving forward.

Most centres' mark record sheets were completed as required. Centres should be mindful that the total number of marks (out of 100) should be written on the front page where required. Centres are also reminded of the importance of taking great care when completing and calculating mark record sheet totals and when entering marks electronically to avoid unnecessary clerical errors. A number of clerical errors were seen this series and corrected by moderators. All assessment criteria should have a mark noted on the mark record sheet, even if this is a mark of zero. Best practice was seen from those centres where clear and relevant justifications were written on the mark record sheet to explain and justify all marking decisions. It was pleasing to see that declaration/authentication sheets had been signed by candidates and assessors in the majority of cases (as well as lead assessors where relevant). Centres are reminded that this is a requirement. Moderation cannot proceed without both these signatures for each piece of work in the sample.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Most samples uploaded this summer included a copy of the relevant Learner Assignment Brief(s) used by candidates. It is encouraging to see that centres are opting for the assignment brief most suitable for their candidates. A copy of the Quality Assurance Form should be uploaded with the sample in all moderation series. Centres must use this form to detail any internal standardization process at the centre and to explain the use of more than one assignment brief across the cohort should they need to. Centres may also wish to add any further pertinent information relating to the assessment process at the centre for the benefit of the moderator. Please be mindful in future that should the sample include a fresh attempt by a candidate, they must use an alternative assignment brief, and centres must upload both attempts for each relevant candidate in the sample. Centres must clearly label these as 'Attempt 1' and 'Attempt 2' so that the moderator is aware which is which. Centres must enter the highest mark of the two attempts.

This series 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. At times, some centres are relying too heavily on the textbooks, particularly for AC1.2, 3.1 and 3.2. Plagiarism, when discovered, is taken extremely seriously. Centres must 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.

In most instances, 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. Centres should note that to award full marks for these ACs, WJEC would expect the application to the assignment brief to be detailed and relevant, whilst also including all other requirements of the AC (in line with the mark bands). 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.

Comments on individual questions/sections

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 (these are required for all roles if awarding full marks). A key point to note is that this AC requires an evaluation of each role in terms of its impact on the investigation and cases should be used as examples to support this evaluation. Students should cover ther number of roles requested by the task.

AC 1.2 showed evidence of consistent marking from most centres and candidates' work was largely of a high standard here. The best examples were when candidates applied the assessment points to the 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 as well as explicit reference to types and situations of crime. Unfortunately, some centres failed to address this requirement, yet centres were crediting marks in the highest mark band.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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. Cases should be used to support the evaluation; however, case description should be concise as the focus is on the assessment of each technique.

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. It was pleasing to see that this confusion between the two ACs is becoming less frequent.
At times, this AC was marked generously by centres. 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, analyzed 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, yet full marks were awarded. The best examples successfully used case studies to support points and addressed all bullet points in the specification.

AC1.4 requires the discussion of all three individuals (suspects, witnesses and victims) from investigation through to appeal. Again, centres are still marking 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 individuals. 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

It was pleasing to see that most centres approached LO2 well this series and candidates are able to achieve marks in the top band for AC2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5.

The main point 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 for candidates to be awarded 4 marks. The full code test refers to the evidential and public interest test, but it is encouraging to see most candidates also include the threshold test. 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. At times this series, AC2.3 often omitted any reference to the hearsay rule and exceptions, yet centres were marking too generously and awarding full marks. Assessors should be mindful that all rules of evidence listed on the specification are required for full marks. The best examples were those that included accurate legislation and concise references to relevant case law.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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 as listed in the task is necessary. Should candidates not include the required range, then marks will be capped at mark band 2. Centres should also be aware that juries are not listed on the specification as an influence and cannot be credited. The best examples used cases well to illustrate the impact. Some responses were overly descriptive when referring to cases and failed to engage with the requirements of the AC by not thoroughly assessing the impact of each influence and not assessing how it affects the outcome of the criminal case.

AC 2.5 showed evidence of clear and consistent marking across most centres in this summer series. 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. Again, the AC focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of lay people, therefore description should be kept to a minimum.

LO3: Be able to review criminal cases

Centres and candidates are showing a better understanding of both AC3.1 and AC3.2 and they are increasingly using key terminology to examine and draw conclusions. At the lower end, some candidates are still merely explaining cases as opposed to critically examining them for validity or drawing conclusions. Unfortunately, for some centres, these ACs highlighted issues of plagiarism.
Centres must discourage candidates from overreliance 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 in any future series. Some centres are also marking too generously with these final ACs and should be mindful of the requirements of the mark bands.

For **AC3.1**, candidates, should aim to examine a range of information sources, including the assignment brief. Candidates often focus on validity (in general) but do not address the other criteria outlined in the specification: bias, opinion, currency etc. This emphasis on a range and the other criteria should be encouraged by centres moving forward. The best examples were candidates who examined a range of information sources (law reports, evidence, media reports, judgements etc.) thoroughly against the criteria set out in the specification before giving an overall judgement on validity. As mentioned previously in this report, detailed examination of the assignment brief should be included, at times this application was very limited and required development for full marks. Some candidates continue to describe cases and do not include a detailed examination whilst others were confusing reliability with validity.

For **AC3.2**, centres are reminded to encourage candidates to address all points in the specification (in an explicit manner) 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. It is pleasing to see that most centres are now discussing just sentencing, in the past this was often omitted and would limit the marks. Some candidates are being overly descriptive in this AC and regurgitating case facts as opposed to analyzing information to draw conclusions based on reasoned evidence.

Finally, where candidates commit any rubric offences across the assessment criteria (including more than the required breadth as requested by the task), assessors should only **mark the strongest elements of these responses up to the range required**. Centres should not seek to give additional credit to those candidates who include more than the required range.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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 and all requested documentation must be uploaded.
• 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.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Certificate

Summer 2022

UNIT 4: CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

General Comments

This was the first full Diploma exam since 2019, but many candidates were well prepared, producing some detailed answers and addressing the exact requirements of the questions. The questions covered a broad range of topics from the specification and enabled all abilities to access the paper. However, it was apparent that there were some candidates who struggled with the demands of a Level 3 examination, and this may be due in part to the lack of previous sitting of public examinations and the impact of the COVID pandemic and online learning.

Across the examination, there was evidence of candidates providing synoptic links to support answers. This included campaigns, aspects of the criminal justice system, criminological theories, and theorists from the other 3 units.

A continuing area for improvement is the need to increase awareness of the marks available for a question and the corresponding expected length of an answer. For example, Question 1(a) required **one aim** of the police service, but often, a development of the aim was provided. Similarly, the 4-mark Question 3(e), on forms of internal social control, often contained as much information, and often even more, than Question 2(c), which was focused on the courts as an external form of social control. To be able to succinctly focus their response on the specific demands of each question or part question is a central aspect of the examination skillset, and some candidates need to spend time working on this.

As per Unit 2, there was a serious issue with the legibility of some candidates' handwriting, which may have been exacerbated by the COVID pandemic and online learning. Legible handwriting gives candidates the best opportunity to clearly convey the point they are trying to make. Sadly, at times, handwriting was illegible and made assessment of the work extraordinarily difficult. Further to this, a substantial number of candidates exceeded the space provided for an answer in the examination paper, and then failed to use the additional sheets provided at the back of the paper. Instead, they tended to use separate additional sheets, at times, using a new sheet for each extension of an answer. This caused significant logistics issues, which were compounded by many of those candidates failing to correctly number – and sometimes failing to number at all – the response, making it difficult to discern to which question the extension material related. We ask centres to please remind candidates of the importance of this prior to the examination period.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 (a) This was a straightforward one-mark question requiring an aim of the police service in achieving social control to be identified. Popular answers included protection of the public, to uphold law and order, and to prevent crime. No further development was expected on a 1-mark identify question, but many candidates offered unnecessary additional material, developing this to include an explanation of how the police would go about achieving the aim. This wasted vital examination time.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) Despite this area being identified on the Advance Information notice, this question was poorly answered. Often it was interpreted as how does the police achieve social control, or what are their aims in achieving social control. Alternatively, some answers provided evaluative responses as to the success of the police in achieving social control. This was clearly an area of the specification to which many candidates lacked familiarity. What was required related to the local and national reach of the police, and how they go about their working practices. Whilst in the minority, better responses explained the number of police force areas, included examples of local areas and units such as the British Transport Police and the National Crime Agency, and explained that these had a national reach. Given the wording of the question, and in fairness to the candidates who responded to all parts of the question, marks were restricted if an answer failed to comment on the reach of the police.

(c) In contrast to the previous question, this produced many well-prepared and detailed answers. Better responses considered a range of agencies, namely the police, Crown Prosecution Service, and prisons and probation services. Typically, statistics on reduced budgets featured together with the negative impact. Very impressive responses included comments about the police investigating crimes that were quickly solved (for example, 2 days' investigation) as opposed to those taking longer (sexual assaults and rape taking 129 days' investigation). Also, there was reference to the downgrading of offences by the Crown Prosecution Service, so that cases can be dealt with by the less costly procedure magistrates' court. Weaker answers, which were in the minority, contained very generalised comments about reduced budgets resulting in less staff and less social control. Such answers contained little development of the consequences upon individual agencies and were awarded marks accordingly.

(d) Many responses to this question produced general comments about the role of the probation service with little evaluative detail. In other words, too much generalised description appeared without enough evaluation. Given the wording of the question, comparison with the police service also appeared and this, often, produced valid information. Better answers developed the consequences of part privatisation of the service with the work of the Community Rehabilitation Companies. This included impressive detail about the challenges they faced and subsequent termination of contracts. Detail such as statistics of reoffending rates and budget cuts helped to develop points made. As did examples of publicised errors, often with tragic results, such as the Connor Marshall case and the killings by Joanne Dennehy, who was subject to a probation order. Strong answers were linked to whether social control was achieved and included both positive and negative elements. Very weak responses confused the probation service with the Crown Prosecution Service.

Q.2 **(a)** This was a well-received question producing some excellent answers. Often the amount of information provided far exceeded that required for a 4-mark *briefly describe* question. Most answers went through the various stages, usually starting with the consultative stage, of a Green Paper and ending with Royal Assent. Some brief description of stages was expected to satisfy the demands of the question and hence a list of the stages failed to achieve full marks.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) **(i) & (ii)** These were comparable questions, each relating to one model of justice. Their strengths, weaknesses and development areas were similar. Initially it is important to comprehend which model is the focus of the question. There were many instances of the wrong model being considered and then attempts by candidates to ensure the answers were swapped between the two questions. Whilst the impact of the pressure of the examination room is understandable, it is an important skill to focus on the demands of the question. The questions are also other examples of too much information being supplied to relatively straightforward *identify* questions. A brief sentence or even a list is sufficient here, but many responses developed the answer to explain how the model worked. This again used unnecessary time. Alternatively, often both questions produced more than the three features required, despite no credit being available for the additional information.

(c) This question produced one of two answers, either clear and detailed or weak without a focus on the demands of the question. Better responses linked to the specifications, using and explaining terminology such as fear of punishment, coercion, and deterrence. They offered links to how the courts provide such control with aspects such as determining guilt and arriving at an appropriate sentence, which could include a restriction of liberty. Coercion could be used to ensure attendance at court and enforce the punishment. These elements, together with others such as shame and embarrassment, could be used to explain deterrence, both individual and general. Weaker responses merely described the court system's make up and the personnel involved.

(d) This was question led to the weakest responses. A typical answer described the process a criminal case takes as it proceeds through the criminal justice system. A range of agencies and their roles were included, whether they featured in the question. Hence the work of the Crown Prosecution Service and probation service were often in an answer. Where answers focused on the roles of agencies, range of available marks was limited as this did not focus on the demands of the question. This style of question is challenging, but it is also familiar to the Diploma examination. Stronger responses, when they appeared, did not contain unnecessary information, instead describing the relationship between the three named agencies and how they work together. This could include the police attending the court for warrants, their provision of evidence, or their desire to extend the period of custody for a suspect. The police also work with the prisons, particularity near the end of an offender's sentence if information is required, especially through MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements). In addition, the courts and prisons must liaise where attendance is required by the remanded offender either in person or by video link. One frequent misconception is the belief that the police act as a transportation service taking the offender to and from the court and prison. If the offender has been denied police bail the police will ensure they are before the court at the first possible opportunity but thereafter, private security firms are used for transportation to prison and return to the court. Only occasionally would a police escort be required.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Q.3 **(a)** This was another example of overdevelopment of a response to a question that did not require it. Too many responses should have identified, but instead explained, and a list would have been perfectly acceptable. Popular answers of the role of a judge included keeping order in a court, advising the jury on the law, summing up at the end of a case and passing sentence. A common misconception was the judge deciding on the verdict in a jury trial.

(b) This was the last 3-mark identify question on the paper and, as with the others, often too much information was provided. The feature, of a financial penalty, was given but then developed with an unnecessary explanation: for example, an aim was stated and then developed into how it is achieved, or the nature of a fine was outlined with the possible consequences of such a payment on an offender. Popular responses included the suggestion that a fine would vary according to the circumstances of the offence or the offenders' personal circumstances, the aims of a financial penalty, and compensation for a victim. More sophisticated answers included a payment towards the prosecution's costs or an amount towards the Victim Surcharge Fund. A confusion that often occurred was the mistaken belief that a financial penalty included unpaid work.

(c) Strong answers for this question considered a range of different aims and linked them to Jake's offending and his prison sentence. Candidates easily referenced the nature of the offence and that grievous bodily harm with intent included danger to the public and hence public protection was achieved with a custodial sentence. Similarly, a good discussion of rehabilitation often included suggestions that prison would provide courses that would help reform Jake, courses such as anger management or in the development of social skills. Weaker responses confused the facts of the question and answered as if Jake has received a community order and discussed the aims accordingly.

(d) This was a question that allowed for extension of candidates' abilities, given that it required the higher-order skill of assessment. Weaker responses explained a range of aims and tried to link them to community orders. However, there was little evidence of judgements being made with evidence in support. Rarely, for example, did statistics appear to show if those who had served a community order reoffended. Or if those in prison had been previously subject to a community order, with the suggestion that they did not produce social control. Community orders were often considered as only relating to unpaid work with little consideration of probation generally, nor of rehabilitation conditions, such as education programmes, which can be attached.

(e) The final question on the paper was another example of a low-tariff question receiving more information than that required by its 4-mark demand for a brief description. Often the length of the answer matched, and at times exceeded, that of a 6-mark question. Whilst the answers were of a high standard, candidates would spend their time more productively – even when they know more information – moving on from a lower tariff question and focus on showing their skills in a higher tariff one. Many responses considered Freud's personality theory and the superego providing social control, traditions and values, religion, and upbringing. This question allowed for a range of specialist terminology such as internalisation and rational ideology, both of which regularly appeared in the answers.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Summary of key points

- Candidates should provide an answer that corresponds to the marks available for the question. This is to maximise the marks that can be awarded for high-tariff questions.
- Better responses address the command term in the question and provided supporting detail that addressed the demands of the question. Such detail may include statistics and examples.
- Centres should prepare candidates for questions arising from every aspect of the specification.
- Handwriting should be as clear and legible as possible, and all parts of questions should be clearly and accurately numbered.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.



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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.