

Level 3 Examiners' Report

Applied Certificate/Diploma in Criminology

Level 3

Summer 2024

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Introduction

Our Principal examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each unit.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.[1]

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	WJEC offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the WJEC subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and unit level. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each unit that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results, Grade Boundaries and PRS (wjec.co.uk)

[1] ***Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.***

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Exam Results Analysis	WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.wjec.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the WJEC subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner | WJEC

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Contents

	Page
Executive summary	**5**
Unit 1- Changing Awareness of Crime	**8**
Unit 2 – Criminological Theories	**15**
Unit 3 – Crime Scene to Courtroom	**20**
Unit 4 – Crime and Punishment	**26**
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	**31**

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Executive Summary

The examination and moderation teams were largely satisfied with the standards achieved this series.

Both examination units assessed all learning outcomes together with a range of assessment criteria and tested a broad range of topics from the specification that enabled candidates of all abilities to access the exams. The demands of both Unit 2 and Unit 4 were comparable to previous series.

Some common issues were seen across the internally assessed Units 1 and 3 and centres must familiarise themselves with the requirements regarding administration, including fresh attempts. Plagiarism was a significant issue, with candidates replicating class resources, internet materials and very often the textbooks. Detailed comments on mark record sheets and annotations in the work are essential to aid moderation. Centres' familiarity with assessment guidelines is crucial

Overall, the majority of candidates approached the **Unit 1** brief with ease and a good standard was seen, however, there are still ongoing issues.

- LO1 tasks were generally well-addressed, but some candidates did not properly analyse or explain unreported crimes, covering personal reasons better than social and cultural ones. In AC1.3, consequences must be discussed with examples, stating if they are positive or negative.
- LO2 AC2.1 comparisons often lacked links to candidates' campaigns, affecting marks. AC2.2 evaluations were good but there was increased plagiarism and overreliance on textbooks.
- LO3 highlighted over-marking and missing timelines in AC3.2, with inappropriate campaign topics. Candidates need to justify campaigns fully in AC3.3 with statistics and real-life cases.

Key improvements include:

- crime analysis (AC1.1)
- multiple media examples (AC1.4)
- use of comparative language (AC2.1)
- linking campaigns to relevant crimes (LO3)

The **unit 2** paper was generally approached with confidence and a good knowledge of the specification. Evaluation skills continued to improve, and stronger responses demonstrated effective and accurate use of specialist terminology. The following topics were often well-understood:

- Evaluation of criminological theories -1c, 2d
- Genetic theories of criminality - 3a(i), 3a(ii)
- How laws differ according to culture - 3b
- How campaigns affect policy making - 3d (Timing also had an impact here)

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Some candidates found addressing command terms difficult, in particular questions 1(a), compare and 2(c), assess.

Areas for improvement include:

- Familiarity with all aspects of the specification including sanctions (1a), any criminological theory stated in the specification, in this instance right and left realism (1b(i) and 1b(ii)) and why culture affects law making (3c)
- Understanding the demands of the question including the command term, marks available, number of examples required, and the topic being tested.

On the whole, high standards were observed in the quality of work submitted for the **Unit 3** controlled assessment. The majority of candidates displayed clear engagement with and application of the selected Brief in tasks 8 and 9 and stronger candidates demonstrated the ability to be selective in their use and application of case studies. This resulted in coherent, relevant, focused and well supported responses. However, too many candidates are continuing to provide lengthy narratives that lack relevance and application to the set tasks.

Key areas for development include:

- Select information for relevance when using case studies
- Reduce the reliance on pre-made materials, in particular textbooks
- Revisit key areas of the specification (including the amplification) to ensure the requirements of each AC are met.

Clear and detailed responses were seen across the **Unit 4** paper with top mark band responses showing detailed understanding of the criminal justice system and social control. Such answers used specialist terminology with ease and provided examples by way of support and development. When judgements are required to be made evidence of statistics, research or reviews would be expected to bring together knowledge, skills and understanding.

The following topics were well-answered:

- Description of the parliamentary (governmental) law making process - 1a(i)
- Identification of courts -1d, 2a
- Forms of punishments - 2e(i),
- Aims of punishment - 2e(ii), 3a, 3b
- Forms of social control - 3d

Some candidates found certain questions difficult to answer due to a lack of understanding of the topic area/specification:

- Judicial law-making processes - 1a(ii)
- Civil liberties and legal barriers - 1c
- Behavioural tactics and measures - 2c
- The judiciary - 2d
- Charities - 3c

Areas for improvement include:

- Ensuring command terms are followed -1b, assess and 2b, identify
- Be familiar with all aspects of the specification - 1c, 2c, 3c

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Areas for Improvement	Classroom resources	Brief description of resource
Selective use of case studies to support tasks/responses	PL resources Teaching for Successful Outcomes 2023-2024 available on the secure Portal	One session is based on the use of case studies and includes suggestions for the classroom.
Understanding demands of the question	Exam walkthrough Resource (eduqas.co.uk) Past papers and mark schemes	Aimed at learners, this Exam Walk Through resource offers practical hints and tips on how to effectively approach questions in the examination paper Demonstrates the range and style of questions that are asked.
Knowledge of all areas of the specification	L3 Criminology Specification Portal	The content and amplification sections should be understood. Additional guidance available on the resources area of the secure Portal.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

Summer 2024

UNIT 1 – CHANGING AWARENESS OF CRIME

Overview of the Unit

Comments made throughout this report 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.

LO1 tasks were generally well-addressed, but some candidates failed to analyse crimes properly or explain unreported crimes accurately. Personal reasons were better covered than social and cultural reasons. For AC1.3, candidates must discuss the specified consequences with examples and state whether they are positive or negative.

In **LO2**, in AC2.1 comparisons of campaigns often lacked explicit links to candidates' own campaigns, essential for higher marks. Teaching how to compare and use of key terminology would help. AC2.2 saw good evaluations but also increased plagiarism and over-reliance on textbooks.

LO3 highlighted over-marking, especially in AC3.2, and some candidates failed to include timelines in their plans. Candidates should produce a range of campaign materials and avoid inappropriate campaign topics. AC3.3 requires full justification for the chosen campaign, including relevant statistics and real-life cases.

Key points for improvement include:

- Analysing crimes from the brief and explaining why they go unreported
- Providing multiple examples for each media type in AC1.4
- Using comparative language in AC2.1 and fully evaluating four media types in AC2.2
- Linking campaigns to crimes in the brief and ensuring methods in AC3.1 are visible in AC3.2.

Familiarity with the Controlled Assessment Handbook and annotated mark scheme is essential for conducting and marking assessments accurately. Only the tasks being completed that day should be given to students.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Administration and presentation of samples

This was the third examination series where moderation was transferred to online only. Most centres have continued to deal with this change effectively, uploading the required documents promptly and in their entirety, including signed mark record sheets, the brief used by candidates attached to the highest scoring candidate (including any fresh attempt briefs used), and centre Quality assurance documentation. Some centres, however, are failing to comply with the instructions sent out by the WJEC and delays in moderation were seen as a result again this year. Centres must make themselves familiar with the process prior to submission to avoid unnecessary delays during the moderation process.

Administration issues seemed to be heightened this year and a number of delays were seen as a consequence. Incomplete samples, unsigned candidate declarations, and incomplete uploads of candidate work are not acceptable. There were far too many centres this year who used their own mark record sheet rather than the one supplied by the WJEC. Again, this is not acceptable and all paperwork that should be used is easily accessible on the WJEC website under 'non-exam assessment' - Level 3 Criminology (wjec.co.uk).

Please ensure that candidates work is submitted using Word or PDF to avoid access issues. A significant number of candidates presented their work for AC3.2 via a link. Under no circumstances should links be included in the candidates work. All work that is to be moderated should be presented to the moderator in an accessible uploaded form. Moderators will not and cannot click on external links so please ensure that copies of all materials produced for AC3.2 are visible to the moderator.

Centres should be mindful that where candidates have taken a fresh attempt during the **same** academic year, both briefs used and both pieces of work must be uploaded for the candidate. If the candidate is resitting in a different academic year this is not required as this is classed as a re-sit and is therefore not required.

Better examples of work provided detailed comments on the mark record sheet to justify the mark band awarded for each AC, highlighting the relevant mark band, inserting the mark and providing outlined focused comments in support of the performance on all mark record sheets submitted.

It is pleasing to see assessors again, 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.

Unfortunately, we are still seeing work that has no annotation at all. This is not acceptable. Annotations must be evident 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 some cases, centres merely noted the mark for each AC without providing any justification or comment on the mark record sheet and annotations were also omitted throughout the assessment. Annotation not only serves to support the assessor's decision but also assists in the moderation process. Failure to adhere to this makes the process very challenging for moderators as there is no justification behind assessment decisions.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Centres are reminded to take care when completing mark record sheets and when entering marks to avoid clerical errors, some centres had not paid attention to this detail, making significant errors when submitting their centre marks. Centres are reminded that marks awarded on the candidates' work must match the marks awarded for each AC on the mark record sheet and must also correspond with the overall mark submitted on IAMIS. Many times this series, this was not the case, and this delayed the moderation process for some centres.

Where centres have more than one assessor, internal verification should be completed to ensure consistency and adherence to standardised procedures across all assessors.

It is understandable that if there is only one assessor conducting the marking within a centre this IV process becomes difficult, however it is highly encouraged, perhaps in liaison with other local centres to maintain consistency.

This series, again, highlighted a few issues relating to plagiarism. Centres should be mindful of the resources that they use during lessons as these resources (class notes) are allowed to be used during the assessment, and naturally some replication occurs.

If lesson resources are identical to the textbook, it will cause issues of plagiarism during the moderation process. Centres should use the textbook as a guide only to avoid this issue. Plagiarism is taken very seriously and if found can impact greatly on the candidates' grades. The main areas where this is evident is AC1.5 and LO2.

As with previous series there were also instance of candidates purchasing or 'lifting' material from the internet.

This was mainly highlighted in ACs 2.1, 2.2 and 3.2 where students have access to the internet and there are ready made answers freely available. Centres should be mindful of this, and this should be picked up at the marking stage and assessed accordingly.

Centres are reminded that there are four briefs that centres can choose to use, and these are found on the secure website. Likewise, centres are reminded that candidates are not allowed to see their brief prior to controlled assessment.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

LO1
The ACs covered under this learning outcome were generally addressed well, showing a good understanding of the assessment requirements.

Task 1, which includes AC1.1 and AC1.2 requires the candidates to use the brief and analyse two crimes evident within it as well as explain reasons why those crimes (the two that they have analysed in AC1.1) go unreported. Some candidates tackled this well while others simply described the crimes and failed to analyse them using the criteria on the amplification, and also missing out whether it was deviant/criminal behaviour. Likewise, when moving on to explain the reasons why those crimes go unreported, some candidates wrote about other crimes going unreported and did apply the amplification.
Generally, as in previous series, personal reasons seemed to be covered far better by most candidates than social and cultural.

Task 2, which includes AC1.3, saw a mixture of answers from centres. While most are completing this to a good standard, there are still centres who are ignoring the consequences listed in the specification. Centres are reminded that it is these consequences that should be discussed with examples of each. Candidates must also state whether the consequence is positive or negative and at times this was missed, limiting marks available to those candidates.

Task 3, which includes AC1.4 and AC1.5 is still demonstrating some instances of plagiarism. AC1.4 produced issues of overmarking because of the lack of examples for each media type discussed and not all media types contained in the specification being covered. Candidate work should consist of clear description of the images and language used and a clear and detailed description of the difference between factual and fictional media. Candidates are also required to have more than one clear and detailed case study/example for each of the different media types. For example, for newspapers candidates may want to give examples of sensationalist headlines which are then supported by statistics on the images of victims or perpetrators used on front pages.

Again, when discussing impact for AC1.5, centres are reminded to follow the impacts that are highlighted in the specification. There are several centres/candidates who continue to address these two ACs as one. Whilst this isn't wrong, what we see when candidates attempt these together is a lack of depth to the task and more often than not, all impacts will not be covered for AC1.5, limiting the number of marks awarded.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

LO2
This section seems to be the most challenging for candidates; mostly regarding AC 2.1, comparison of campaigns.

AC2.1 requires candidates to compare campaigns for change and in order to reach the higher mark band; they must also make that explicit link to their own campaign (the campaign designed in AC3.1). Without this explicit link they cannot reach the top mark band.

As outlined in the specification, the content should focus on comparisons which can be linked to the following**, but does not have to cover all**:

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

Some centres were very well prepared for this AC and sample assessments did demonstrate a high understanding from candidates. The best examples were those where candidates selected four/five (including their own) appropriate campaigns for change and compared the campaigns in depth, addressing key aspects such as purpose, success, aims and methods used etc.

As outlined in the amplification section, 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.

Weaker candidates did not demonstrate comparison, and simply described the campaigns. Spending time in centre teaching candidates how to compare and what key terminology to use will be beneficial when delivering AC2.1. Where candidates did give a detailed comparison, they failed to reach MB3 due to not explicitly linking to their own campaign (this should be the same campaign designed in LO3). A simple mention of the candidates' campaign is not enough. They should be comparing all aspects of the campaign such as the purpose, the people behind it, campaign methods etc. against real life campaigns for change.

There were instances where it was clear that candidates completing tasks in order caused an issue with the comparison of their own campaign, as candidates simply forget to go back to AC2.1 once they had completed LO3.

To overcome this issue, centres can advise candidates complete task 6 before task 5. This should help overcome the issue.

AC2.2 was largely well completed by candidates. Evidence of good practice was observed in sample assessments where candidates evaluated four media methods with clear links to existing campaigns which offered supportive evidence and well-reasoned judgements. However, this year saw a further increase in plagiarism in this AC and over-reliance on the textbook

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

As this AC is worth 15 marks, the amount of written work should reflect that. Candidates should be giving a definition of the media type, along with a good evaluation of that media type (from a campaign angle not a business angle where the campaign is one of advertising products in order to boost profits or raise brand awareness), detailing at least three advantages and three disadvantages and including an example of a campaign that has used that method with a measure of how successful it was for that campaign.

LO3

This learning outcome was where we saw most of the issues concerning over-marking arising, particularly AC3.2 where one method/material had been produced and the candidate was awarded a mark in MB2/MB3. The annotated mark scheme will help guide centres in such circumstances and are advised to consult it before marking takes place.

AC3.1 was still a concern where candidates were seen to produce a well detailed plan but failed to include a timeline. This is imperative for all mark bands. Where candidates produce a Gantt chart, they must also include a description of their timeline/chart. A Gantt chart on its own is not detailed enough to award in Mark Band 3.

The most significant feedback linked to this learning outcome to come from this moderation series is the relevance of the chosen campaign for change. Candidates must be mindful when selecting a campaign for change. In some instances, candidates were creating campaigns which were not appropriate for changing behaviour or were not in line with the Unit 1 assessment task. This included campaigns on health behaviours, or crimes not on the brief such as knife crime.

Candidates must pursue a crime that is highlighted in red – please do not remove these from the sheet during reprographics, they are there to help the candidates.

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 (as outlined on the specification):

- Aims and objectives
- Justification of choice of campaign
- Target audience
- Methods to be used
- Materials to be used
- Finances
- Timescales
- Resources needed.

In most instances, the campaign materials which were designed as part of AC3.2 enabled candidates to achieve significantly high marks for this task. Evidence of excellent practice was observed by candidates who had designed several methods (minimum of 3) and demonstrated creative ability with the use of persuasive language, powerful imagery to stimulate interest and relevance to the appropriate campaign.

Some candidates had devoted a significant amount of time to this section and used research to create appropriate materials which would engage the target audience. In some weaker examples, candidates designed 1 form of media (for example: one poster) which was often limited in relevance and accuracy to the chosen campaign for change.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Centres should be reminded that for a 20-mark AC, the expectation will be that candidates produce a range of campaign materials.

It should be noted however, that the logo does not count as a method, nor do multiple examples of one method count as more than one method. For example, three different types of social media would be classed as one method – social media. A T-shirt and a wristband would count as one method- merchandise.

Centres can use any software they feel appropriate for their candidates to produce these materials, however, please be mindful of online applications that can be accessed outside of the controlled assessment room. If candidates are starting and finishing LO3 in the one session this is not an issue but if they start on one day and complete on another, they have the potential to access the materials at home and work on them outside of the stipulated 8hrs – be mindful of this.

AC3.3 requires full justification for the need for the chosen campaign. Most candidates did well here, with better candidates justifying their materials in AC3.2 and including stats and real-life cases in AC3.3 to help justify the need for their campaign. Weaker candidates simply justified their materials in a simple way, why a certain colour was used for example, and lacked evidence to support the need for their campaign through statistics and relevant cases. Candidates should avoid combining AC3.2 and AC3.3 with regards to justification (often by using annotations), as marks were significantly lower in these instances.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

Summer 2024

UNIT 2 – CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORIES

Overview of the Unit

This paper assessed all learning outcomes together with a range of assessment criteria. The demands of the paper were comparable with the 2023 series.

Overall, the paper was approached with confidence and a good knowledge of the specifications. Evaluation of criminological theories has been an improving area over recent years and this trend continued with the current series. A range of points were provided in responses that commenced with evaluation from the outset, without any description of the theory. In addition, the selection of incorrect theories to address a question appears to be diminishing, which suggests that centres are preparing candidates well for the examination. Effective and accurate use of specialist vocabulary was often a feature of top mark band responses.

It is important that candidates read the exam paper very carefully to ensure they understand the demands of the question. This includes the command term, marks available, number of examples required, and the topic being tested.

The following topics were well-understood or well-answered:

- Evaluation of criminological theories 1c, 2d
- Genetic theories of criminality 3a(i), 3a(ii)
- How laws differ according to culture 3b
- How campaigns affect policy making 3d

Some candidates found addressing command terms difficult, particularly compare (1a), and assess (2c).

Areas for improvement include:

- Familiarity with all aspects of the specification including sanctions 1(a), any criminological theory stated in the specification, in this instance right and left realism 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii) and why culture affects law making 3(c)
- Providing the correct number of examples 1(c), 2(d) – theories, 3(d) – campaigns

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 (a) This question required candidates to utilise the skill of comparison. Therefore, appropriate and relevant phrases were expected, such as, similarly, in comparison to, whereas, on the other hand, however, in contrast etc. Whilst many candidates produced a response with some of these, others treated the contents separately and merely described sanctions. Examples of sanctions were useful support for this answer, but some candidates incorrectly developed those examples and considered the merits of prison and community service. Another common error saw the suggestion that the sanction of prison would be allocated to criminals and community service to deviants. Reference to the scenario and in particular to Richard and Geta was not required and indeed where they did appear references to right and left realism detracted from the response. Good responses included examples of both types of sanctions and comments about formal/informal/ seriousness/ provider of sanctions and consequences. More sophisticated responses were able to identify that deviancy is most likely criminal, and therefore punishable by the courts, and also the fact that deviancy is often an aggravating factor and might justify harsher sentencing.

(b)(i) & (b)(ii) These questions tested a candidate's knowledge of right and left realism. Weak responses failed to identify any realism theory and often merely referred to the 'realism' theory. In addition, the incorrect type was assigned to both Richard and Geta. If this was followed by an appropriate description, of the correct theory, then an appropriate amount of credit could be awarded. However, where an incorrect theory was described, this clearly negatively impacted on the mark. Weak responses often included nothing more than a rewording of the scenario and some responses demonstrated no knowledge at all about the theories. Stronger responses expanded upon and supported comments in the scenario relevant to the type of theory. Centres should discourage candidates from providing evaluation where description only is required.

The difference between these two questions was the amount of description required. 1b(ii) was a brief description worth 4 marks and good responses adhered to this request, hence maximising time and marks available. Both questions produced some excellent specialist vocabulary which was very credit worthy. Terms included relative deprivation, marginalisation, subcultures and zero tolerance. It was also impressive to see references to theorists, even in the 4-mark answer. Weaker answers often focused on one key part of a theory, such as harsh punishments or zero tolerance. Stronger responses discussed a wide range of key factors, such as rational choice, class system, poor socialisation and biological disposition. Finally, a reminder to centres that there should be explicit links to criminal behaviour rather than behaviour in general.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(c) As requested in the question, both strengths and weaknesses were expected. If either of these were omitted this restricted the mark awarded. The mark would also be restricted if only one theory was evaluated, as the wording of the question required theories in plural. It was very pleasing to see most responses providing the correct type of theories. Only a small number of candidates failed to consider sociological theories, instead exploring individualistic and often the social learning theory. Biological theories rarely appeared. Whilst consideration is always given to both breadth and depth of an answer, it was indicative of top mark band responses to state the strength or weakness followed by an explanation of why it was a strength/weakness by way of development to explain the reasoning. Weaker evaluation tended to repeat the same points such as determinism or reductionism, ignoring other factors and then repeating these points in relation to multiple sociological theories. Whilst this may have shown some understanding, the repetitive nature of the evaluation impacted the ability to show a clear and detailed focus.

Q.2 **(a)** For this question both a theory and a policy were expected to be named. Too often a response merely suggested that a theory informed policy development, without any more specific detail. A link between the policy and theory was expected and was often given for Freud and psychoanalysis, social learning theory and film ratings or operant conditioning and token economy. Use of specialist vocabulary often helped secure full marks. Occasionally a non-individualistic theory appeared for instance, Lombroso and eugenics.

(b) Common errors included an incorrect type of theory (often Sheldon's somatotypes) or a failure to link the theory to domestic violence. Bandura and social learning often appeared but so too did copious facts from the bobo doll experiment. This had a negative impact on both time and quality of a response. Other popular theories included Skinner's operant conditioning, Freud's psychodynamic theory and Eysenck's personality theory. Again, effective use of specialist terminology was a common feature of answers placed in the top mark band.

(c) Effective answers were ones where a series of mini judgements were made during the assessment. Better responses used named research, findings or statistics to support their assessment. Successful answers also tended to discuss effectiveness in relation to deterrence, real life application, scope to explain many crimes and ability to prevent re-offending. Weaker answers occurred where candidates only explained the policy rather than assessing it. This showed a failure to interact with the command word effectively. It also showed a missed opportunity as often when responses made this mistake they explained the policy well, showing knowledge and their potential. Use of the token economy system in prisons was a common choice of policy and one that was often effectively assessed. Candidates considered the limited impact a token economy system would have outside of prison when rewards are discontinued. Other aspects were also considered such as a more pleasant and safer prison environment and how rewards can be manipulated and varied to effectively control behaviours.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(d) Candidates are approaching these type of evaluation questions in a very productive manner. The most effective responses start to evaluate immediately, whereas less effective responses provide a lengthy description of the theory followed by brief evaluation. Better answers considered a wide range of strengths and weaknesses specific to the theory, rather than very generic points such as determinism and reductionism. It was important to provide both strengths and weaknesses of each of the two theories to ensure compliance with the demands of the question. Development of why something was strength or a weakness provided the support that produced a clear and detailed answer and enabled the top mark band to be achieved. Often these standards of responses referred to the findings of key research and used the outcome/findings to show support for the theory. At times weaker responses tried to disguise the description of the theory as a strength. Candidates should be reminded that the evaluation refers to the theory's effectiveness in explaining the causes of criminality. Therefore, the strengths and weaknesses are not about the theories per se, but how effectively they account for criminal behaviour. Less effective answers described a connected study in detail, for instance Bandura's bobo doll experiment. Noticeably, in answers that evaluated psychoanalysis there was less of a focus on research and more effective points were put forward for aspects such as influence, use, time consuming nature/ethics and the unscientific/immeasurable nature of the psyche. The most common individualistic theories that appeared were the social learning theory, operant conditioning and the psychodynamic theory, and less frequent was Eysenck's personality theory and Kohlberg's moral development theory. Occasionally an incorrect type of theory was given such as labelling, Marxism, Lombroso's or Sheldon's theory.

Q.3 **(a)** **(i)** A straightforward question with many answers identifying the XYY theory, twin studies, adoption studies and Lombroso's born criminal theory. Sheldon's somatotypes theory was not accepted as it focuses on physiological features rather than genetics. Also, candidates occasionally provided a brief description of the theory but a question which asks for something to be identified only needs the name stating.

(a) **(ii)** Better responses to this question provided clear and detailed knowledge and understanding of a genetic theory. The XYY theory was a popular response, and an effective response was able to link aggression to increased testosterone, explain relevant features of an XYY male (relevant to criminality) and include the findings of Jacobs et al showing more of a prevalence in the prison population compared to the general population. Specialist vocabulary was often present, for example with twin studies this included terms such as monozygotic, dizygotic, DNA and inheritance. As is always the case with this style of question explicit links must be made to criminal behaviour rather than behaviour in general. When candidates selected to describe Lombroso's theory, they needed to make it clear that they were describing the theory from a genetic perspective rather than a physiological perspective. For instance, describing criminality as heritable, the 'born criminal', ancestral features as opposed to simply explaining the physiological features of a criminal.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) This was a straightforward and high scoring question. Both the name of a law/piece of legislation or an area was accepted. Popular responses included bigamy/polygamy, adultery, homosexuality and age of consent.

(c) This question focused on why culture affects law-making and not how laws are different between different cultures. Unfortunately, many candidates interpreted the question as the latter, hence their marks were restricted. Answers that correctly focused on the question explained how law-making was influenced by religion, the status of women, tradition and norms and values. Norms and values were often mentioned but not always developed or supported. More effective answers were able to select specific values or norms to add detail and show understanding. For example, the value of equality and diversity to explain laws relating to racial discrimination and the Equality Act 2010 or the value of independence and democracy to explain voting rights or abortion laws. Centres should be aware that this question resulted in stereotyped and incorrect answers regarding cultures. Centres should challenge such attitudes and mistaken beliefs regarding the widespread occurrence of crimes relating to honour and polygamy in non-western culture(s). A more informed understanding would allow candidates to appreciate that such behaviour is not prevalent and avoid suggesting that non-western cultures are inferior to western culture(s).

(d) Some candidates failed to appreciate that this question required the discussion of at least 2 campaigns. Where only one was included in an answer this resulted in restricted marks being awarded. There was plenty of scope to discuss various aspects of the success of campaigns. This included policies by name and desired impact, methods used to gain success, where support was gained from and how long it took to be successful. A lack of success was also credited. Popular groups included the British Lung Foundation, Black Lives Matter, Inquest, Snowdrop, Protection Against Stalking and Stonewall. Weaker responses provided very general comments about pressure groups producing campaigns to change policies, without mentioning a named campaign. All too often the story behind a campaign was detailed and described the policy sought in very general terms, rather than the specific title and full details of the policy. Alternatively, errors of fact were included showing a lack of understanding, such as candidates stating that under the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme it is possible to discover if a partner has any previous criminal history.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

Summer 2024

UNIT 3- CRIME SCENE TO COURTROOM

Overview of the Unit

The aim of the report below is to help centres identify areas for improvement for future cohorts and to improve quality assurance of not only moderating but of teaching across the qualification ensuring consistency is maintained and centres are aware of the standard expected. It is therefore necessary to include comments of a constructive nature and to identify issues within certain areas alluding to the administration and the marking of LO's. The comments included are not applicable to all centres and certainly do not detract from the overall high standard of work from many candidates and centres this series. Centres generally maintained the high standards expected for the controlled assessment, as well as following the protocols put in place for maintaining the level of control required. It was also evident that some centres have engaged well with the specification and prepared candidates using a varying range of resources to develop skills and knowledge.

The majority of candidates displayed clear engagement with and application of the selected Brief in tasks 8 and 9 and stronger candidates demonstrated the ability to be selective in their use and application of case studies. This resulted in coherent, relevant, focused and well supported responses. However, too many candidates are continuing to provide lengthy narratives that lack relevance and application to the set tasks.

Key areas for development include:

- Select information for relevance when using case studies
- Reduce the reliance on pre-made materials, in particular textbooks
- Revisit key areas of the specification (including the amplification) to ensure the requirements of each AC are met.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Administration and presentation of samples

Many of the issues set out under Unit 1 above are also relevant here, namely:

- The presentation of work for moderation – complete and correct samples, quality of scanned work, file format
- Key documents, including signed declarations and completed mark sheets, QA forms and briefs. Mark record sheets should not be modified. Only WJEC versions should be utilised and submitted
- Annotation- marks awarded must be clearly justified. Centres should identify where on the candidates work they have seen evidence to award marks and then describe their justification for awarding marks on the mark record sheet
- Clerical errors – centres MUST check that accurate marks are uploaded and tally with the paperwork submitted
- Fresh attempts – upload both
- Over-reliance on textbooks – continues to be a significant plagiarism risk. Candidates should make their own notes in their own words to avoid plagiarism
- Internal standardisation - Centres should ensure consistency across assessors

Centres need to be directed to the importance of their Moderator report and the Principal Moderator report not only for last year but all previous series. Some persistent areas for improvement that were highlighted last moderation series (2023) were at times not addressed in this series, which subsequently limited marks for candidates. For new centres the importance of moderator's reports is also paramount. Centres should refer to the guidance on the WJEC website as well as the JCQ guidelines in order to determine how to conduct the controlled assessment, but also how to mark and moderate the work submitted, including the uploading and presenting of candidates work.

The structure of candidates' work was very clear and coherent on the whole with most of them completing their assessment in a report format. Use of headings and sub-headings which followed the assessment criteria wording were particularly useful and should be encouraged by all centres.

The majority of centres adhered to the strict protocols laid out when conducting the controlled assessment however, some centres need to give this further attention. All work should be the candidates own, and candidates should not rewrite textbook paragraphs. Centres can of course use the WJEC endorsed textbooks within lessons, but candidates should not be using the full textbook or extracts from within it when in the controlled assessment, and this should not make up the majority of a candidate's response. If this arises the centre should take appropriate action when awarding marks by highlighting the plagiarised work and restricting marks accordingly. This has been seen more frequently than in previous series and is especially prevalent in LO3. AI is also an issue to consider. Please note that it is the centres duty to be vigilant when teaching and assessing.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Candidates showed a clear engagement and application of the assignment brief/scenario. However there has been an increase in references to the 'Gareth Hughes case' which is not a real-life example of any crime and was created as a brief for the WJEC- therefore candidates should not be referencing this at all. There has also been an increasing number of centres who expect the brief to be included for all ACs and who impose mark restrictions if this is not done. Please note the brief is only required for LO3 (tasks 8 and 9) and candidates should not be penalised if they do not do this in other tasks/ACs. It should be actively discouraged as an ineffective use of candidates' time. Where candidates do this in LO1/LO2 please ensure it is credited to LO3, if relevant.

Higher level candidates showed the ability to be selective in their use of information avoiding irrelevant lengthy narratives of case studies. Stronger candidates also engaged with the assessment criterion using key terms consistently and effectively throughout. One point to note with regards to this is the inference of content. Assessors should not infer if a candidate is referring to a key term and the candidate needs to do this explicitly in order for it to be credited, this is most often seen in LO1 and LO3.

LO1

Once again candidates largely demonstrated an excellent understanding when approaching this learning outcome and again it was evident centres have been delivering this AC to a high standard to ensure candidates have a deep knowledge and understanding of the topic area. However, the moderation team again saw some issues within LO1, and these have largely been raised in previous series.

AC 1.1- The command word of this AC must be addressed, and candidates cannot be awarded high marks for describing the roles of personnel. The focus of the AC is on investigation so content focused on trials and court cases should not be highly awarded. The effectiveness should be considered in the context of potential limitations: cost, expertise and availability, as laid out in the specification. This was often omitted by candidates, or the attempt made was largely superficial. Also, some candidates included these key concepts but not in an evaluative manner, simply stating or describing the cost, availability, and expertise, and again this does not meet the demands of the command word. Case examples can at times overwhelm this AC, cases can be included to further develop points and expand evaluation, however over described case studies hinder the ability of the candidate to evaluate and assess.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AC 1.2- Candidates should assess the required range of investigative techniques in terms of their effectiveness in criminal investigations. Again, investigation and not trials should be the focus. Eye-witness testimony (EWT) often references juries heavily in the evaluation, if this is the case then the content is potentially a repeat of AC 2.4/3.1 and lacks focus on this AC. On the whole the responses were of a high standard. A point to note moving forwards is that all interview techniques (EWT and experts) are counted as one technique as well as all surveillance/profiling etc. Similarly, if DNA is assessed as a forensic technique, it cannot be further assessed in databases.

Therefore, centres are encouraged to find new topical content to apply yearly, this can include gang matrix, Interpol databases etc for databases and computer forensics and data mining for forensics. Again, case studies should be included to enhance the assessment of the various techniques and candidates should be discriminatory in the content they chose to include. The majority of candidates also discussed the effectiveness of investigations in terms of situations and types of crime, this can be seen in case studies, however all candidates should make reference to this in order to further develop answers in accordance with the specification. A number of instances were seen where this was omitted but full marks were awarded. Type/situation does not have to come from the ones identified within the specification however it does need to be explicitly seen and cannot be inferred as being present by the assessor. 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 and a summary of type/situation effectiveness to conclude.

AC 1.3- In response to previous years' Moderator Reports, centres are attempting to address concerns surrounding transfer, but this has often resulted in extremely lengthy responses. This is not necessary and does not ensure the key content is covered and also reduces the ability of candidates to use their time effectively. Centres should 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, this does not need to be balanced and more content can be seen for physical than testimonial as long as all key concepts are covered. Often only one type of evidence was discussed or only the collection was identified. Candidates should refrain from typing up a list of how different types of evidence are collected as shown in the textbook, nor should the rights of witnesses when giving evidence in court be included for testimonial processes. Testimonial evidence is often reducing the quality of responses as it focuses on vulnerable witnesses, hearsay evidence etc which does not meet the criterion of collection, transfer etc. Transfer of evidence is an ongoing issue with 'transferred to the lab' being the only mention in some work. This is not sufficient to warrant high marks, and centre should refer to previous reports and PL materials for further guidance on this. Case studies are required for this AC with one to support physical and one testimonial evidence including a link to the processes for the case study.

AC 1.4- This was generally done well and reflected clear and detailed understanding. Candidates tended to discuss all three individuals however these were not always discussed in terms of arrest to appeal as identified in the specification, suspects are often included but appeal for victims/witnesses is often omitted, and this is not identified by the centres with full marks still been awarded. The unduly lenient scheme can be considered for both victims and witnesses as a concept of appeal.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

LO2

LO2 saw excellent practice and candidates demonstrated knowledge of and engagement with the specification, including the amplification section, which resulted in impressive candidate work. However, some centres demonstrated a high reliance on the textbook for this LO and this should be discouraged. Although this was widely seen, candidates should ensure they include relevant case law for ACs 2.1 and 2.3 to ensure a full description is evident. Candidates should also resist the urge to use bullet points as this can affect the clarity and depth of what is being described.

AC 2.1 does not require reference to the threshold test and candidates are often having marks restricted when they do not include it. This is not a requirement of the specification, and marks must not be removed for this. Reference to both pieces of legislation is a requirement.

AC 2.2 can have personnel embedded within the response and does not need to be a separate section within the AC. This helps ensure candidates are able to use their time more effectively in other larger ACs. Criminal and legal procedures were often embedded within the AC.

AC 2.3 requires hearsay and expectations as stated in the specification, exceptions is often omitted but this is necessary for full marks. Legislation again can be embedded throughout and is not needed as a separate section.

A.C 2.4 showed exceptional examples across the cohort however, some candidates discussed the various factors in a similar way to their discussion within ACs 3.1 and 1.2. Candidates should focus more on how this many influence a criminal trial and the outcome the jury may give. Candidates should assess their impact and again use case studies to enhance and extend responses, the significance of this impact should be the primary focus. Higher level responses included relevant criminal cases to support the assessment given such as Christopher Jefferies, Colin Stagg and Sally Clark etc.

However, candidates should again be mindful and to select key information to support points and not describe full cases. Often case studies become the main focus, and this detracts from the needs of the AC. Please also note juries are not counted as the judiciary so cannot be discussed as a separate influence. They can, however, be discussed in reference to judge's/barrister's/media influence upon them. It is also more apparent that the textbook is again used heavily by centres to inform candidates responses which should be actively discouraged.

AC 2.5 tends to be extremely well attempted and completed to a high standard across candidates with clear evaluation and supporting case law/evidence. However, again a point to note is to reduce the reliance on the textbook for candidate responses.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

LO3

The feedback for this LO is generally the same as previous series and centres must address these issues to ensure candidates' success.
On the whole candidates clearly distinguished the two AC's attempting each individually and in detail with separate references to the brief.

AC3.1 showed considerable consistency across centres and candidates. The majority of candidates were clearly well-prepared as a range of information sources were examined and many candidates dealt with bias, opinion, currency, circumstance and accuracy. Relevant case studies were often applied effectively and included Jeremy Bamber, Amanda Knox, the Hillsborough disaster, Christopher Jefferies, and Sally Clarke and Roy Meadows etc. and some centres showed excellent practice by including a variation of new and emerging cases. Weaker candidates largely described cases without including the required key terminology. Candidates must explicitly reference bias, opinion, circumstances, currency and accuracy as this must not be inferred by the assessor. General reference to validity or validity discussed holistically is not enough to warrant full marks. An over-reliance on the textbook was seen within this AC which often meant candidates included information that is not relevant, and candidates were producing the same content across the cohort.
Please note not all information sources are required.

AC3.2 Overall this was addressed with clarity and most candidates demonstrated excellent skills to draw objective conclusions, whilst including supporting evidence. Centres should be aware of the necessity for a range of sources and candidates should not rely solely on the assignment brief. It is important to engage with the scenario, but a plethora of different resources can be identified as appropriate. An over-reliance on the textbook is becoming more evident within this AC yearly, which has again led to duplication of content across cohorts.

Candidates should draw conclusions based on safe verdicts, just sentencing and miscarriages of justice and an explanation on why a case is a miscarriage of justice etc. is essential. Candidates can also discuss unsafe verdicts/sentences etc.to facilitate them demonstrating their understanding of 'just'. As is the case with AC3.1, if content for AC 3.2 is seen within LO1/LO2 this should be credited to LO3 if appropriate, with clear justification/annotations to support.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3

Summer 2024

UNIT 4 – CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

Overview of the Unit

Overview of the Unit

The demands of this question paper were comparable to previous series and the paper was a suitable and fair test for the candidates at Level 3. All learning outcomes were assessed together with a range of assessment criteria. The question paper provided a broad range of topics and enabled candidates of all abilities to access the exam.

There were many clear and detailed responses showing that centres had prepared candidates well. Top mark band responses showed detailed understanding of the criminal justice system and social control. Such answers used specialist terminology with ease and provided examples by way of support and development. When judgements are required to be made evidence of statistics, research or reviews would be expected to bring together knowledge, skills and understanding.

The main area that requires development relates to knowledge of all parts of the specification. There were some questions which candidates found very difficult to answer due to a lack of understanding of the topic area. All question areas are outlined in the specification, and many have examples of features to be studied. Any of these topics could be tested on an exam paper and therefore need to be taught by centres.

The following topics were well-understood or well-answered:

- Description of the parliamentary (governmental) law making process 1a(i)
- Identification of courts1d, 2a
- Forms of punishments 2e(i),
- Aims of punishment 2e(ii), 3a, 3b
- Forms of social control 3d

Some candidates found the following questions difficult:

- Judicial law-making processes 1a(ii)
- Civil liberties and legal barriers 1c
- Behavioural tactics and measures 2c
- The judiciary 2d
- Charities 3c

Areas for improvement include:

- Ensuring command terms are followed - 1b, assess, 2b, identify
- Be familiar with all aspects of the specification -1c, 2c, 3c

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 (a) (i) & (ii) Both of these questions were linked to law making but required very different answers. Responses to the parliamentary (governmental) law making question usually had 2 stages described but not always accurately. Common stages included the committee and royal assent stage, perhaps because these contain specific actions not found in the other stages. An error seen was a failure to address the requirements of the question by providing a list of all the stages with little description. Whilst most candidates demonstrated knowledge of the stages in 1a(i), the same could not always be said for part (ii). Some responses repeated parliamentary stages or confused aspects of judicial precedent with statutory interpretation. Centres should note that when a legal case is included, brief facts to support the answer may be useful but full details of a case are rarely needed and detracts from the answer. Stronger responses included both types of judicial law making with an accurate definition supported by brief details of how they operated. Many responses included the rules of interpretation and methods of avoiding precedent.

b The key focus of this question was to assess and not describe. Purely descriptive responses were restricted in marks as they only partially addressed the demands of the question. Some answers started by unnecessarily defining both community service and deterrence. Answers generally centred on the unpaid work aspects of a community order and omitted many other conditions such as supervision by probation services, residence, curfew and drug/alcohol treatment programmes. Such conditions do focus on deterrence, especially when tailored to a defendant, and so would have been very relevant. However, candidates were able to include how unpaid work was embarrassing due to the wearing of high visibility jackets and the deterrent impact of spending time carrying out work that was unpaid. Weak responses merely asserted that community orders provide deterrence but failed to include much by way of support. A top mark band response would develop to include statistics about the effectiveness of community orders, especially when compared to prison sentences and the percentage of successfully completed orders. Some responses also looked at the lack of a deterrent effect and cited the number of people in prison with at least one previous community order and the number of breaches that occur.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(c) Many found this to be a challenging question. Unfortunately, many responses showed that candidates were unfamiliar with this area of the specification and wrote about irrelevant aspects such as internal and external social control, limitations of funding for agencies and ineffective punishments resulting in high re-offending rates. There was also a lack of accurate reference to authority such as the provisions in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 and articles in the European Convention on Human Rights. Stronger responses included support from the right to silence, right to free independent legal advice, stop and search provisions, article 6 right to a fair trial, article 10 freedom of expression and article 11 freedom of assembly and association. Some responses were able to cite some of these provisions but could then not link to how they impacted on the achievement of social control. However, better answers explained that the exercise of them usually resulted in restrictions on the agencies of social control, such as the police and this in turn can lead to criticism where criminal behaviour results. The example of Abu Qatada often appeared but accuracy varied. Very strong answers were able to accurately consider civil liberties and legal barriers separately and give examples of the impact of each.

(d) A high scoring response with many appropriate answers. There were very few incorrect answers, but they did include House of Commons and the minor court.

Q.2 **(a)** The magistrates' court was the only acceptable answer. Some candidates wrongly stated the crown court, criminal court, appeal court, parliamentary court and smaller court.

(b) Either the name of a relevant agency or the associated personnel would be an acceptable response to this question. Rarely was an incorrect response given but duplicate answers were not acceptable, such as the judiciary and a judge or the Crown Prosecution Service and a prosecution lawyer. Some candidates felt the need to write about the personnel and/or agencies but an identify question only needs the name stating and no further detail.

(c) A minimum of two tactics and measures were required to meet the demands of this question and many candidates focused on token economies and anti-social behavioural orders. Strong responses, which featured ASBO's, were well developed and included a description of the conditions and faults of an ASBO and a description of the replacement criminal behaviour order (CBO) with an examination of its positive nature. The question clearly stated behavioural tactics and measures were required, but some candidates wrote about environmental measures. Candidates must remember to focus on the demands of the question and appreciate the different aspects of the specification.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(d) A common error of this question was to mistake the judiciary for the jury. They are two very different sections of the criminal justice system and weaknesses of the jury were not credited. At times responses were rather general with comments about bias due to age and gender. However, better responses brought in statistics and linked those to not being representative of society and thus could impact on social control. As well as gender and age weaknesses also included ethnicity, social background, education and other aspects that impact diversity. Unduly lenient sentences were often included in better answers together with cases to support. However, weaknesses that were out of the control of the judiciary such as re-offending rates, the delays in the court system and conviction rates were not appropriate. Stronger responses were supported by statistics or examples and explained the impact of the weakness on social control.

(e) **(i) and (ii)** These questions were generally well answered but a frequent error was to identify an aim of punishment, such as rehabilitation or retribution, rather than an actual punishment. Prison was the most popular punishment, which was unsurprising as it had to be linked to the protection of society. The majority did link to this aim and tried to explain the connection mentioning such aspects as being locked up, removed from society, not causing society any more harm and inability to re-offend. Better responses also explained about the positive impact of rehabilitation, whether in prison or not, and gave examples of how this could be achieved to then bring about protection of society. It was also pleasing to see reference to the criminological theory of left realism. Other than prison, punishments included electronic tagging, chemical castration, community orders and the death penalty.

Q.3 **(a)** To meet the demands of this question a reference to the prison sentence was expected, but not necessarily to Goldie. In addition, at least two aims should have been considered, as required by the question. An explanation of only one aim would result in restricted marks being awarded. Rehabilitation was a popular choice with a suggestion that Goldie may have accessed courses during her time in prison. Both individual and general deterrence were also detailed with comments about Goldie being deterred from re-offending due to the conditions in prison and the general population being deterred by seeing Goldie being given a custodial sentence. Weaker responses merely mentioned either the facts from the question without reference to an aim or mentioned an aim without linking it to the prison sentence. Better answers worked through a range of aims explaining how they connected to the punishment of the prison sentence.

(b) Only a brief discussion was needed for this question, with no need to refer to either Goldie or a prison sentence. Despite this, prison was often referred to with a link to attempts at providing rehabilitation through treatment programmes. Strong answers also provided comments and statistics about re-offending to suggest that rehabilitation is often unsuccessful. The theory of left realism was often cited, as was drug, alcohol and skills training treatments. The main fault was that many responses were too brief, with limited information failing to reach a reasonable focus.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(c) Strong responses produced examples of charities with an illustration of a successful initiative. For example, Unlock and 'Ban the Box', the Prison Reform Trust and 'Care not Custody and' the Howard League for Penal reform and their 'Books for Prisoners' campaign. Weaker responses examined charities in general, suggesting that they provide help such as education and accommodation without any specific supporting evidence. It was noticeable that many answers described the issues behind the 'End Friday Releases' campaign by NACRO, which would dominate an answer, detracting from the focus of the question. Such answers could be improved by less detail on the issues of Friday releases and by bringing the response up to date with the inclusion of the Offenders (Day of Release from Detention) Act 2023. Comments about factors which negatively impact a charity's success were also credit worthy and such aspects included funding through donations, competition from a number of similar charities and a lack of power to force change.

(d) This appeared to be a very popular and well answered question. Many good answers included both internal and external social control with examples to aid the explanation. Another feature of a top mark band response was the effective use of specialist vocabulary such as fear of punishment, coercion, tradition, internalisation, rational ideology, moral compass etc. Often control theories were present, mainly those put forward by Travis Hirschi and Walter C Reckless.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.
Tel: 029 2240 4287
Email: criminology@wjec.co.uk OR criminology@eduqas.co.uk
Qualification webpage: Level 3 Criminology (wjec.co.uk) OR Criminology Level 3 | Eduqas

See other useful contacts here: Useful Contacts | WJEC

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/

WJEC Qualifications

As Wales' largest awarding body, WJEC supports its education community by providing trusted bilingual qualifications, specialist support, and reliable assessment to schools and colleges across the country. This allows our learners to reach their full potential.

With more than 70 years' experience, we are also amongst the leading providers in both England and Northern Ireland.

© 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.