EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LEVEL 3 CERTIFICATE AND DİPLOMA IN CRIMINOLOGY

AUTUMN 2020

© 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	5
Unit 3	8
Unit 4	11

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Certificate

Autumn 2020

UNIT 1: CHANGING AWARENESS OF CRIME

General Comments

Despite challenging circumstances, it was pleasing to see that so many centres have succeeded in maintaining the exacting standards set in previous series. The purpose of this report is to help centres identify areas for improvement for future moderation series. Comments made throughout this report are not to be taken as applying equally to all centres and do not detract from the overall reliable performance of many candidates and centres.

For the majority, the samples received showed an elevated level of understanding and engagement by the candidates. It was encouraging to see that candidates were well prepared for the controlled assessment and had responded effectively to the new task structure. Evidence of good practice was observed by centres which had thoroughly engaged with the assessment criteria by exploring both the content and amplification section of the specification. For some centres, the level of engagement with the specification should be developed for future series. In most cases, candidates' work was well presented and organised for the purpose of moderation. The better examples provided detailed comments on each mark record sheet to justify the mark awarded as well as concise annotations throughout the work itself. It is pleasing to see assessors engaging with key terminology found in both the specification and mark scheme. Best practice was evident in centres where assessors provided concise justifications as to why the candidate had achieved such a high-level performance or alternatively, reasons why the candidate could not achieve higher-level performance with improvement points listed. These better examples also highlighted the relevant mark band on the mark record sheet each time.

Centres should note that some work is still being submitted with no annotations at all; this is not acceptable practice. Annotations are expected within the main body of work to identify points of credit for each assessment criteria. This significantly assists the moderation process and is an approach all centres must adopt for future series. It is especially important where centres are cross-crediting, that is awarding credit for a given AC elsewhere in the work. Where this justification is not provided, it is difficult to follow the assessment approach adopted by the centre. In a small number of cases this year, assessors were awarding marks yet failing to transfer these marks to the mark record sheets. This led to a significant number of clerical errors at some centres. Centres are reminded to take care when completing mark record sheets and when entering marks to avoid such errors.

Each centre must also include a copy of the brief/s used at the centre and must submit a Quality Assurance Form. This Quality Assurance form details the internal verification/standardisation process at the centre and can be used to detail the assessment process at the centre, which may assist the moderator. Where centres have more than one assessor, internal verification should be completed to ensure consistency of marking and adherence to standardised procedures across all assessors. During this series, there were several cases where assessment decisions lacked consistency across assessors. This led to entire cohorts of work being called in for moderation. All centres are reminded that they must be able to comply with requests for further samples immediately. Centres will find further guidance on the Internal Standardisation process within the document *WJEC Instructions for conducting controlled assessments* on the WJEC website.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

All centres are advised to complete the required paperwork and collect the necessary signatures at the time of the assessment. Samples must also be dispatched to arrive with the moderators by the published deadline. It was disappointing to note the number of centres that did not adhere to these deadlines and did not complete the required paperwork in sufficient detail. The timely release of results will be put at risk if the deadlines for submission of marks/grades and correctly organised samples are not adhered to.

It was pleasing to see that centres have responded positively to the recommendations in last year's report and that issues relating to plagiarism have significantly reduced as a result. All centres should be mindful of the resources that they use during lessons as these resources (class notes) can be used during the assessment. If lesson resources are identical to the textbook and students become over reliant on these, issues of plagiarism may arise. Centres should use the textbook as a guide only; candidates must not paraphrase the textbook but use it as a launchpad for their own research so that they can prepare individualised notes for the assessment. The work produced in the assessment must be the candidate's own.

Comments on individual questions/sections

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

The ACs covered under this learning outcome were addressed with depth and clarity. However, candidates must be reminded to consider the marks available for each AC when managing their time in the assessment.

Task 1, which now includes AC1.1 and AC1.2 requires the candidates to use the brief and to 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; others ignored the "Analyse **two**" instruction and analysed up to four crimes, wasting valuable time. Candidates must be aware of the importance of responding directly to the task. No advantage can be gained by covering more of the specification than requested by the task. Likewise, when moving on to explain the reasons why those crimes go unreported, some candidates wrote about other crimes being unreported and did not link these ACs together. They were merely copying their notes and ignoring the instruction. For example, if the candidate completes an analysis of white-collar crime and honour crime for the first part then we would expect to see an explanation of why white-collar and honour crimes go unreported; covering both personal and social and cultural reasons for each. Candidates continue to overwrite for these tasks and should be advised accordingly by their teachers.

LO2: Understand how campaigns are used to elicit change

This section seems to be the most challenging for candidates. Nevertheless, it was pleasing to see an improvement from previous years. AC2.1 requires candidates to compare campaigns for change, and to maximise their score they must also make an explicit link to their own campaign. Without this explicit link they cannot be awarded marks in the highest mark band. As outlined in the specification, the content must focus on comparisons that can be linked to one or more of the changes identified by the specification. Some centres were very well prepared for this AC and some samples showed a high level of understanding from candidates. The best examples were those where candidates selected four or five appropriate campaigns for change (including their own) and compared those campaigns in depth, addressing key aspects such as purpose, success, aims, and methods used. As outlined in the amplification section of the specification, campaigns could include, for example, classification of drugs, euthanasia, abortion, and smoking. Covering a range of campaigns that aim to change, for example, policy, law, funding, and awareness also assists in giving candidates a wider understanding that may be useful when it comes to selecting and designing their own campaign in the controlled assessment.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AC2.2 was approached with accuracy by candidates. Evidence of good practice was observed in sample assessments where candidates evaluated four media methods with clear links to existing campaigns and offered supportive evidence and well-reasoned judgements. There are still some candidates who miss achieving full marks by not including a measurement of success with regards to the campaign example. This AC is worth 15 marks, and the amount written should reflect this significant weighting.

LO3: Plan campaigns for change relating to crime

This learning outcome offered the most thorough and well-thought out responses by candidates, with clear evidence of effective preparation by most centres. Overall, the quality of the campaigns that were planned, designed, and justified in this section was impressive. The most significant piece of feedback and advice to centres linked to this learning outcome is the relevance of the chosen campaign for change. Candidates must be careful when selecting their campaign for change. In some instances, candidates were creating campaigns that were not appropriate for changing behaviour or were not in line with the Unit 1 assessment task. The task asks candidates to create a campaign for change related to one of the crimes evident in the brief. It is vital that candidates do so as marks will be significantly limited if not. Where a campaign is not related to any of the categories of crime identified in the brief (all familiar categories from AC1.1), candidates must be limited to a mark within Band 1 for AC3.1. It was pleasing to see that some centres did recognise this and adjusted the marks accordingly.

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 full range of specification content seen in AC3.1.

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

In most instances, the campaign materials that were designed as part of AC3.2 enabled candidates to achieve high marks. Evidence of excellent practice was observed where candidates had designed several materials and demonstrated creative ability along with the use of persuasive language and 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 that would engage the target audience. In some weaker examples, candidates designed one form of media: one poster, for example, which was often limited in both accuracy and relevance to the chosen campaign for change. Centres should be reminded that for a 20-mark AC, the expectation is that candidates produce a range of campaign materials that show coherence. AC3.3 required full justification for the need for the chosen campaign. Most candidates did well here, with higher-achieving candidates justifying their materials in AC3.2; further, they included statistics and real-life cases in AC3.3 to help justify the need for their campaign. For some candidates, creditworthy elements of justification were observed in work produced for AC3.1.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Summary of key points

- Centres are reminded that all candidate notes must be stored securely between sessions. Candidates cannot augment their notes once the controlled assessment has begun.
- Samples for moderation must be sent via the deadlines published by WJEC.
- All samples must meet the requirements outlined by the specification and must include a copy of the assignment brief 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 provided clearly in the body of work and via the mark record sheet.
- Centres must be prepared to provide further samples of work immediately should WJEC request them. This is a condition of the assessment and failure to comply may jeopardise the awarding process.
- Candidates should only see the tasks required by them for a controlled assessment session. Most centres complete this Unit 1 assessment within two sessions of 3 and 5 hours, respectively. Within the first 3 hours, the candidate should only have access to Tasks 1 – 4. The remainder of the tasks can be distributed at the beginning of the 5 hours.
- In response to Task 1, the crimes that are analysed must be directly evident in the brief. Candidates should give reasons why these specific crimes could go unreported (covering both personal and social and cultural reasons) across the response.
- In response to Task 5b, candidates should fully evaluate four types of media and include an example of a campaign that used that media type. They should show the degree of success experienced by that campaign by relating it to a measure of success. For example, one candidate referred to the *Help for Heroes* campaign and how it had successfully used merchandise. The candidate showed that this success can be demonstrated by the £50,000 of revenue generated through sales.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Certificate

Autumn 2020

UNIT 2: CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORIES

General Comments

Despite the unusual nature of this examination series the overall quality was like that of previous years. While the number of entries was significantly smaller in comparison to previous series, overall candidates were well prepared and provided some excellent responses. These indicated that the paper was accessible to a wide range of abilities. Both centres and candidates should be credited for their positive approach to the examination after a period of uncertainty in education.
This was also the first series using the adapted mark scheme and mark bands. These proved to be very workable and enhanced the whole process.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 **(a)** Higher-scoring responses referenced the facts in the scenario to the theory described in the previous question. Linking to the gang's criminality was an essential aspect of this question. It is good practice to not repeat the theory but to link actions to the relevant aspect of the theory. This approach allowed all candidates to access available marks, even if they included an incorrect theory in the previous question.

(b) There were two requirements to this question and both were required to achieve maximum marks. Firstly, an understanding of a moral panic was required and secondly a reference to the Hart Mail's daily reporting. These two aspects were expected to complement each other. Many responses also included other examples of a moral panic, in particular reference to the reporting of clashes between the mods and rockers in the 1960s.

(c) In comparison to other questions this proved very challenging for some candidates. The expected focus was on methods of campaigns. Examples of campaigns could well enhance an answer if they were used to help explain the use of campaign methods. However, copious facts of campaigns were not the focus of this question and consequently such responses would not reach the top mark band. The responses that linked successful campaigns and their methods to policy development produced the desired answer. While actual policies were not required in this methods question, a small number of, usually very good, responses did provide them.

Q.2 **(a)** This was a well-answered question and one that was accessible to many candidates. Comparisons between the two terms – deviant and criminal behaviour – were evident in varying levels of quality. The higher-scoring responses used language that made it explicit that comparison was taking place. Lower marks were achieved by responses that discussed the two terms as separate aspects without looking at similarities and differences. No additional example of criminal, or deviant, behaviour was expected but many answers provided them to support explanations given.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Q.2 **(b)** The XYY theory was by far the most popular theory selected by candidates. Overall answers were of a good standard with clear and detailed responses allowing the top mark band to be accessed. Candidates managed to cope with the six-mark *describe* question appropriately, and in more detail than a four-mark *briefly describe* requirement. Higher-scoring answers tended to provide details of the research carried out by Patricia Jacobs, whereas, those at the lower end failed to link the theory to the reason for the commission of crime.

(c) This question allowed candidates to select any individualistic theory of criminality. The social learning theory and Freud's psychodynamic approach were both very popular. The demands of the question were accessed by most candidates. Again, with this type of question, a reference to criminality is expected.

(d) The command term *evaluate* clearly made this a demanding question, especially in comparison to other parts of Question 2. Candidates should be reminded that a description of the theory is not required and indeed, it is better practice not to do so. This allows for time to be devoted to evaluation. A top mark band response would include both advantages and disadvantages of a theory, even if not in equal measure. Candidates should be reminded to either look for an indication in the question of the number of theories that need to be covered. For instance, in some questions a set number may be provided. Alternatively, and as in this question, the prompt would be a plural as in *theories*. As such, in such a situation, a minimum of two theories would be expected.

Q.3 **(a)** Many candidates coped with the demands of this question and produced brief details of white-collar crimes. As required by the question a link to Harry was also required. While a list of crimes would not enable a response to attain full marks, only a little expansion of the offences was required. This may have been an attempt at providing a definition or explanation of the offences. Some responses also provided an explanation of white-collar crimes and the typical offender, again referencing Harry. A small minority of responses confused white-collar crimes with high-level offences such as murder, and consequently failed to receive any credit.

(b) At times, the demands of this question were only partially addressed. Many responses considered the question in terms of previous examination papers and explained, in general terms, how social changes informed policy development. However, this question required a reference to the scenario and the changing nature of crimes considering technologies developed in the 21st century. A failure to reference the type of crimes in the scenario would restrict the marks available to candidates. A top mark band response would include reference to the increasing number of crimes using technology, for instance the use of the internet and online fraud.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Q.3 **(c)** This was a question that, by its nature, facilitated a high attempt rate. It permitted the choice of any type of theory, be it sociological, individualistic, or biological. The more challenging aspect of the question was to use the chosen theory to explain why people – such as Harry – commit white- collar crimes. Consequently, it was not in relation to criminality but in relation to the stated type of offending. Stronger responses made this link and demonstrated their authors' ability to cope with the demands of this question. Freud's psychodynamic theory, social learning theory and Marxism were popular choices.

(d) The challenging aspect of this question related to the requirement to *assess*. This was not always attempted by candidates who provided detailed descriptions of various policy developments but did not include any assessment of them. Further, the question demanded two examples of policy development.

Many responses offered policies relating to Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). Other popular choices were CCTV or penal populism. While not specifically required by the question, some very adept responses provided sociological theories as the foundation to link to policies and the assessment of them. Right and left realism were frequently included in such responses.

Summary of key points

- Candidates are reminded to pay attention to the wording in the question, noting matters such as the required number of theories, policies, or plural/singular requirements.
- For the higher-order questions – evaluate and assess and so forth – candidates are reminded to not spend copious amounts of time describing as it merely restricts the time available to fully address the demands of the question.
- Where a question demands a specific link to the scenario or other stimulus material, candidates would do well to incorporate said link; this will enhance the quality of the answer and facilitate access to the higher mark bands.
- The use of specialist terminology is very important; its effective use is essential to access full marks.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Diploma

Autumn 2020

UNIT 3: CRIME SCENE TO COURTROOM

General Comments

Despite the challenging circumstances, centres generally succeeded in keeping the ambitious standards set for Unit 3 controlled assessment work. The hard work evident on the part of candidates and teachers is appreciated. It was clear from the samples submitted that centres continue to engage well with the specification and prepare candidates effectively for the controlled assessment. The aim of this report is to aid centres in finding areas for improvement associated with both the teaching and marking of these assessments. It is therefore necessary to include comments of a constructive nature and to find specific issues about administration of samples and the marking of identified Learning Objectives. The comments included are not applicable to all centres and certainly do not diminish the overall high standard of work seen from many candidates and centres this year. However, it is imperative that these issues, where they apply, are found and addressed during the next academic year.

Overall, centres sent work that was marked to a high standard with clear annotation and justification throughout. However, centres should ensure that sample work is sent to arrive with the moderator ahead of the deadline set by WJEC. In Summer 2021, the deadline for the submission of samples will be 15 May. All centres must ensure that marks are entered, and samples dispatched to arrive with the moderator on or before this date. Each sample must be accompanied by the required paperwork. This includes a copy of the assignment brief that was selected and a completed quality assurance form to detail the assessment process and internal standardisation procedures at the centre. All front sheets must be signed by the assessor and the candidate and the marks awarded should be clearly displayed. Often centres did not say which assignment brief had been used and did not include centre and candidate numbers on mark sheets. Please be reminded to ask all candidates to include their candidate number on their work. Once again, this year, candidates were able to apply their knowledge and understanding to the assignment brief/scenario of Gareth Hughes or John Smith. The highest-scoring candidates were able to embed concise references to the scenario, where relevant, throughout the main body of work.

Excellent practice was demonstrated when clear assessor annotation and justification of the marks awarded were recorded throughout the body of work and within the mark record sheets. Please note that the comments within the mark record sheets should be clear and detailed for each individual AC. These comments should not repeat the mark band descriptor as this does not show a clear and reasoned justification. Similarly, a mark should be recorded for each AC even if this is a mark of zero. All scores should be totalled correctly and double-checked. Most candidates structured their work clearly and coherently, completing their assessment in a report format that followed the AC order chronologically. All candidates used headings and sub-headings that followed the assessment criteria wording. This is particularly useful for the moderator and is appreciated.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Comments on individual questions/sections

LO1

AC 1.1 is marked accurately and consistently for the most part and centres are clearly engaging with the specification. However, a key point to note is that this AC requires an evaluation of each role in terms of its impact on the investigation and not the individual. Some candidates evaluated whether a person would want to undertake that role based on cost, availability, and expertise implications. This approach was self-penalising. **AC 1.2** often shows evidence of consistent marking but one key point to highlight is the application of expert witnesses within this AC. This Learning Objective is focused on criminal investigations and candidates should not be referring to the involvement of a judge or jury at this stage. Where these references are made, they should be credited within Learning Objective 2. At times, this error meant that candidates did not show the required range within AC1.2. Although **AC 1.3** carries fewer marks in comparison to AC 1.1/AC 1.2, candidates often did not obtain full marks here. They often listed how, for example, blood, glass, and fingerprints were collected but they did not cover other parts of the process and omitted other stages such as storage and transfer. This can be easily rectified through a general discussion at the outset of how evidence is collected, stored, analysed and so forth; this may then be followed by specific examples to support points. Often, the discussion of testimonial evidence also missed some of these crucial components. One thing carried forward from earlier reports is the importance of case studies within this AC. High-scoring responses successfully used two case studies consistently throughout this AC. Within AC 1.4, the common error of not discussing appeals for all 3 individuals continues to be made on occasion.

LO2

The work seen for AC 2.1 shows unambiguous evidence of understanding from most candidates. One thing to note is the necessity to include reference to the Prosecution of Offences Act 1985 and the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Both are clearly found within the specification. AC 2.2 and AC 2.3 are well-understood by candidates and consistently marked by assessors. The moderators often agreed with the assessment of AC 2.4; however, some candidates continue to over-describe case studies and do not sufficiently assess the key influences. Candidates can be given credit for relevant work seen in the write-ups of AC1.2, and this was often overlooked by the assessor. AC 2.5 shows evidence of clear and consistent marking across centres.

LO3

Based on earlier reports, signs of improvement were seen here during this moderation series. Candidates are showing understanding of both AC 3.1 and AC 3.2, and they are increasingly using key terminology to evaluate. At the lower end, some candidates are still simply explaining cases as opposed to critically analysing them for validity and conclusions drawn.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Summary of key points

- Centres are reminded that all candidate notes must be stored securely between controlled assessment sessions. Candidates cannot add to or augment their notes once the controlled assessment has begun.
- Samples for moderation must be sent via the deadlines published by WJEC.
- All samples must meet the requirements outlined by the specification and must include a copy of the assignment brief 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 request them. This is a condition of the assessment and failure to comply may jeopardise the awarding process.
- Centres should refer to the specification and ensure the content covered is relevant to the AC and/or Learning Objective each time.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

CRIMINOLOGY

Level 3 Diploma

Autumn 2020

UNIT 4: CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

General Comments

Despite the significantly reduced number of entries this October, the quality of the entries was like earlier series. Given the restriction experienced by centres and candidates it is to their credit that so many accessed and engaged with the paper. This was the first use of the adapted mark scheme and mark bands and they proved to be useful and enhanced the whole process.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.` **(a)** This question was well received, with candidates selecting a suitable charity working in social control. The Prison Reform Trust and the Howard League for Penal Reform were popular choices. The role of the agency was given a wide interpretation as per the specification. A small minority of answers did not access the question.

(b) Candidates who scored highly in part (a) also, usually, did so here. Only brief details were required as stated in the question. Funding was a limitation that often appeared and good responses developed the answer to incorporate the difficulty with obtaining voluntary donations or the lack of grants being available. The question required a description of *limitations* (note the plural), and as such, more than one limitation was expected. This could have included the need to compete with similar charities or the inability to force government to bring about change.

(c) The vast majority of candidates clearly understood the term recidivism and several impressive responses included figures showing the increase in the size of the prison population. Most responses connected constant reoffending to a lack of funding, education and so forth, which can lead to even further recidivism.

(d) This question complemented part (c) and allowed for the demonstration of knowledge of the issues in prisons that exist due to a lack of resources. Higher-scoring responses included: overcrowding in prison; issues with not being able to supply education; rioting in prisons, which also appeared in responses on occasions. Responses could be improved upon by simply showing that all such points mean a lack of rehabilitation.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Q.1 **(e)** Traditionally, candidates are challenged by questions of this nature and this year proved to be no different. Lower-scoring responses confused the role of various agencies and incorrectly stated their function in the criminal justice system. Many candidates described how a criminal case proceeds through the legal system, noting the role agencies play within the process. However, to achieve the top mark band it is important that the relationship between the agencies is covered. This relates to how they must work together, how they aid each other or how they function when a defendant is placed before a different agency: for example what the probation service may do when a defendant is at court or in prison. It also provided the opportunity for specialist terminology to be used.

Q.2 **(a)** This was well answered with many candidates achieving full marks. It should be note that nothing other than the feature needs to be provided. There is no need to explain the feature or give examples. It is more advantageous to use the time on other questions.

(b) The main omission from answers to this part question was a failure to link the aims of the community order to Ellie. Often, candidates were well rehearsed in discussing the traditional aims such as rehabilitation or retribution but did not mention how it could rehabilitate or provide retribution to Ellie. More effective responses showed a link between the high tariff (300 hours) and the issue of deterrence. Other important references included the public nature of community service, and thus the impact of denunciation on Ellie. Due to the wording of the question, at least two aims had to be considered. The highest-scoring responses effectively used specialist terminology.

(c) This question allowed candidates to produce some very impressive and high-scoring responses. Many included CCTV but this was not essential, as indicated in the question. Consequently, gated lanes and CPTED initiatives also regularly appeared. Many candidates also incorporated a discussion as to the usefulness – or otherwise – of the environmental measures to enhance their response. Slightly disappointing was the fact that there were few examples of the use of the measures. For instance, the use of CCTV in identifying suspects in the 2011 London riots or the use of gated lanes in cities such as Cardiff and Hartlepool.

(d) This question allowed candidates the choice of selecting agencies for which they have the most in-depth knowledge. The police, courts and the probation service proved to be popular choices. Many responses evolved into a discussion of how a case proceeds through the criminal justice system, and this is entirely proper, providing the roles of the agencies were discussed. The scenario supplied many prompts and links to Ellie's case. Low-scoring responses lacked detail, did not include specialist terminology, and held an inaccurate understanding of roles. For instance, a handful suggested that the Crown Prosecution Service sets the sentence in a criminal case.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Q.3 **(a)** **(i)** The overwhelming majority of candidates were able to access this question with ease and supply the information to achieve full marks. However, as a reminder, only the feature is needed: supporting information is not necessary for this type of question.

(ii) Similar comments apply as Question 3(a)(i). However, on this occasion a small number of answers confused the two models of justice and so could not achieve the available marks.

(b) High-achieving responses to this question utilised specialist terminology to address the demands of the question. For instance, the deterrent nature of losing one's liberty, the fear of punishment and the coercive nature of imprisonment was often provided. Weaker responses resulted in a failure to address the question at all, or produced limited and vague information.

(c) Many candidates clearly understood retribution and rehabilitation as aims of punishment and most responses included both terms. Retribution was usually covered in greater detail then rehabilitation. Higher-scoring responses not only explained them but provided links, such as driving while using a mobile phone. Responses at the lower end often lacked detail and had inaccurate information. Again use of specialist terminology enhanced an answer.

(d) Whilst this was a challenging question there were responses that focused fully on its demands by addressing the aim of public protection. However, many responses discussed other aims of punishment rather than consider the forms of punishment or different sentences available. The expected response, which was often seen, explained each form of punishment, for example custodial, financial, community and discharge, and considered how they provided public protection. There were several responses that supplied unexpected information that was, nevertheless, creditworthy. Such responses considered punishment particular to motoring offences such as disqualification from driving, retaking of a driving test and undertaking educational courses about safe driving. These responses showed a good depth of knowledge in this area. However, while knowledge was clear, a persistent weakness centred on a lack of assessment. More attention needs to be given to the key instruction in the question; candidates must be aware of the nature of assessment and what is required.

Summary of key points

- It is important for all candidates to have a clear understanding of the role of the agencies involved in social control and how they work together at different points in a criminal case.
- More attention needs to be given to the requirements of the question in terms of the command instruction, in particular the need to evaluate or assess.
- Specialist terminology is expected in answers and will assist in the awarding of the higher mark bands.

© 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.