

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 2

The evidence for this candidate achieved the following marks for each question and element of this course assessment component.

Question 9

You are researching the motivations of white collar criminals. To what extent would a case studies approach be the best method for investigating this issue?

In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples. You should include reference to an alternative method(s) in addition to case studies.

(15)

Analysis

This response was awarded **3 out of the 6** marks available for this element.

The candidate analyses several key aspects, including looking at how case studies give first-hand accounts, whether or not white collar criminals might lie to garner support. The response then goes on to explore interviews as an alternative methodological approach, arguing this may be better as clarification of issues are possible and the method can be repeated. However, the response is capped at three for this element, due to a lack of relevant and contemporary supporting evidence. Some aspects which are discussed, including travel time, are judged to be irrelevant.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **6 out of the 6** marks available for this element.

The candidate's evaluative comments clearly address the scenario in question and show both the benefits and limitations of case studies and the candidate's own chosen alternative methods – interviews and covert observation. The coverage includes exploration of the narcissistic tendencies of white collar criminals and how this actually aids the information that is likely to be gleaned. It also evaluates interviews and covert observation, though use of the latter is likely to be quite difficult in this scenario. Ethical issues of harm are covered too.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **2 out of the 3** marks available for this element.

The conclusion makes it clear that structured interviews are the preferred method. Comparison of the three methods discussed is presented. However, there is a lack of supporting evidence and depth to the overall conclusions which limits it to two marks for this element.

Overall, this response was awarded 11 out of 15 marks.

Question 10

To what extent can source B be considered trustworthy?

(15)

Analysis

This response was awarded **4 out of the 6** marks available for this element.

The candidate analyses key aspects of the source, including the authorship, demographics and the date of the source. The points about telephone surveys and the link to the original publication are not expanded upon fully enough, which would have allowed the candidate to score more highly in this element. The structure of having a 'positives' paragraph, followed by a 'negatives' one limits the depth and quality of analysis and evaluation made.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **5 out of the 6** marks available for this element.

There are evaluative comments made about the political slant of the government, including the candidate's own knowledge about conducting research, ie Freedom of Information (FOI) requests and the Brexit example. Judgements are made that the sample size and date of the source make this less valid, as does the wholly white demographic and the date. Reference is made to being able to check the information and further clarify it, which helps move this response into the 5-6 marks zone, although this aspect could be further explored and developed.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **2 out of the 3** marks available for this element.

The conclusion makes a clear quantified judgement about the extent to which the source can be trusted and lists the advantages and disadvantages covered that led them to this conclusion. This was judged to be enough to score two marks, but further depth is needed.

Overall, this response was awarded 11 out of 15 marks.