16.1 Defining and Measuring Crime, and Offender Profiling: 30-minute Pack

AQA 7182 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 Outline cultural relativism and provide an example.

(Total for Question 1 is 2 marks)

2 Outline a strength of official statistics for measuring crime.

(Total for Question 2 is 3 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 Explain the dark figure of crime and its importance.

(Total for Question 3 is 3 marks)

---

4 Discuss the strengths and limitations of offender profiling, covering top-down and bottom-up approaches and implications for policing.

(Total for Question 4 is 16 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 16.1 Defining and Measuring Crime, and Offender Profiling: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

outline: cultural relativism is the idea that definitions of crime vary between cultures, depending on local norms and values oe — **B1**

example: e.g. in some countries drinking alcohol may be illegal or heavily restricted while in others it is lawful and socially accepted oe — **B1**

Answer: Cultural relativism: crime definitions depend on cultural norms; for example, alcohol consumption may be legal and normal in one country but illegal in another.

Question 2

identifies a strength, e.g. they provide consistent, standardised records over time across large areas oe — **M1**

explains how this helps, e.g. allows trends to be tracked and resources to be allocated by police and policymakers oe — **A1**

adds consequence: this can support planning and comparison between regions oe — **A1**

Answer: Official statistics are routinely collected and standardised, allowing trends to be tracked over time and comparisons across regions, which helps police and policymakers allocate resources.

Question 3

defines the dark figure: offences that occur but are not reported to or recorded by the police oe — **M1**

explains why it matters: it means official statistics underrepresent true crime levels and may mislead policymakers oe — **A1**

gives consequence: reliance on official figures alone can lead to poor resource allocation or misunderstood crime patterns oe — **A1**

Answer: The dark figure refers to crimes that go unreported or unrecorded; it matters because official statistics then understate true crime levels, potentially misleading policy and policing decisions.

Question 4

Level 4 Knowledge of offender profiling is accurate and detailed. Discussion evaluates both top-down and bottom-up approaches using empirical evidence and methodological critique. Arguments are balanced and interactive, considering practical utility, limitations such as scientific basis and reliability, and ethical or operational implications. The answer is coherent, focused and uses specialist terminology effectively. — **13-16**

Level 3 Knowledge is generally accurate with some detail. Discussion includes strengths and limitations of one or both approaches and offers some evaluation, but may be less well balanced or detailed. Some application to policing practice is included. The answer is mostly clear and organised. — **9-12**

Level 2 Knowledge is present but limited. Evaluation is superficial or one-sided. Few links to evidence or practical implications are made. The answer may lack organisation and use specialist terms inconsistently. — **5-8**

Level 1 Knowledge is minimal and largely descriptive. Little or no critical evaluation or application to policing. The answer is fragmentary or list-like. — **1-4**

Level 0 No creditworthy material. — **0**

Indicative content:

- AO1: Top-down approach origins and claims: developed from US FBI work with crime scene classification into organised and disorganised offenders, producing offender profiles that infer personality and background.
- AO1: Bottom-up approaches: investigative psychology builds profiles from statistical analysis of multiple offences and behaviours, focusing on interpersonal coherence and forensic awareness; geographical profiling analyses spatial patterns distinguishing marauders and commuters.
- AO3: Strengths supporting profiling: bottom-up approaches are more empirical and use data from many cases, allowing probabilistic, testable inferences; investigative psychology links behaviour to likely routines, aiding operational decision-making.
- AO3: Empirical support and limitations: some studies show useful investigative leads from bottom-up profiling, whereas top-down typology has been criticised for lacking empirical foundation and being based on anecdotal interviews with a limited sample.
- AO3: Methodological critiques: problems of validity and reliability, e.g. circularity in some top-down profiles, lack of inter-rater reliability, small or biased samples in original top-down work, and difficulties in testing many profiler predictions objectively.
- AO3: Practical utility: profiling can prioritise enquiries and narrow suspect pools, saving resources, but over-reliance can misdirect investigations when profiles are inaccurate; examples where profiling helped and where it may have hindered should be discussed.
- AO3: Ethical and legal concerns: risk of bias, stereotyping and confirmation bias leading to miscarriages of justice; importance of integrating profiling with traditional evidence and forensic science.
- AO3: Integration and improvement: combining bottom-up statistical methods with forensic evidence, ongoing validation, and training can increase usefulness; use of geographic information systems and behavioural databases improves accuracy.
- AO3: Conclusion: balanced judgement weighing profiling as a useful adjunct, especially bottom-up, but not a standalone solution; highlight need for empirical validation, caution in application and combination with other investigative methods.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk