

**AQA A LEVEL
SOCIOLOGY**

tutor2u 

TOPIC TEN MARKERS

Crime & Deviance



ITEM A

People are set goals by society, but not everyone has an equal chance of achieving those goals by legitimate means. Barriers to achievement might include where people live, as well as educational attainment. There are a variety of ways in which subcultures can respond to this.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which deviant subcultures respond to blocked opportunities. (10 marks)

Subcultures are groups within mainstream society that have their own, different, norms and values. Functionalists suggest these subcultures are often formed when opportunities are blocked. Inversion of mainstream norms and values or total retreat from society are two of the ways in which subcultures may respond to a lack of opportunity.

Albert Cohen developed his theory of status frustration. He notes that young working class boys are often low achievers at school; this means that opportunities to succeed on mainstream terms are blocked. The boys respond by forming a subculture which inverts the norms and values of mainstream society. What is considered good or praiseworthy by the majority is seen as negative and deserving of censure in the subculture, and vice versa. Because they are unable to attain high status by conforming to societal values, members of the subculture carry out anti-social acts and commit crimes, thereby garnering high status within their group. What Cohen notes is not dissimilar to the anti-school subcultures recognised by Paul Willis in his "Learning to Labour" study. However, Cohen has been criticised for concentrating on working-class boys without seriously engaging with social class or gender. Some sociologists have questioned whether members of delinquent subcultures consciously invert the norms and values of mainstream society rather than committing criminal acts out of boredom and a desire for excitement.

Cloward and Ohlin, on the other hand, considered how the area in which someone lives might affect the sort of deviant subculture they join and how that subculture responds to blocked opportunities. A lack of socio-economic opportunity through education does not automatically mean that an individual will either embark on a criminal career or succeed as a criminal. The locality in which people live can block opportunities for success through crime, too, depending on whether organised criminal networks already exist in the neighbourhood. Where no such network exists, a criminal

There is no requirement for an introduction for 10-mark questions. However, it's a good opportunity to make your "2 ways" fully clear.

One of the "hooks" in the item (educational achievement) has been picked up here and linked to Cohen. Cohen's theory is briefly outlined. This is picking up A01 marks (knowledge) and A02 (application of material from the Item).

Some analysis begins with the comparison with Paul Willis (and it's good to be synoptic).

Here is some evaluation. The mark scheme asks for "appropriate analysis/evaluation".

Another "hook" is taken up here with the idea that locality might link to blocked opportunities.

Cloward and Ohlin explained succinctly with a focus on one specific response (retreatism).

subculture might become retreatist (drop out of society) and the response might therefore be to engage in drug-taking or similar activity. Cloward and Ohlin identified this response alongside others, such as organised crime and fighting for territory. In reality, however, many deviant subcultures involve two or more of these characteristics. Gangs making large sums of money from drug dealing also use the drugs; and they fight with other gangs to take over territory and so increase their drug trade. Thus, some would argue that Cloward and Ohlin fail to explain how deviant subcultures respond to how living in different localities might either block or increase opportunities.

Again there is clear evaluation that is ultimately linked back very explicitly to the question.

[421 words]

Examiner comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

This answer is comfortably in the top band. Two “hooks” are taken from the item and developed in a way that clearly answers the question. Sufficient knowledge of subcultural theories is included to gain plenty of A01 marks, while there is also plenty of analysis and evaluation for A03.

There are other ways this question could have been approached, although “where people live” and “educational attainment” are the obvious hooks and therefore do lend themselves to these theories. Some students might see “blocked opportunities” and focus on Merton’s strain theory, perhaps picking up on two “adaptations” to strain, however, without a very clear development to “deviant subcultures”, this approach would struggle to attain high marks.

ITEM A

Some Marxists argue that crimes committed by the rich tend to be ignored, or they are able to afford to get away with them through paying for the best lawyers or bribing officials. Other Marxists point out that most laws are designed to control the working class or benefit the ruling class anyway, even those that appear to benefit workers.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which society's response to crime and deviance benefits the ruling class. (10 marks)

Traditional Marxist ideas about crime emphasise how the real purpose of the law is to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie and to control the proletariat in order to prevent revolution. The ruling class, and the institutions that serve them, respond to crime only to benefit themselves. One way in which they do this is by turning a blind eye to white-collar and corporate crime. Another is by treating proletarian crimes more seriously, giving harsher punishments.

Chambliss found, in his study of Seattle, that the serious criminals were often businessmen and politicians who used their connections and wealth to avoid punishment, while the police concentrated on the street crime and anti-social behaviour perpetrated by the working class. Chambliss argued this was because the laws and the police were not there to prevent crime, only to control the working class and protect the rich. This is supported by the work of Graham, who found that the USA's "war on drugs" did not extend to those drugs that made a profit for bourgeois pharmaceutical companies. However, this research is from the 1970s and in recent years there have been high-profile criminal investigations into corporate crime (such as the Enron scandal). Rather than the authorities choosing only to pursue working-class offenders, it may be that it is simply easier for white-collar criminals to escape detection because of the nature of their crimes (often hiding in plain sight, with diffuse victims).

However, Marxists note how, when they are pursued, white-collar and corporate criminals usually receive lesser punishments compared with working-class criminals, even though their offences might involve much larger sums of money. Fraudsters sometimes avoid imprisonment or are in open prisons, whereas a burglar will be locked up. Sometimes corporate crime is not dealt with through the criminal justice system at all; for instance in high-profile tax evasion cases where companies are able to reach arrangements with the

An introduction is not essential for 10-mark answers but can help. Here it explains an overall Marxist approach to the issues raised in the question and clearly identifies the two "ways" that will be pursued. These do emerge from the Item, but the "hooks" are less clear in this item than some.

Demonstrates some clear knowledge and understanding of Marxist views on class and crime and gains some A03 analysis marks by finding parallels between different studies.

Some clear evaluation of the first "way" for A03. Also keeps using examples and key terms.

The second way is introduced partly in analysis of the first way (which is quite an effective way of maintaining a good chain of reasoning).

Again the "way" is evaluated quite strongly and ultimately

government. Although contemporary legal cases, such as those of Starbucks and Google, support this argument, there is also evidence to the contrary, where wealthy defendants get harsher sentences and so 'made an example of.' A millionaire's daughter received a long prison sentence for driving looters around London in August 2011, and the judge used her advantaged background as an aggravating factor when deciding her sentence. This would suggest that society does not always respond to crime in a way that benefits the ruling class.

[404 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

This is a top-band answer to quite a difficult question. Sometimes there will be two very clear hooks in the item, and on other occasions it might take a little more digging, like this one. There were clearly other ways that could have been developed from the item, but these two answered the question appropriately.

Essentially, this response is a brief introduction and two strong PEEEL paragraphs (point, explain, evidence, evaluate, link).

This answer is concept-rich with key terms employed throughout and it manages to be contemporary, both by using the age of some of the relevant theories as an evaluative point, and by using contemporary examples.

linked to the question. Of course more could have been included here (such as the argument that people who commit personal and violent crimes are more in need of custodial sentences than white-collar criminals) but selectivity is also a useful skill for 10 markers.

ITEM A

Some sociologists say that right realist approaches achieve control but not justice. Right realists recommend severe punishments for anti-social behaviour and low-level crime in order to demonstrate to the rest of society that these behaviours are not acceptable. They argue that this also prevents more serious crime. Whether the police interpret behaviour as anti-social might, however, depend on where it is happening and who is doing it, not just on what is being done.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why right realist approaches to crime and deviance might 'achieve control but not justice.'
(10 marks)

James Q. Wilson's right realist "broken windows" theory inspired zero tolerance policing in New York that appeared to have an astonishing impact on the city's crime levels. However, two criticisms, suggesting that it achieved control but not justice, are: some people were unfairly sent to prison for minor crimes; the approach was inconsistently applied, depending on particular social characteristics.

The idea of broken windows was that a community tolerating minor misdemeanours (such as vandals breaking windows) falls foul of serious crime. To prevent the latter, there should be zero tolerance of anti-social behaviour and minor crime. One example of this was the "three strikes and you're out" approach: a serious custodial sentence would be given to people who had offended three times, regardless of what that third offence was. This meant that people could be serving long custodial sentences for crimes as minor as jay-walking, public drunkenness or washing people's cars at junctions. This led to a reduction in such behaviour, but could certainly be viewed as being unjust, not to mention inefficient. At the same time the broken windows approach reduced anti-social behaviour and minor crime, there was a dramatic decrease in serious crime, too, with the homicide rate falling by over 50%. Critics maintain that other factors, beyond zero tolerance policing, accounted for the fall, for instance, a reduction in poverty in the city. However, the correlation of the police tactic and the fall in crime is impressive. Nevertheless, people serving significant sentences for minor crimes is an example of control without justice.

Another way in which the control achieved through right realist approaches might be considered unjust is how it impacts on some social groups more than on others. After all, freshman students engaging in public drunkenness or jaywalking are very unlikely to find themselves accused of a

A brief introduction that clearly puts the question into context and identifies the two reasons to be analysed. These very clearly emerge from hooks in the item (i.e. the references to severe punishments and police interpretation).

This is a classic PEEEL paragraph. There is a chain of reasoning in the paragraph allowing for some counter-evaluation at times and there is a very clear link back to the question at the end.

The same approach is taken with this paragraph: a classic PEEEL, plenty of detail and a

crime at all, let alone face a prison sentence. The targets for zero-tolerance policing tend to be minority-ethnic or low-income people.

Stereotypes about crime, labelling and police discretion combine to ensure that while there is zero tolerance of anti-social behaviour by poor black people, there is significantly more tolerance of middle-class white people engaging in the same behaviour. However, while right realists are likely to argue that zero tolerance should mean zero tolerance of students and middle-class youth too, the discriminatory way in which “zero tolerance” policies have been enforced is another example of control without justice.

[398 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

This is a very clear response, comfortably in the top mark band. It identifies the two reasons quickly, and they are very clearly drawn from the item. The two reasons are then analysed very clearly in two classic PEEEL paragraphs.

While an introduction has been used here, this is not essential. However, it has allowed the writer to give some background and clearly identify the two reasons. Even with this, there is still quite a lot of further explanation of the right realist approaches in the first paragraph so if all of this had gone in the paragraphs with no introduction, it might have impacted on the clarity and readability of the response.

Key terms are used regularly throughout and clear understanding is demonstrated of the relevant concepts.

discussion that follows a chain of reasoning. Again, there is a clear link to the question.

ITEM A

Black and Asian people are much more likely to be stopped and searched by the police than are their white peers. Sociologists disagree about whether or not this is evidence of racism by the police. Some sociologists suggest that the times when and places where stop and searches occur means that it is unfair to expect stop-and-search data to be proportional to the whole population.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why some ethnic groups are much more likely to be stopped and searched by the police than others. (10 marks)

Stop and search statistics present a clear picture. In 2014, the police stopped and searched 15 White, 65 Black, 23 Asian and 28 mixed race individuals per thousand in the population. Why this difference in the rates of stop and search happened is less clear. While some sociologists put this down to institutional racism and the nature of police discretion, others suggest that black and minority-ethnic individuals are more likely to be out on the streets in high-crime urban areas at the times when stop and searches take place.

In 1999 the McPherson Report concluded that the Metropolitan Police was 'institutionally racist', and other studies have shown evidence of extensive racism within the police force. A BBC undercover report (The Secret Policeman) found shocking evidence of racism in the Greater Manchester force, for example. The police choose who to stop and search. Sociologists disagree about the cause(s) of the discriminatory ways police deploy their discretion. Potential causes include: individual police officers' discriminatory views, a cultural issue within the police itself deriving from a conservative canteen culture, or a more structural, institutional issue. Marxists, for example, argue that the police's job is to support the interests of the ruling class and control the proletariat. The minority-ethnic groups that are most likely to be stopped and searched are overwhelmingly working class; therefore, the inequality of stop and search statistics might be the police simply carrying out their role in a capitalist society, on behalf of the bourgeoisie. Whether or not this explanation has merit, discriminatory policing is one possible cause for some ethnic groups being much more likely than others to be stopped and searched.

However, Waddington et al. (2003) suggested a very different explanation for these statistics. Their study looked at what they called the 'available population' (i.e. those people who could potentially be stopped and searched), and found that

A brief introduction with key knowledge goes on to identify the two reasons that will be analysed which are both very clearly drawn from hooks in the item.

This paragraph addresses the first reason, police racism. Plenty of evidence is provided in a succinct way. This paragraph is an interesting alternative to a PEEEL paragraph elsewhere, depending more on analysis than evaluation. A range of different explanations for police racism are considered in an analytical way. Of course, it would have been possible to suggest a criticism of this view, but that evaluation really comes in the form of the second reason.

Clear link back to the question.

The second reason also provides evaluation for the first one, making for an answer rich in AO3.

those who were stopped and searched were broadly proportional to the available population. In other words, stop and searches took place at particular times of day and in particular areas (such as town centres) and there were many more minority-ethnic individuals in those areas at those times. However, the police were actively involved in Waddington's study, so they could be accused of lacking objectivity. Whatever the underlying cause, the characteristics of the available population is one reason why some ethnic groups are much more likely to be stopped and searched than others.

Succinct description of the study clearly applied to the question and evaluated.

Again a very clear link back to the question.

[389 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

This is comfortably in the top band: a very direct response with a brief introduction and then two paragraphs that clearly address the question.

The answer is succinct with lots of key terms, concepts, examples and theories packed into the two paragraphs. However, it is still readable and does not lose clarity by trying to say too much.

This question had very clear hooks in the item that it was important to pick up. However, a reasonable answer could have taken two different explanations for police discrimination (institutional racism and canteen culture, for instance) and this could still be said to have been drawn from the item. However, the marker would want to see some engagement with the second hook, referring to time and place.

ITEM A

Even today, boys and girls are often brought up very differently and taught different norms and values. This can be seen both in family life and in expected adult job roles. Statistics suggest that men are much more likely to commit crime than women.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which gender socialisation might lead to gender differences in rates of offending. (10 marks)

Men are much more likely to commit crimes than women. Men commit 90% of murders, for example. Sociologists suggest a range of reasons for this, many of which relate to gender norms. Two underlying reasons for this gender differential might be: women are socialised into the expressive role in the family (to be nurturing and caring); while men, traditionally at least, have been socialised to go out to work and provide for the family.

Feminist sociologists, for instance Heidensohn, have noted how the role women are expected to take in a patriarchal society makes them less likely to commit crimes. Women are socialised into a domestic role (what Parsons called the expressive role): they are expected to be nurturing and caring. Given their expected role and behaviour, women committing violent crime would be doubly deviant, deviating both from society's norms and values and from gender scripts. A key element of this perspective is Heidensohn's control theory. From birth to adulthood, families exert greater control over the behavior of girls, which forms part of the canalisation into gender roles. Because they are controlled, they have fewer opportunities to commit crime. Boys are much more likely to be out in groups or alone at night when much criminality takes place. However, liberationist feminists like Freda Adler would argue that this is an outdated view; since the 1970s, girls and women have had much more freedom. However, she also notes the significant upsurge in female crime, which supports the view that socialisation into different roles within the family lies behind gender differences in offending.

Traditionally, men were socialised to provide for the family and go out to work. In the past, women were more likely to be marginalised in a domestic role, while men had the opportunities at work to commit occupational crime or to make relationships outside the family that could lead to criminality. Furthermore, some argue that aspects of masculinity are potentially criminal: toughness, independence and even aggression. The social pressure to provide for the

A brief introduction sets the scene and gets straight to the point with identifying two ways, clearly drawn from the item.

A good PEEEL paragraph / chain of reasoning that analyses and evaluates the first reason with clarity, revealing good sociological knowledge and understanding and use of key terms.

Chain of reasoning is ultimately linked back very explicitly to the question.

The same approach is taken with the second way.

Plenty of analysis and evaluation. Of course there are plenty of other ways this chain of reasoning could have gone,

family can lead to property crimes when men are unable to earn money or provide in other, legitimate ways. Again, this might be an outdated view; and other sociologists argue that men do not commit many more crimes than women; rather that, for a variety of reasons, such as the chivalry thesis, the statistics are misleading. Nevertheless, socialisation into a masculine gender role could account for gender differences in criminality.

[403 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

A top band response which very clear draws on two hooks from the item and develops them successfully.

A brief introduction is used to give some useful background knowledge and clearly identify the two ways that will be considered. Some markers might look at the second paragraph and feel that multiple ways are presented (working, groups, masculinity, need to provide, etc.) but by being clear in the introduction that this paragraph is all about men being socialised to go to work and provide for the family, it unites these different strands. It is quite likely that when explaining and analysing a point you find yourself making supplementary points that could be read as being entirely separate points. A brief intro clearly identifying the points prevents confusion on the reader's part.

Clearly much more could have been included in this answer. In evaluation, chivalry thesis could be explored, postmodern criticisms could have been raised, etc. However, it is important to directly answer the question and be selective.

such as postmodern ideas about a crisis of masculinity, etc. but the skill of being selective is also to the fore.

Linked back to the question.

ITEM A

Some sociologists argue that there is an underclass in society whose members are more likely to commit crimes than members of other social classes. They argue that this class has been created by government welfare policies and is characterised by households in which nobody has a job.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why members of an "underclass" might be more likely to commit crimes. (10 marks)

New Right sociologists, like Charles Murray, argue that the welfare state has created an underclass in society: dysfunctional workless families. They argue that members of this class are inclined towards criminality because of inadequate socialisation in single-parent families, while left realists would argue that such individuals are more likely to offend because of relative deprivation.

Murray argues that government welfare policies give perverse incentives for people to form lone-parent families. The children of such families, particularly boys, are inadequately socialised because they do not have a strong male role model. The absence of a father and his instrumental role, providing discipline and a work ethic, means that children are likely to engage in anti-social behaviour. Tolerance of that behaviour will, right realists like Wilson argue, lead to more serious criminality. However, critics argue that the statistics used to support this position are questionable; other factors like social class, ethnicity or location might be more important. Police statistics do not support the right realist idea that involvement in anti-social behaviour necessarily leads to involvement in serious crime. However, the New Right argue that the welfare state and the increase in single-parent families causes individuals from the underclass to commit more crime.

Left realists like Lea and Young take a very different view. It is not the family structures among deprived groups that leads to criminality but the deprivation itself, particularly in relation to other groups in society. As Merton explained in his strain theory, people are socialised into aiming for particular goals in society, and these are often material goals: nice houses, expensive cars, and so on. In modern cities, people who have these things and people who have no real hope of attaining them legitimately live side by side; and the wealthy and successful are presented in the media as being the norm. As such, relative deprivation – having less than others – can be a major driving force for crime. Those who have no job and are

A clear introduction gives the theoretical background to the question and identifies the two reasons that will be developed.

A strong PEEEL paragraph that makes the link between this first reason and a hook in the item (government welfare policies) absolutely clear.

Direct and explicit link to the question.

The same approach is taken with the second reason. There were a few ways to go with this (although "households in which nobody has a job" was the obvious second hook) but left realism provides a good contrast with the first paragraph.

reliant on government benefits, or who have employment but on zero-hours contracts are therefore more likely to commit crimes than those with high incomes. The New Right would counter that there has always been poverty and inequality, but that crime rates increased significantly in the post-war period after the introduction of welfare policies that were designed to make people less deprived but, they would argue, caught them in a poverty trap. However, relative deprivation is a convincing explanation for why members of a so-called underclass are more likely to commit crimes than others in society.

[413 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band 8-10*

A top band answer that neatly answers the question. By including a short introduction followed by two strong and well-developed PEEEL paragraphs, all the assessment objectives are addressed

While the New Right approach, considered in paragraph one, was an inevitable approach to take given the item, there were plenty of possible routes to go with the second reason. While the likely hook was joblessness, this could have been developed with Marxist ideas or indeed with strain or subcultural theories. While left realism worked well, there are often multiple acceptable ways to answer a question. Similarly, an extended example could have been included in the analysis, like the UK riots of 2011. Again, there are many ways to answer these questions but the skill of selecting what to write and what not to write is an important one to develop.

Clear reference to “those who have no job” to ensure the marker is aware which hook is being developed here.

Another clear, explicit link back to the question.

ITEM A

Many sociologists argue that the world is undergoing a process of globalisation, where it is becoming ever more interconnected. This has positive benefits, like improved opportunities for travel and communication, as well as negative effects like the erosion of local cultures or the loss of traditional jobs in developed countries. It is also suggested that globalisation has a number of influences on crime and deviance.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which globalisation might be causing an increase in crime. (10 marks)

Many sociologists argue that societies are becoming globalised: the world is ever more inter-connected. This greater global integration could lead to an increase in crime in two ways: improved global travel and communication creating new opportunities for criminality; the transfer of manufacturing jobs to developing nations from developed countries increasing relative deprivation in the latter.

While hyper-globalists view the developments in travel and communication since the middle of the 20th century in overwhelmingly positive terms, these very developments have enabled, or even created, a range of criminal activities. The ease with which people and goods can travel around the world is reflected in the black market of smuggling and trafficking. People smugglers often exploit the people they smuggle, taking them from a desperate situation in one country then using them as illegal workers in the developed world. The smuggling of products like illegal drugs is also facilitated by the ease of global travel. The internet's communication revolution has also created a whole new array of cyber-crimes, e.g. identity fraud. Traditionalists, who question the whole concept of globalisation, argue that such crimes have always existed, and that new technology has always changed the nature of crime to some extent (like steamships or gunpowder); but nothing significant or new is happening today. Many other sociologists disagree and think the globalisation of travel and communication, while mostly positive, has transformed criminality.

Pessimistic globalists point to the way globalisation has had a negative impact on the traditional working-class communities in the developed world. Manufacturing industries like steelworks and coalmines have been exported to countries with much lower labour costs leaving concentrated areas of joblessness. The subsequent relative deprivation is, according to left realists, a key cause of crime. People living in largely

A quick introduction briefly defining the key term in the question and clearly identifying the two ways to be developed in the answer. These clearly emerge from hooks in the item.

Good use of key terms and mixture of theory and examples in this well-developed PEEEL paragraph.

Although this could seem like two ways in the one paragraph, the clear introduction put these together as "improved global travel and communication".

Clear link back to the question.

The same approach taken with the second way.

prosperous countries may find themselves lacking many of the material goods enjoyed by their compatriots, and feel left behind. As well as driving property crime, globalisation may also propel political extremism, and in developing countries the sense that their cultures and identities are being eroded by a global culture, both of which may result in criminal activity. Hyper-globalists would question this and suggest that globalisation is a driver of growth and prosperity. But the high rates of crime and unemployment in ex-mining areas of the UK or ex-steel areas of the USA suggest that globalisation could be causing crime through relative deprivation.

Some useful evaluation, grounded in a theoretical framework and then a very clear link back to the question.

[399 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

A top-band response which quickly and succinctly identifies two hooks in the item and develops them into a clear response to the question.

There is a clear theoretical framework and knowledge and understanding of the theories mentioned is sound. A wide range of potential criminality is referred to and successfully linked to the question. Although there is not a direct reference to the item (as in "As explained in Item A...") there is an echoing of the language of the item in order to signpost that a hook has been responded to.

A logical chain of reasoning, essentially following the classic "PEEEL" structure, in both paragraphs notches up plenty of A03 marks for both analysis and evaluation.

ITEM A

Green crime is crime committed against the environment, rather than against a human victim. This could include pollution or animal cruelty. There is a debate between those who take a traditional approach and are only interested in green crime that breaks the law, and those who consider all harm to the environment to be green crime, regardless of whether a law has been broken

Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why a minority of green crimes are prosecuted by the criminal justice system. (10 marks)

Green criminology is a concept first introduced by M. J. Lynch in 1990. Green crime is defined as crime committed against the environment itself. Two reasons why such crimes may fail to be prosecuted by the criminal justice system are: first, there is often no clear victim and second, not always have laws been broken.

Whether you take an anthropocentric approach to green crime or an ecocentric one (i.e. whether your main concern is the human cost or the ecological one), many green crimes do not have a human victim. Crimes like pollution or animal cruelty, as in the item, are therefore less likely to be reported to the police than burglary or assault. Most crimes that are prosecuted have been reported to the police by the public. However, a lot of green crime does have a direct human victim. If a water course is being polluted, or there is illegal fly-tipping, landowners or local residents are likely to report it. Similarly, while animals themselves cannot report crimes, there are various pressure groups and concerned citizens who will take up cases on their behalf. Also, while primary green crime is arguably often victimless, secondary green crime (criminality in order to avoid environmental regulations or censure) often does have a victim. Nevertheless, the lack of directly affected human victims in many green crimes can account for large numbers not being prosecuted.

A more significant issue in relation to the prosecution of green crime is that green criminology is often transgressive: it is concerned less about illegality and more about harm. Many examples of environmental harm are not illegal, at least not in the countries where they are happening. It is therefore impossible for such "crimes" to be prosecuted through the criminal justice system. Instead, international pressure, including from non-governmental organisations like Greenpeace, is the way the issues may be resolved. Green crime is often global in character. Deforestation in one

Snappy introduction explains green crime and identifies the two reasons that are being developed, both drawn from the item.

Lots of key terms used. These are briefly defined (which is good practice if you have time).

The point is explained with examples and then there is the usual detailed analysis and evaluation, featuring further key terms.

Explicit link back to the question.

The candidate includes some analysis even within putting forward the two points, by considering their relative significance.

Again examples are included. It would have been possible to expand this further with specific reference to logging in

country can lead to flash floods in another. If the deforestation is legal in the country where it occurs, there is little the victims can do about it. Many sociologists of crime and deviance would argue that legal acts which cause harm to the environment should not be considered to be crimes at all. However, for those sociologists who do take a transgressive approach, the legality of much green crime inevitably means that much of it is not prosecuted.

[403 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band 8-10*

A top band response. It includes a number of quite difficult concepts. In other topic areas, it might be possible to refer to a concept with definition, because it's a familiar concept across sociology, but things like anthropocentric or transgression do need some explanation. An answer could pack in fewer concepts and still hit the top band.

This is clear and follows the now familiar structure of a brief introduction and two full, well-developed PEEEL paragraphs. Sometimes people forget about linking to the question, and it's very important in these questions as the marker needs to be very clear what the two points are and that they directly address the question.

Nepal and flooding in Bangladesh. There is certainly no reason not to include this, although this response is already on the long side. Similarly, the evaluation could be more brief. Clear link back to the question.

ITEM A

Situational crime prevention strategies assume that the choice to commit a crime is a rational one, made after weighing up the benefits against the risks. These strategies are intended to reduce the opportunities for the committing of crimes. An example would be the installation of a burglar alarm to reduce the risk of being burgled.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why situational crime prevention strategies may not be effective in reducing crime. (10 marks)

Situational crime prevention (SCP) strategies are popular with local councils and property owners. They include designing out (e.g. homelessness spikes) or target hardening (e.g. anti-vandal paint). Two reasons why they might be ineffective are that criminals do not necessarily make a rational choice to offend, and criminality may just be displaced rather than prevented.

Postmodern sociologists, like Katz and Lyng, question whether criminals really make a rational choice to offend. For target hardening to prevent a crime, a burglar must see a burglar alarm and decide that the risk of being caught outweighs the possible benefits, and so choose not to offend. For many, though, criminality is about the buzz and the risk, and the desire to avoid boredom, rather than a rational calculation. For those seeking a buzz from risk taking, in particular, the higher the risk, the greater the buzz. Yet there is evidence that burglar alarms reduce the risk of burglary, for instance. While some anti-social behaviour might be about risk taking (therefore anti-vandal paint might seem like a challenge) for more serious crime, the risk of getting caught, and the potential punishments, do act as a deterrent. However, it is clear that for some minor crime, such as graffiti, SCP strategies might simply up the stakes and produce a greater thrill.

A more practical difficulty with SCP is that of displacement. While burglar alarms or CCTV might deter a crime in that particular location, it may only succeed in displacing the crime, and therefore fail to reduce crime overall. Widespread use of CCTV in town centres, for example, has arguably pushed criminality into other areas of town where there is less surveillance. Once crimes such as drug dealing and soliciting move into other areas, they can reach a “tipping point” and cause a neighbourhood to become associated with criminality. Installing SCP strategies there merely displaces the problem again. Target hardening merely pushes criminals

A quick introduction explains terms and highlights the two reasons (clearly linked to hooks in the item). Be cautious with abbreviations, one or two unfamiliar ones clearly labelled first time is fine to help time management, but essays full of “wc, rc, avp” etc. test the marker’s good will!

A link to some theory and a clear point, well explained, analysed, evaluated and linked back to the question.

The same approach taken again with quite a detailed explanation of displacement and the introduction of some other related concepts.

towards softer targets. If burglars avoid homes with alarms, they do not give up burglary altogether, instead they concentrate on properties without alarms. Of course, the greater and more widespread the use of SCP, arguably the fewer soft targets are available and this could ultimately reduce the crime rate; but affordability would ensure that not all potential targets were protected. Therefore, the likelihood is that SCP strategies will continue to displace crime rather than reduce it.

A succinct but detailed analysis and evaluation ultimately links back to the question.

[388 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

A very clear, succinct response which is comfortably in the top band. It contrasts well with the Green Crime response to show how a similar mark can be attained with fewer words. It is still rich with concepts and those that might be unfamiliar are fully explained.

A clear understanding of situational crime prevention is demonstrated, the two reasons are very clearly linked to two recognisable hooks in the item, and the reasons are subject to some well-argued analysis and evaluation.

As with other responses, plenty of other content could have been included, such as comparing with alternative forms of crime prevention and that would have been a perfectly acceptable avenue of analysis and evaluation. However, it is important to be selective and not to throw everything at these 10 mark questions. In a 30 mark question about crime prevention, all those other points would be highly appropriate.

ITEM A

Some groups in society are much more likely to be the victims of crime than others. For example younger people, including students, also unemployed people and those on low incomes are statistically more likely to be a victim of a crime than people who are older or wealthier.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which people's characteristics or behaviour might contribute to being a victim of crime. (10 marks)

Positivist victimology suggests that people's behaviour or characteristics increase their likelihood of being a victim of crime. Young people putting themselves in risky situations, and the least well-off not having money to spend on protecting themselves are two ways which may exemplify the Positivist perspective.

Young people are the age group most at risk of becoming victims, according to data from the Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW). One reason for this is that they are more likely to put themselves in vulnerable situations. People in their late teens and early twenties often drink to excess (making them vulnerable), go out late at night and generally have a more carefree, even reckless, attitude to their own safety. However, some sociologists would criticise this explanation and suggest that it is victim blaming. Just because someone gets drunk or stays out late does not mean that they are responsible for the criminal actions of another person. Criminals have agency and choose to commit crimes, irrespective of the behaviour of their victims. Nevertheless, the recklessness of youth is one way in which someone's behaviour or characteristics could contribute to victimhood.

CSEW data also shows that those on the lowest incomes, especially the unemployed, are also at a heightened risk of victimisation. Positivist victimology again seeks to explain this in terms of behaviour and characteristics. There are various precautions that can be taken to protect oneself from crime, but these cost money. Home security systems, for example, are expensive, as are modern cars with hi-tech security systems. One precaution people might take is to stay away from areas with high crime rates, but this is impossible if you live in one. However, Marxist sociologists would criticise this perspective and say that working-class people are more likely to be victims for structural reasons, rather than because of their own behaviour. Logically you would expect the rich to be at greatest risk of crime as they have more to steal, but the

A quick introduction which places the question in a theoretical framework and identifies the two ways to be developed (clearly linking to hooks in the item).

A classic PEEEL paragraph with extensive explanation, evidence and evaluation and (very importantly) a clear link back to the question.

The same approach is taken for both paragraphs. This approach picks up plenty of marks for all assessment objectives.

state's role is to protect the rich from the crimes of the poor. According to Marxists, the state does very little to protect the poor. They would argue further that living in areas with high crime rates and not being able to afford expensive security is the result of the structure of a capitalist society, not individual behaviour. However, not paying for the best protection from crime is another way in which people's behaviour or characteristics can contribute to their own victimhood.

By writing a clear chain of reasoning, it is possible to essentially hold a discussion about the topic, while maintaining readability.

[410 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band:8-10*

A top-band answer that gets straight down to answering the question. The brief introduction is helpful in that it provided an opportunity to set the question in a theoretical framework (positivist victimology). This immediately shows the marker that the candidate has a good knowledge of victimisation and will go beyond a common sense extension of the item (which would be the nature of many answers to this question).

By linking the answer and the hooks from the item to knowledge of the Crime Survey of England and Wales, the candidate again reveals good levels of knowledge and application. The response then goes on to be analytical and evaluative and directly links back to the question.

ITEM A

Sociologists debate the purpose of punishment. Some argue that if criminals make a rational choice to offend, when they see people are punished severely for their transgressions, they should make a rational choice not to offend. Others emphasise the need for criminals to reform their ways.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which punishment can prevent further crime. (10 marks)

For sociologists, the purposes of punishment can be summed up as prevention, compensation and retribution. Two ways in which punishment can perform the role of prevention are deterrence and rehabilitation.

The idea that punishment can act as a deterrent to further crime is based on rational choice theory. As stated in the item, if offenders weigh up the benefits and costs of criminality rationally, then the more severe the punishment the more likely they are to choose not to offend. This view is supported by right realists who favour tough sentences even for minor offences, in order to prevent more serious crime. However, some postmodern sociologists like Lyng (1990) argue that part of the reason why crime is seductive is because of the thrill of taking risks. Therefore, arguably the risk could increase the “buzz”. Also some crime is not rational but is instead committed out of frustration or when under the influence of alcohol or drugs. However, it seems likely that tough sentences do deter some types of crime.

Punishment can also prevent further crime through the rehabilitation of offenders. The purpose of punishment is not just to deter others from committing crime but to correct the flawed values of offenders so they can return to society as reformed citizens and not commit future crimes. If this is a key purpose of punishment, its lack of effectiveness can be criticised: reoffending rates are high for those who have served custodial sentences. Indeed, prisons can act as a form of subculture where criminals only socialise with other criminals, normalising and reinforcing crime and deviance even more. This is partly due to what Sutherland called differential association: prisoners associate with criminals, and therefore learn deviant values. New Right sociologists, who support prison as the best form of punishment, argue that reoffending rates are due to prison reforms having made prisons less unpleasant; that the best way to rehabilitate offenders is to deter them from future crime through their

A very clear introduction which essentially “decodes” the hooks in the item to identify two ways to consider.

A classic PEEEL paragraph that includes plenty of key concepts and some theory. This is the sort of question where it would be easy to miss out any sociological theory, so including postmodernism and right realism makes it sufficiently sociological.

Linked back to the question within the chain of reasoning.

The second way is addressed in the same way, with a PEEL paragraph.

Again this is made more sociological by linking an otherwise “common sense” point to relevant sociological theory.

experience of prison. They also support prison's role of incapacitation - people cannot commit further crimes if they are in prison. Nevertheless, one aim of punishment is to rehabilitate offenders and prevent them from reoffending.

A clear link back to the question.

[369 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

A top-band answer that avoids one of the potential pitfalls for a general punishment question. Many of the points that can be made about punishment are not especially sociological (they could equally be made in a citizenship essay, for example). It is therefore useful to link the points to sociological theory in order to lift the AO3 marks out of the middle band.

The hooks in the item were very clear, but the knack here is to develop them in a clear, sociological way which explicitly answers the question.

ITEM A

Howard Becker points out that people react differently to the same act depending on who is doing it and where they are doing it. This influences whether the act in question is labelled as deviant or not, as in the saying “one person’s terrorist is another person’s freedom fighter”.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which the social context of an act might influence whether or not it is labelled as deviant. (10 marks)

The idea that the social context of an act influences how it is labelled and therefore how the criminal justice system might respond to it has been raised by both Howard Becker and Aaron Cicourel. Two ways the context might influence perception: who is performing the act, and where they are performing the act.

Cicourel argued that the label of delinquency was placed on juveniles from low income backgrounds but not on better-off youths doing exactly the same things. He identified two stages of what he called the ‘negotiation of justice.’ First, the police will be influenced by their stereotypes of the typical criminal. Therefore, they will view drunk and disorderly behaviour by a middle-class student differently to the same behaviour by a homeless youth. The former will be seen as normal student high-jinx, the latter as deviance. The actions of the Bullingdon Club (a notorious student society for the very rich at Oxford University) has always been interpreted differently from that of an inner-city youth gang, even though some of the activities would be very similar. Yet there are examples of the opposite happening, with a millionaire’s daughter who drove looters around London in the 2011 riots receiving a higher sentence because of her privileged background. However, even if the negotiation of justice sometimes works against the rich, it is still an example of the social context influencing the application of the label.

As well as who is committing the act, the place in which it happens is also a factor. Drunk and disorderly behaviour in a town centre is treated differently from the same in a quiet residential area, for example. When radical Muslims travelled from Britain and elsewhere to Libya to fight against General Ghadafi, they were allowed to travel and were praised for fighting against a presumed tyrannical regime. When people made similar journeys to Syria, the label switched from “freedom fighter” to terrorist. In both countries, some people joined groups like ISIS, but different attitudes to the conflicts

A succinct and useful introduction that establishes a theoretical framework and identifies the two ways which are to be developed.

This is the stronger of the two ‘ways’, in terms of linking to sociological theory (although both can relate to Becker or Cicourel). It is a clear PEEEL paragraph with plenty of theory and useful examples.

Working through this example provides some useful development. The evaluation comes through a contrasting example.

Linked back to the question, clearly.

The second paragraph is arguably less sociological than the first. The theoretical framework is really the same as the first way, and it would waste time in the exam to repeat the point. However, the

meant that the label changed. However, arguably this was not because it was a different place, but instead because the interpretation of British interests had changed: i.e. that returning ISIS fighters posed a threat to the UK. It is clear that the same act carried out in different places can be labelled very differently.

answer could be strengthened further with more theoretical evaluation. Again the evaluation comes through the example, followed by a clear link to the question.

[387 words]

Examiner Comments: *Mark Band: 8-10*

This is a top-band answer to quite a difficult question. The item is quite clear and the hooks easily identified. However, what is more difficult is finding different ways to develop the two ways that emerge from the hooks. It is really two aspects of social context and both best relate to Cicourel's Negotiation of Justice, or to Becker's labelling theory. It is important not only to identify two ways, linked to the item and develop them, but to ensure that the two ways are clearly distinct from one another. This response succeeds in doing this, partly by basing much of the analysis and evaluation around examples rather than the theoretical framework.

However, it would have been possible (and would have attained good marks) to use contrasting theory to evaluate in one of the paragraphs. For example, in the first paragraph, Marxism could have been used to argue that Cicourel ignored the capitalist structure of society, or realism could have been used in the second paragraph to question the usefulness of classing "terrorism" as a label, rather than a real problem.

NOTES

A series of horizontal dotted lines for writing notes.

CRIME & DEVIANCE 10 MARKERS

1. Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which deviant subcultures respond to blocked opportunities. (10 marks)
2. Using Item A analyse two ways in which society's response to crime and deviance benefits the ruling class. (10 marks)
3. Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why right realist approaches to crime and deviance might 'achieve control but not justice.' (10 marks)
4. Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why some ethnic groups are much more likely to be stopped and searched by the police than others. (10 marks)
5. Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which gender socialisation might lead to gender differences in rates of offending. (10 marks)
6. Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why members of an "underclass" might be more likely to commit crimes. (10 marks)
7. Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which globalisation might be causing an increase in crime. (10 marks)
8. Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why a minority of green crimes are prosecuted by the criminal justice system. (10 marks)
9. Applying material from Item A, analyse two reasons why situational crime prevention strategies may not be effective in reducing crime. (10 marks)
10. Applying material from Item A, analyse two ways in which people's characteristics or behaviour might contribute to being a victim of crime. (10 marks)

More Psychology revision and support at:
www.tutor2u.net/sociology



@tutor2usoc



ALevelSociologyStudentGroup



tutor2usoc
