
A-LEVEL SOCIOLOGY

7192/3R - Paper 3 Crime and deviance with theory and methods
Mark scheme

7192

June 2018

Version/Stage: v1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Qu	Marking guidance	Total marks
01	<p>Outline two ways in which gender may influence the risk of being a victim of crime.</p> <p>Two marks for each of two appropriate ways clearly outlined or one mark for each appropriate way partially outlined, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Females are more likely to be trafficked across borders (1 mark), where they are then forced to become sex workers (+1 mark). • Females are often at risk of domestic violence (1 mark), because they are financially dependent on their partner (+1 mark). • Males may act tough to assert their masculine identity (1 mark), resulting in being assaulted by other males (+1 mark). • Transgendered/non-binary people are more likely to be victims of violence (1 mark), because of prejudice/transphobia (+1 mark). <p>Other relevant material should be credited.</p> <p>No marks for no relevant points.</p>	4
02	<p>Outline three criticisms of the labelling theory of crime and deviance.</p> <p>Two marks for each of three appropriate criticisms clearly outlined or one mark for each appropriate criticism partially outlined, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It fails to explain primary deviance/why people offend in the first place (1 mark), which occurs before they have been labelled (+1 mark). • Determinism (1 mark); it wrongly assumes labelling automatically leads to a deviant career (+1 mark). • It implies that deviants do not know they are deviant until they are labelled (1 mark), but most know they are defying society's norms (+1 mark). • It fails to explain where labels come from (1 mark), e.g. the shared value system or capitalist ideology (+1 mark). • It ignores the possibility that labelling can reduce crime (1 mark); e.g. reintegrative shaming avoids stigmatising the offender by condemning the act not the actor (+1 mark). <p>Other relevant material should be credited.</p> <p>No marks for no relevant points.</p>	6

Qu	Marking guidance	Total marks
----	------------------	-------------

03	Applying material from Item A , analyse two reasons for social class differences in official crime statistics.	10
----	--	----

Item A

The different agencies of the criminal justice system, such as the police and the courts, are responsible for processing individuals who are suspected of committing crimes. Some individuals may also have greater motivation or pressure to offend, or have more opportunity to do so.

Marks	Level Descriptors
8–10	<p>Answers in this band will show good knowledge and understanding of relevant material on two reasons for social class differences in official crime statistics.</p> <p>There will be two developed applications of material from the Item, e.g. agencies of the CJS such as the police use taken-for-granted stereotypes or typifications that characterise working-class people as criminal suspects, resulting in selective enforcement; the working class may be under greater pressure to commit economic or property crimes because of their social position.</p> <p>There will be appropriate analysis/evaluation of two reasons, e.g. police stereotypes lead them to concentrate on policing working-class neighbourhoods, apprehending more working-class offenders and producing a self-fulfilling prophecy and class differences in the official statistics; the working class may face blocked opportunities that prevent them obtaining material rewards legitimately and so commit instrumental crime.</p>
4–7	<p>Answers in this band will show a basic to reasonable knowledge and understanding of one to two reasons for social class differences in official crime statistics.</p> <p>There will be some successful application of material from the item, e.g. middle-class criminals have more opportunity to commit large-scale economic crimes, for example company accountants may have access to their employers' bank accounts.</p> <p>There will be some analysis/evaluation.</p>
1–3	<p>Answers in this band will show limited knowledge and understanding of one to two reasons for social class differences in official crime statistics.</p> <p>There will be limited application of material from the item. Some material may be at a tangent to the question, e.g. there may be some drift into material on ethnic or gender differences in crime statistics.</p> <p>There will be limited or no analysis/evaluation.</p>
0	No relevant points.

Sources may include the following or other relevant ones: Becker; A.K. Cohen; Chambliss; Cicourel; Merton; Miller; Piliavin and Briar; Sutherland.

Qu	Marking guidance	Total marks
04	Applying material from Item B and your knowledge, evaluate sociological contributions to our understanding of the relationship between crime and the media.	30

Item B

Much media output is devoted to crime but the media offer a distorted portrayal of crime and criminals. The media are also often seen as causing crime, for example by creating a sense of relative deprivation or causing moral panics. The new media also provide opportunities both for committing crime and for policing it.

Marks	Level Descriptors
25–30	<p>Answers in this band will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge of a range of relevant material on sociological contributions to our understanding of the relationship between crime and the media. Sophisticated understanding of the question and of the presented material will be shown.</p> <p>Appropriate material will be applied accurately and with sensitivity to the issues raised by the question.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant. Evaluation may be developed, for example by evaluating different aspects of the relationship between crime and the media, or by locating the discussion within debates between perspectives. Analysis will show clear explanation. Appropriate conclusions will be drawn.</p>
19–24	<p>Answers in this band will show accurate, broad or deep but incomplete knowledge. Understands a number of significant aspects of the question; good understanding of the presented material.</p> <p>Application of material is largely explicitly relevant to the question, though some material may be inadequately focused.</p> <p>Some limited explicit evaluation, for example of the idea of moral panics, and/or some appropriate analysis, e.g. clear explanations of some of the presented material.</p>
13–18	<p>Answers in this band will show largely accurate knowledge but limited range and depth, e.g. a broadly accurate, if basic, account of how the media increase relative deprivation and crime. Understands some limited but significant aspects of the question; superficial understanding of the presented material.</p> <p>Applying listed material from the general topic area but with limited regard for its relevance to the issues raised by the question, or applying a narrow range of more relevant material.</p>

	Evaluation will take the form of juxtaposition of competing positions or one to two isolated stated points. Analysis will be limited, with answers tending towards the descriptive.
7–12	<p>Answers in this band will show limited undeveloped knowledge, e.g. two to three insubstantial points about moral panics. Understands only limited aspects of the question; simplistic understanding of the presented material.</p> <p>Limited application of suitable material, and/or material often at a tangent to the demands of the question, e.g. accounts of theories/studies of crime with little reference to the media.</p> <p>Very limited or no evaluation. Attempts at analysis, if any, are thin and disjointed.</p>
1–6	<p>Answers in this band will show very limited knowledge, e.g. one to two very insubstantial points about crime and deviance in general. Very little/no understanding of the question and of the presented material.</p> <p>Significant errors and/or omissions in application of material.</p> <p>No analysis or evaluation.</p>
0	No relevant points.

Indicative Content

Concepts and issues such as the following may appear: over-representation; the dramatic fallacy; the age fallacy; the social construction/manufacture of news; news values; copycat crime; catharsis; relative deprivation; cultural inclusion; economic exclusion; cultural criminology; media-saturated society/mediascape; commodification of crime; consumption; modernity; late/post-modernity; moral entrepreneurs; deviance amplification spiral; societal reaction; folk devils; moral panics; distortion and exaggeration; prediction; symbolisation; stigmatisation; marginalisation; cyber-crime; digital surveillance/control.

Sources may include the following or other relevant ones: Becker; S. Cohen; Cohen and Young; Ditton and Duffy; Felson; Fenwick and Hayward; Hall et al; Hayward and Young; Jewkes; Lea and Young; McRobbie and Thornton; Schramm; Soothill and Walby; Surette; Thomas and Loader; J. Young.

Qu	Marking guidance	Total marks
----	------------------	-------------

05	Outline and explain two disadvantages of using laboratory experiments in sociological research.	10
----	--	----

Marks	Level Descriptors
8–10	<p>Answers in this band will show very good knowledge and understanding of two disadvantages of using laboratory experiments in sociological research.</p> <p>There will be two applications of relevant material, e.g. laboratory experiments are conducted in an artificial rather than a naturalistic setting so as to give the researcher control over the variables to be tested; practical and financial constraints mean laboratory experiments are often small in scale and of limited duration.</p> <p>There will be appropriate analysis, e.g. the artificiality of the setting undermines validity because of the Hawthorne effect: participants respond to the experimental situation/researcher rather than to the experimental stimuli; short, small-scale laboratory experiments are not suited to investigating the effects of large-scale social structures or long-term historical processes.</p>
4–7	<p>Answers in this band will show a reasonable to good knowledge and understanding of one or two disadvantages of using laboratory experiments in sociological research.</p> <p>There will be one or two applications of relevant material, e.g. it is often necessary for participants to be unaware of the aims of the experiment but this means they cannot give informed consent.</p> <p>There will be some basic analysis.</p>
1–3	<p>Answers in this band will show limited knowledge and little or no understanding of the question or the material.</p> <p>There will be limited focus on the question, e.g. there may be some drift into the disadvantages of field experiments.</p> <p>There will be limited or no analysis.</p>
0	No relevant points.

Indicative content

Answers may include the following and/or other relevant points:

- Ethical problems, e.g. informed consent, vulnerability of/harm to participants
- Lack of representativeness due to small scale
- Lack of validity

- Experiments' positivist assumptions fail to recognise humans have free will.
- Unsuitability for investigating open systems/lack of control over multiplicity of variables
- Unsuitability for studying past events
- Difficulties matching control and experimental groups' characteristics exactly
- Experimenter bias/expectancy effect

Sources may include the following or other relevant ones: Charkin et al; Durkheim; Harvey and Slatin; Keat and Urry; Mason; Mayo; Milgram; Rosenthal and Fode; examples of natural science experiments.

Qu	Marking guidance	Total marks
----	------------------	-------------

06	Applying material from Item C and your knowledge, evaluate the advantages of using structured interviews in sociological research.	20
----	---	----

Item C

Structured interviews are a relatively cheap way of studying a sample. Positivist sociologists favour structured interviews because they produce reliable data that can be used to test hypotheses.

However, critics argue that structured interviews are inflexible and that their results lack validity.

Marks	Level Descriptors
17–20	<p>Answers in this band will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge of a range of relevant material relating to the advantages of using structured interviews in sociological research. Sophisticated understanding of the question and of the presented material will be shown.</p> <p>Appropriate material will be applied accurately and with sensitivity to the issues raised by the question.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant. Evaluation will be closely related to the specific practical, ethical and theoretical advantages of structured interviews identified in the answer, and may consider the inter-relationship between practical, ethical and/or theoretical aspects. Analysis will show clear explanation. Appropriate conclusions will be drawn.</p>
13–16	<p>Answers in this band will show accurate, broad or deep but incomplete knowledge. Understands a number of significant aspects of the question; good understanding of the presented material.</p> <p>Application of material is largely explicitly relevant to the question, though some material may be inadequately focused.</p> <p>Some limited explicit evaluation, e.g. of the significance of refusal rate in relation to representativeness, and/or some appropriate analysis, e.g. clear explanations of some of the presented material.</p>
9–12	<p>Answers in this band will show accurate knowledge but limited range and depth, e.g. a broadly accurate, if basic, account of some advantages of structured interviews. Understands some limited but significant aspects of the question; superficial understanding of the presented material.</p> <p>Applying listed material from the general topic area but with limited regard for its relevance to the issues raised by the question, or applying a narrow range of more</p>

	<p>relevant material.</p> <p>Evaluation will take the form of juxtaposition of listed disadvantages of structured interviews unlinked to stated advantages, or one or two isolated stated points. Analysis will be limited, with answers tending towards the descriptive.</p>
5–8	<p>Answers in this band will show limited undeveloped knowledge, e.g. two or three insubstantial points about structured interviews. Understands only limited aspects of the question; simplistic understanding of the presented material.</p> <p>Limited application of suitable material, and/or material often at a tangent to the demands of the question, e.g. drifting into an answer about other research methods.</p> <p>Very limited or no evaluation. Attempts at analysis, if any, are thin and disjointed.</p>
1–4	<p>Answers in this band will show very limited knowledge, e.g. one or two very insubstantial points about structured interviews or about sociological methods in general. Very little/no understanding of the question and of the presented material.</p> <p>Significant errors and/or omissions in application of material.</p> <p>No analysis or evaluation.</p>
0	No relevant points.

Indicative content

Concepts and issues such as the following may appear: methodological preference; positivism; hypothesis-testing; standardised measuring instrument; representativeness; reliability; generalisation; causal laws; social facts; closed- and open-ended questions; objectivity; quantitative data; training interviewers; cost; time; refusal rate; interpretivism; validity; insight; researcher imposition; interviewer bias; social desirability; interview as interaction situation; inflexibility; superficiality; feminist views; ethical issues (vulnerability, harm, informed consent); utility in relation to different research contexts and issues.

Sources may include the following or other relevant ones: Crime Survey for England and Wales; Goldthorpe and Lockwood; Graham; Oakley; Reinharz; Young and Wilmott.