



Simply Sociology

Using material from Item A and elsewhere, assess the usefulness of labelling theory in explaining crime and deviance. (21 marks)

1. Labelling theory shed light on the labelling process that deems someone as criminal or deviant. E.g Becker argues someone only becomes deviant because moral entrepreneurs with power and resources declare someone to be. This could explain why homosexuality was deemed deviant and even criminal in the past because religion was the largest moral entrepreneur. Now it is no longer considered deviant or criminal because LGBTQI groups hold lots of power and pressurized governments to change. Labelling theory shows that no act in itself is deviant, but the labelling process creates deviance.
 - a. + This shows the importance of power relationships between those who commit acts and those who deem those actors to be deviant.
 - b. However ignores the fact there are many acts in the world that anyone would consider criminal in itself, such as murder or sexual violence. Therefore this theory is inadequate at understanding some things are just 'wrong' in themselves, a person or group do not have to label it to be known.
 - i. However, on this point there are differences across the world in what is 'wrong' morally or otherwise. For instance it is argued that everyone believes killing or murder is wrong, yet we have armies that slaughter and in the East there are countries that condone 'honour killings' which are just another form of murder. Therefore actually labelling theory is more adequate and useful at explaining the differences in crime compared to other theories which argue an act is criminal in itself, when other societies would disagree.
2. Labelling theory can aid understanding of why there are big differences in crime rates, i.e why the working classes and ethnic minorities are overrepresented in the official crime statistics. This is because of selective law enforcement. In practicality the police do not have unlimited resources and have to tackle crime selectively, they act on racist and prejudiced assumptions and label people as deviant in order to meet quotas and be seen to be tackling crime. For example Cicourel found that police officers attached harmful stereotypes called typifications to working class

youth even when the middle class youth did the same thing. The police were more likely to conceive acts of the WC youth as deviant or criminal compared to the MC youth. The police let off the MC youth for criminal or deviant acts because the MC parents could negotiate justice (e.g my kid is just acting out, they are a good child and will not do it again).

- a. + Shows the importance of stereotyping in understanding deviance and law enforcement
 - b. Realists would rebut this argument by saying that potentially there is more WC crime compared to MC and as such the police do not stereotype working class youth but know what to look out for because the same group have committed so much crime. In fact the Left realists would argue that WC youth do commit more crime because they are more marginalised, relatively deprived and form into delinquent subcultures.
 - c. Labelling theory ignores the importance of wider structural factors like poverty in crime, those who are poor might be more likely to commit crime rather than those who are poor are more likely to be labelled as deviant.
 - d. Doesn't explain where prejudice comes from in the first place, where did the first person who labelled someone get the idea to label that person from? Does not explain that.
 - e. Doesn't explain why some people are labelled and others are not!
3. Labelling theory can highlight the labelling process and how it works in detail as well. For instance Lemert (1972) distinguishes between primary and secondary deviance and how behaviour moves from being an act to becoming deviant or criminal. To explain, if we use the example of a paedophile who only downloads child pornography in their free time at home on their computer then they aren't labelled as deviant and their activities don't affect their self concept. This is primary deviance. However as soon as that deviance becomes public and people find out about it, such as a neighbour house sitting finding the child pornography on the computer, the person is labelled as a paedophile and this becomes secondary deviance. Different to the straight forward 'you are deviant' label, Lemert argues that secondary deviance manifests itself in the self-concept of the deviant, meaning that a person becomes their label and everyone treats them as that label. For example Becker argues that if a child pornographer was a manager or mother, or sister or samaritain it wouldn't matter, a master status effect would come into play and they would only be known by their label paedophile.
- a. If nothing in itself is deviant before secondary deviance or even primary deviance why do some people react so strongly with labels.

- b. This argues that deviance becomes deviance when people label it but people know they are being deviant before it is labeled so it is not just the labelling process.
 - i. However it could be argued that people know they are being deviant before they are personally labelled because people before them have been labelled after doing the same act and so they are conscious of it even before they have been caught out.
 - c. + Highlights details of the labelling process that structuralist theories simply cannot.
 - d. Because this theory is concerned with the labelling process it does not explain the cause of deviance in the first place, before a label why does someone choose to do an immoral act?
 - e. + Although it can show how the label affects self concept in a way other theories cannot.
4. Labelling theory is useful in explaining how deviance can be amplified by media's reaction to it. For instance Young (1971) showed how people who recreationally used cannabis got picked up by the media and stereotyped as hippies with long hair tie dye tshirts and smoked cannabis a lot. The effect of the media's reaction meant that those who did have those attributes were stereotyped and labelled as deviant. This caused them to be marginalised in society, although this marginalisation process caused the 'hippies' to band together and smoke weed more as that's what everyone thought was happening anyway. Labelling process can explain how the label attached to someone causes them to act more like their label in a Self Fulfilling Prophecy fashion.
- a. + Shows how labelling can lead to SFP and deviant careers.
 - b. This theory even as an action theory is very deterministic in that it assumes once someone has been labelled they will become deviant, but in most cases it would put someone off that act or avoid deviance all together because of the strong public reaction to it.
 - c. Removes blame from deviants to labellers, romanticises them.
5. Conclusion:

Using material from Item B and elsewhere, assess the view that the process of globalisation has led to changes in both the amount of crime and the types of crime committed. (21 marks)

Item B Some sociologists define globalisation as an increasing interconnectedness in the world. Globalisation is multi-causal, and there are a number of key processes and events that may have aided its development, including: technological innovation global crises the end of the Cold War the growth of transnational organisations the expansion of free trade. Views on the impact of globalisation on crime vary. Globalisation has led to changes in the opportunities to commit crime. This has meant increases in some types of crime such as fraud, and new crimes such as cyber crime.

Globalisation is the increasing interconnectedness between different countries and their dependence on each other. Crime has become transnational made possible through technological advances and communication. Types of global crime include;

- Arms trafficking, movement of illegal weapons for wars
- Human trafficking, movement of human beings for the sex industry or as slaves
- Cyber crimes, such as fraud or hacking e.g North Korea hacking Sony
- Terrorism, such as the growth of ISIS or Al Qaeda in the past
- Money laundering, movement of illegal money from separate accounts to hide their illegal origin.

1. It has been suggested that the global crime economy has rocketed up in recent years, Castell now estimates that the business is worth of 2 trillion dollars a year. He argues that what has driven this change and swift growth is the demand in the North, whereby the South come into play to supply them. For example the North's drugs are supplied by South America largely, although there are ports which traffic drugs all over Europe, one of the biggest being in Ukraine. With reference to Item B the opportunities for crime are opening up as countries across the globe have opened their borders up for trade of legal substances, meaning illegal substances can be trafficked through without suspicion. Therefore the process of globalisation has led to the opening up of previously small demand and supply from North to West, leading to a 2 trillion crime economy.

- a. However thinking about the 2 trillion dollars specifically this could be grossly exaggerated because it would be impossible to estimate or approximate the value of the illegal drugs trade because it is illegal. In its very nature there would not be any paperwork highlighting exactly how much cocaine they had shifted through a certain port and sold for a certain amount that Castell or governments could use to find this number.
- b. However it could be argued that this process of supply and demand is not as big as it is made out; meaning that in the 19th and 20th centuries Britain was

a vast exporter and trader in opium, at two points they forced China to trade in it, selling unprecedented amounts to China and causing people to die and two opium wars. Now it seems that the South is supplying vast quantities to the North. It is just a switch over, rather than a sudden growth.

2. It could be argued that globalisation has led to the increase in crimes across the globe. Taylor argues that there are links between capitalism, TNC's and crime. For instance because of globalisation TNC's have realised they can get cheaper labour abroad with lower regulations and smaller tax so that they can maximise profit. For instance we have seen in the past BT has taken their call centres abroad to save money. Because TNC's have gone abroad there are less career progressive jobs in Britain and in other western countries which has led to greater poverty in our country. Taylor believes that this has risen crime levels because the people in poverty have no option but to turn to crime to gain some kind of income to survive. This not only affects crime rates of the poor, but this also means all classes are affected. For example middle class crime has risen, especially corporate crimes, tax evasion from companies like Starbucks as well as working class crime.
 - a. However it could be argued that this is far exaggerated because not all poor people in the countries of origin turn to crime. For instance when BT left not all of the staff left behind turned to crime to get by. So this theory of a crime increase cannot explain the case for everyone, and thus may not be a fully theory of crime rising.
 - i. Although, this theory is good at highlighting the current trend in tax evasion which is a crime. For instance more and more we are hearing of global companies which have avoided paying tax by not being based in a country, or being based in one but paying another country's tax rates. Therefore Taylor can help explain how crime rates of this nature have increased; in search of profit.

3. The globalisation process has led to changes in the types of crime we have as well. For instance there are increased in terrorism which wasn't seen as much on a global scale before 9/11. In fact the risk of global terrorism from groups on the other side of the world wasn't really known of on this extent until that time. Now it has become more and more common, we are fighting ISIS who are using cyber tactics which aren't strictly illegal to persuade people to fight for them as well as foiling more terrorist plots from 'allies' to these groups. Hobbs and Dunningham argue that crime is no longer a local phenomenon, they refer to crime as 'glocal' meaning that whilst

the base of crime is in a town it has global links. For example getting drugs from South America and selling them at your local pub. Globalisation has allowed this process to exist and therefore has produced a change in the crime we see.

- a. However, 'glocal' crimes are normally arms trade or drugs, which have always been globalised. For instance without drawing suspicion and spending money on facilities gangs have always had to get their drugs abroad. So maybe this has always been a phenomenon not a new crime.
 - b. Also some globalisation theorists like Traditionalists would argue that this system of global trade has existed for years, now it is just an advanced form of capitalism not a new thing opening up new crimes.
 - i. Although it could be argued that there has been a change in hierarchical gang structures because of globalisation. Before there were stages in a gang, a boss and minions for example. However now globalisation has opened up doorways for opportunistic individuals. This change to individuals could explain the increases in lone wolf crimes of the MC, for instance fraud or cyber crime. Because of the man-power associated with the old ways these crimes weren't as appealing, however these can be done relatively easily (with expert knowledge) by the right individuals.
4. Conclusion: Whilst new types of crimes have come up for instance global terrorism and cyber crime have increased in commonality, it is heavily debated whether the extent of globalisation is as large as they say with some traditionalists or pessimistic globalists arguing that globalisation isn't great and it doesn't exist on the exaggerated level, whilst some argue that it is real, it is happening and crime is changing and rising because of it. It could be argued that instead of crime rising, the risks of crime awareness is rising. Beck's risk consciousness idea could relate to this debate and argue that it is not crime itself rising but our consciousness of it because of globalisation. This would explain why the UK have tightened their border controls, they are aware of the risks of groups like ISIS infiltrating.

Assess the contribution of functionalist and New Right theories and research to our understanding of society today. (33 marks)

1. Functionalists can shed light on how society across time works and how it is structured. To explain they makes comparisons between the human body and society through the analogy of the human organ system. E.g Parsons (1970) identified three ways in which they are the same;
 - a. System- they are both self-regulating but still independent parts that fit together, like social institutions (education) and individual roles (teacher).
 - b. System needs- the organs of the body have needs they need to meet to survive. Society has similar needs and it uses socialisation of people to continue society in order to survive.
 - c. Functions- the functions of the body and societies are to meet the needs of them. For example the economy meets the needs of food and shelter.

Therefore Functionalists can explain the inner workings of society.

- i. However it could be argued that an analogy is not an explanation in itself but a comparison to another system which does not give understanding of that which is being explained. Parsons does not explain the structure of society so much as he describes the workings of the body.

- ii. Although it could be counter argued that this does add understanding. For instance, we still understand how society is a system with needs and methods of meeting those needs. We understand that it is full of self-regulating but independent systems. Whilst Parsons does not directly explain the society by itself he does still explain it adequately through the body. Therefore it still makes a contribution to the understanding of society.

2. Functionalists can explain how social order exists in society. For instance Parsons argues that value consensus of a central value system of beliefs and goals keeps social order. Durkheim believed (1895) that people were naturally selfish and so without collective consensus from socialisation society would fail. Through institutions in society like education, religion or the family socialisation occurs which can internalise the values of society into the child, which would mean they bond with others through them. Through this bonding process the naturally selfish elements of

the human being are removed and replaced with values which they share with the rest of society. Therefore Functionalists are able to explain how social order exists.

- a. However Post-modernism would argue that today society is so fragmented and individualistic that there is no whole shared collective value consensus. So if the basis of social order is through the value consensus then society would be in constant turmoil, however it is not and so this theory cannot adequately explain social order in the modern society today.
- b. On the other hand Marxists would argue that there is a value consensus and to this much Functionalists are correct, however where this value consensus come from is not through great socialisation of children but instead through ruling class oppression. Gramsci would argue that instead of collective conscious what maintains social order is RC hegemony. The RC gain consent through promoting their values through education in the form of idealistic meritocracy and through the media stipulation of wealth, success and overindulgence. People do not want the latter in instinct however promoting these values allows people to feel more comfortable working within the capitalist system to gain them, inadvertently selling themselves as cheap labour. Therefore Functionalists do not provide an adequate account of social order and do not contribute greatly to the debate on this.
- c. Although on that note it could be argued that the ruling classes don't exist, yes capitalism is the system we work under however the oppressive forces and legitimisation of unrealistic goals aren't as apparent anymore in the current society. So too Marxism fails to fully account for social order.

3. Functionalists can show how and individual is integrated into society. Integration in a Functionalists eyes means moving or directing a person to meet the needs of that society. Parsons argues that there are two main ways to integrate a person into society;

- Socialisation- through family, education, and work the individual internalises the values that these institutions promote such as fairness, hard work, deadlines, working under management and respect for authority.

- Social control- positive sanctions reward conformity and negative sanctions punish deviance. For instance if you are conformist you are likely to get the job, you are more likely to get the house or apartment and if you are deviant you are going to prison.

The result of this process of integration into society means that peoples behaviour is relatively predictable; they will get up for work, they will go to school, they will stay in work all of their lives etc.

- a. However Post-modernists would argue that people are parts of lots of different institutions, because of the way society is there are lots of values being presented from lots of different sources, sometimes even contradicting each other. For example Christianity, Islam, Judaism etc are all conflicting religions yet all prevalent in society. So how it is that an individual is integrated if there are so many different values, how do they come out with the same ones. Back in the time Functionalists came about society was very collectivists but now this theory cannot explain society.
- b. Max Weber would argue that in order to understand integration and collective behaviour we need to first look at the objective social structures around them, but also the meanings behind their behaviour. Functionalists do not look at how the individual feels, whether they passively accept the values of society or whether they actively work against them from within. Therefore this theory is not very adequate at understanding society.

4. New Right theorists can aid our understanding of society because of their understanding of poverty, the causes and stipulation of. To explain the New Right believe that there are cultural causes of poverty through the underclass. Sociologists like Murray believe that parts of society are in poverty because of the underclass, a group lower than the working class which house their own values and belief systems. This group socialise the next generation into reckless values of irresponsibility and laziness, Murray characterises the men as financially and sexually irresponsible and the women as lazy dependants. These values form part of a dependency culture whereby those newly socialised people have no skills and rely on the government welfare benefits, which forms a dependency culture. The next generation are raised poor and so on. Therefore New Right research and approaches have contributed to our understanding of society through their explanation of how society remains poor.

- a. + In practical and political application this approach is 'anti-scrounger' and as such is popular with a lot of people.
- b. + Can explain and draw attention to the problems of long term unemployment, meaning that they form the theoretical basis for the issues, ie. the underclass
- c. However it has been argued that this approach is based on harmful stereotypes of the poor, e.g Murrar is criticised for having little evidence to support his claim that men in the underclass are irresponsible as a group. Evidence for the dependency culture they believe continues poverty is limited as well. Less than 1% according to some statistics of benefits are fraudulent meaning that the other 99% or so are needed.
- d. Cannot explain the phenomenon of people being born into poverty but moving out of it over time, this shows that they don't internalise the values of being poor and actually want to achieve in life. They ignore the influence of the media, for instance watching reality TV shows like made in chelsea or the only way is essex would promote middle class wealthy which they could strive for. Thus this theory is limited in understanding the continuation of poverty.

5. The New Right and Functionalists can aid our understanding of the role of education. To explain the New right believe that the state imposes a framework for schools that they have to follow, such as OFSTED, league tables etc. These promote the active choice parents have as to the best school to send their children too. They also believe that the state imposes a national curriculum to transmit a shared culture to all pupils so they have one national identity. These British values are transmitted through subjects like British History, English Literature and studying Christianity. From a functionalist perspective this internalises the students values so they can become functional parts of society when they leave. Therefore New Right and Functionalists perspectives can shed light on the role of education in society.

- a. However it could be argued that there is a contradiction between parental choice over schools through looking at OFSTED reports and league tables, and imposing a national curriculum in all schools so that the same values are transmitted to each student. There cannot be much choice if the curriculum is state imposed.
- b. + Although it does help us understand how society integrates individuals into society on a deeper level than we have seen from Functionalists so far. Durkehim would argue that schools promote a sense of social solidarity through the curriculum and the shared values that are transmitted.
- c. Post-Modernism would argue that they are wrong to assume the meta-narrative of British culture is the right way to go. For instance, this ignores the ethnic minorities in

this society who's own meta-narrative could be even better. Whilst this is a very ethnocentric approach anyway, it fails under how the theory is no more relevant than any other on the same subject.

- d. Marxists would argue that the 'shared values' that are transmitted may not be consensual or even shared values of the society as a whole. For instance some Marxists believe that the values being transmitted are from the ruling classes who are trying to justify and legitimise their oppressive rule. Schools who are higher on the OFSTED reports or league tables only work for middle class students and parents who can move into the area. Because of the excessive marketisation and competition this theory promotes, schools will higher the prices of houses around them meaning only the richer can afford good education. Therefore New Right theorists contribute to an understanding, however the values schools promote are not what they claim, and they do not promote fairness but inequality. They therefore are a hub of ruling class values not consensus.

6. Functionalists can also explain the state of education currently, this is through the idea of meritocracy and socialisation. Parsons believes that the role of school is to do what New Rights believe and transmit values, however it is also to 'bridge the gap' between stage one of family socialisation which promotes fairness etc to stage two of socialisation in school, hard work, obedience and overall shared values internalised. Therefore slightly differently, Functionalists believe that the role of education is to bridge the gap of socialisation.

- a. However the same problems fall again, from the Marxists they argue that this perspective of shared values may just be ruling class values and therefore not shared values which is what they argue.
- b. The basis of meritocracy teaching children to work hard to bridge the gap into working life is disputed as well. This is because some perspectives argue that there is no meritocracy because working classes and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as the middle classes, they cannot afford resources and cannot go on trips. Therefore even if the system is meritocratic, it only benefits the MC who can afford to compete against others and work hard.

7. Conclusion / or if you have time could include a paragraph about Parsons building blocks of society.

‘Sociology can and should be a science.’ To what extent do sociological arguments and evidence support this view? (33 marks)

This essay has two parts, can sociology be a science meaning what qualities can sociology and science share leading to sociology being classed as a science, and two, should sociology be a science depending on what perspective sociological theory takes, looking what society actually is and whether you should study it scientifically. Popper and Kuhn argue that sociology cannot be a science because there are fundamental differences between the two, whilst Realists argue that it could be it could be argued to share some elements just different subject matter. Positivists think sociology should be a science because essentially their whole method aims to be scientific, whilst interpretivists believe sociology should not be a science because society cannot be studied like one, the subject matters are fundamentally different.

Karl Popper argues that sociology cannot be a science because a science has to be falsifiable and has to have the highest elements of objectivity. He believes that sociology does not fulfil either and therefore cannot be one until it does. To explain, falsifiability is the term used to describe the ability to prove something wrong. For instance water boiling at 100 degrees is falsifiable because we can test it at various temperatures and see if it boils. However it is believed sociology cannot be proved wrong. For example Marxism has the idea that eventually the working class will gain class consciousness, realise their exploitation and overthrow the ruling class. This cannot be proved wrong, because Marxists could say 'well it just hasn't happened yet' for the rest of time, and thus this theory is always right. Karl believes we can never have absolute knowledge of truth, and as such a good theory has to be proved wrong. This also relates to objectivity, because science aims to prove things wrong it removes the subjective opinion about something, you can collect as much data as you want that support your view and it will not be valid, but trying to actively disprove your theory is the most objective a person can be. As sociology can sometimes not be proved wrong we can assume that the studies are not objective. For example Feminism is value laden, everything oppresses women, science in itself oppresses women and they actively find different ways to support their views, hence they can never be objective. Therefore sociology cannot be a science because it can not be objective and it falls into the fallacy of induction, finding evidence to support rather than trying to disprove.

However there is some criticism particularly from the positivists who believe that sociology should be a science and it in fact can be a science because it can be objective and it can be falsified. For instance the positivist methods always aim to be scientific, they use detached methods like non-participant observation and structured interviews, that they they do not let any of their views onto their research. They also favour using the methods of official statistics which is very detached, and can be falsified. For instance, positivists may believe that Suicide is a social fact and the result only of social and moral regulation and integration and can find this through statistics, but there is always the possibility of finding a statistics that is nether and therefore disproves the theory. Therefore sociology should be a science and can be because it can be objective and falsifiable.

Alternatively Popper might respond and argue that the objectivity and falsifiability that positivists claim is the wrong type. Whilst being detached is scientific yes, it does not automatically mean objectivity, the researcher could still in a structured interview manipulate the way they write result to fit their ideas of the hypothesis, they are only human and could interpret an answer in a way it is not supposed to be viewed. Also they do not actively try to disprove their theory, for instance Durkheim searched for evidence of patterns and trends in suicide across Europe, it is highly likely that when he came across suicide that did not fit he ignored it. Contextually at the time, statistics were not as organised so no one would even realise he missed them out. On the other hand, the Durkheim example specifically cannot be falsifiable because the terms of integration and regulation are not properly operationalised. For instance he did not define exactly what both of them were and so technically all deaths and suicides could be fitting into one or more category, having such blurred lines means we cannot prove the theory wrong because if we decide a suicide does not fit into regulation it could be argued to fit into regulation and cannot not fit into these.

On the other hand it could be argued by Feminists that science itself is malestream and whilst they claim that feminists are value laden and therefore cannot be objective it is only because science is run by males and for males and so any evidence they find will show the oppression of women because it is designed to fundamentally in the nature of being male dominated show that. Also, Harding and Hart argue that science is inadequate and holds little value to women because it does not work for women, it is based on males and for males. Science in itself is oppressive to women and so sociology one cannot be a science because it has women involved in it (feminists) and should not be a science because it is oppressive.

Realists alternatively argue that science and sociology can work together because of the controls on research that both use; open and closed systems. Whilst sociology favours open systems there are still elements of control. For instance positivists favour structured methods and in this way can control for word differentiation on answers, different questions

meaning different things to different people and can be quantified. Therefore sociology can be a science because it holds some of the control systems that science does also.

Secondly, Thomas Kuhn argues that sociology cannot be a science either because science is defined by having paradigms that all scientists work under, sociology has so many conflicting theories there can be no one paradigm and therefore it cannot be a science. To explain a paradigm is a set of values and beliefs that research can be conducted under, for instance valuing the objective study of phenomenon in the world rather than the subjective opinion based study of the world, they want conscience and controlled research with little confounding variables. All scientists work under this and research is funded if it best fits the paradigm, sociology does not have one. There is a conflict between interpretivists who believe that society is in our heads and so should be studied subjectively and there are positivists who believe that society is an external phenomenon that we can objectively study. Fundamentally there are differences within theories and how they study society in the same way there are fundamentally different theories for things in sociology, for instance Functionalists and the New right are explaining education but are coming up with totally different explanations for its role. Kuhn thinks that sociology is in a pre-paradigm state, where there is no one paradigm and until the conflicts between theories can be sorted out or one proved wrong, there will be no paradigm, therefore sociology cannot be a science.

Although it is suggested by sociologists like Lakatos (1970) that science does not have one overarching paradigm at a time, paradigms are a progression from history, for instance there have been many different paradigms over time, for example the enlightenment project and so sociology can be a science because rather than over history having different paradigms they have them all at once.

As well as this Post-Modernists argue that a scientific paradigm is just another meta-narrative that brings nothing new to society, and cannot help to improve it because it is of no more value than any other perspective. For instance post-modernists believe that society and the world now is so fragmented and that there are so many perspectives on everything that truth has now become relative. So science cannot be the best way forward, and the paradigm shift over time and discipline (science and sociology) does not matter, they are just meta-narratives. On the other hand post-modernists argue that science should not be allowed a monopoly of truth and to do so is dangerous. For instance if we are to be scientific we are essentially suggesting that being scientific is the best thing an academic discipline can be and it should be strived for. However it is just one version of the truth and it brings about very bad things; for instance we are now in a scientific risk society, we are aware of greater risks to our health from pollution and nuclear war because of science than we were before. Problems like degrading environment and getting MRSA or other super drug

resistant bugs in us were not concerns 100 years ago, the risks created in society are greater now because of science. Essentially sociology should not be a science because it will monopolise society through its influence.

However the interpretivists agree with Kuhn in a way, because like Kuhn believes that sociology cannot be a science, they agree that sociology should not even try to be a science because the study of science and the study of the mind are totally different things. For instance science is concerned with phenomenon which do not have consciousness for instance water boiling at 100 degrees does not decide to, it just does. Whereas sociology is created through shared meaning, motivations and actions of individuals and therefore involves consciousness which science cannot study validly. The positivists whilst trying to be scientific lose validity because humans are not unconscious they have motivations and closed questions and non-participant observations are not going to get those validly. The only method of studying society that should be implemented is a subjective one. For example, Mead a symbolic interactionist argues that science cannot fully understand why motorists stop at red lights. For instance, in driving if there is a red light cars stop and wait for it to go from red and orange to green before they can go. This is not because of a force when that orange light comes on causing the cars engines to cut out, the foot on the break to push down and the car to come to a stop, it is because the motorists have attached the meaning of 'stop' to a red light so stop. It isn't even because of the fear of death which animals have by instinct, most motorists don't consider the effects of passing the red light when they stop, just that they have to stop and wait.

Also free will is not something that can be studied scientifically it is an unobservable phenomena. Whilst determinism can be studied because theoretically it has a cause and effect of behaviour, in the interpretivist world there is only free will and so attempting to study causes and effects are pointless. We may be confined by the meanings we attach to things, such as stopping at a red light, but like Blumer argues we have every ability to negotiate and change the meanings we attach.

On another note science also does not allow Verstehen which is very close to the interpretivist theory, meaning the ability to understand a person from their perspective. Science by being objective from the paradigm that this is the best thing, restricts the information it can collect. For instance, a questionnaire on poverty seems scientific, it has closed questions, it is standardised and has a lot of control. When a person is asked how hard they feel poverty is they have the option to respond 'very hard', however this does not give us anything. We cannot understand anything from their perspective and thus get rich useful data if we just accept their answer, we have to go in using an Ethnomethodological

approach and really understand what they mean by 'very hard' and the meanings they attach to it through their motivations.

However a criticism of this perspective from the realists is that both the interpretivists and the positivists ideas of whether sociology should be a science are wrong. For instance the interpretivists have claimed that science cannot study the means and motivations because they are unobservable, and the positivists only study the observable. But science itself is not just restricted to what they can observe. For instance black holes in far away galaxies are not observable but using science we can study them, gravity is not directly observable, there are not giant arrows in the sky pointing down all the time to show us, but it is still able to be studied. Therefore sociology can be a science because the unobservable meanings and motivations can be studied in a scientific way, however in exactly what way (maths, testing, physics etc) is undecided.

Again post-modernists would argue that interpretivists bring nothing to society by assuming that sociology shouldn't be a science because it is just another meta-narrative which holds no more grounding than the idea that it should be a science, that science has paradigms or that sociology has no objectivity in it.

In conclusion it could be argued that the main point of clash in whether sociology can and should be a science is what exactly the phenomena that sociology is studying is. For instance if you believe that society is an external objective phenomena with structures and determinism and therefore cause and effect it could be possible that sociology could be a science if it maintained falsifiability and objectivity. However if like the interpretivists argue society is a creation of shared meanings (Garfinkel) and has no objective reality (and neither does social order) then it may not be possible to study society objective because it is not an objective phenomena. However in terms of objectivity, is it objectivity meaning detachment that science wants and demonstrably the positivists can offer or is it objectivity in terms of wanting to disprove your own theory and thus not actively supporting it with biased evidence? Depending on what type of objectivity you favour then leads to whether sociological theory like the positivists can offer than and if they can then maybe they can and should be a science. However like Kuhn if sociology does not have a paradigm can it be scientific? But then it is argued that science itself is not just one paradigm over time, there are scientific revolutions and so sociology could be a science if it can form one overarching paradigm. Overall it could be concluded that at least in the time being and depending on what objectivity you want, sociology can't be a science and maybe shouldn't try to be because it could lead to science having a monopoly on truth.

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

Assess the usefulness of conflict theories for an understanding of crime and deviance in contemporary society. (21 marks)

1. Traditional Marxists believe that that capitalist system that forms the basis for our society is criminogenic, meaning that in its very essence the structure of our society creates crime. For instance the conflict between those who are successful and wealthy and those who don't have the same opportunities creates the less successful to turn to crime out of necessity. Davis argues that crime is a rational response to the conflict and lack of opportunity within society. Therefore Traditional Marxists would argue that in order to understand crime and deviance in society we need to see it as a response to capitalist society.
 - a. Doesn't explain why everyone doesn't turn to crime e.g not all of the poor or disadvantaged are criminal.
 - b. Cannot explain white collar crime or middle class crime, can only explain crimes where the people have no alternative.
 - c. Cannot explain the different types of criminal or crimes. For example violent, sexual or non-utilitarian crimes cannot be explained by looking at lack of success.

2. Feminists argue that the conflict in society is between gender not class. For instance women are oppressed by men in society through the patriarchy more so than classes are oppressed through capitalism. The patriarchy means that women have to fit into narrow definitions of womanhood or face marginalisation, no freedom on the career ladder and a fear of going out at night from fear of violent crimes. Crime and deviance statistics are biased because men make up most of the offenders, this difference exists because women cannot commit crime due to the heavy patriarchal controls in their lives. For instance in the home women are consumed with their gender role of looking after the kids, cooking dinner, looking after the house etc that there is no time to commit crime. They are controlled in work because they are held down by a glass ceiling and so no opportunities for white collar crime. They are controlled at night and in public through the male gaze and fear of sexual assault. Women don't have the chance to commit crime.

- a. However, Marxists would immediately argue that feminists have it wrong, the main area of conflict is between the classes.
 - i. However dual systems feminism would argue that the system of the patriarchy and capitalism are one and the same, women are exploited in both ways independently and together.
 - b. Although, consensus theories like Hirschi's social bond theory would argue that it isn't so much conflict between genders but whether either gender has stronger social bonds. For instance women are more involved, they have more to lose in terms of their domestic home, they are involved in women's clubs and their children's clubs. Women are more likely to be involved in their children's schooling, getting their child a job and attached to their family. Therefore it is not about oppressed women not having the opportunity to commit crime, but that they have more to lose than men.
 - c. Functionalism would agree with feminism in that women are socialised into their roles and their roles are primarily in the home etc and that women have no time. But they would differ as a consensus theory and say that it's not so much to do with time but poor socialisation. If men were properly socialised then they would be at work or providing for the family, yet men make up the biggest offenders thus they had poor sex role socialisation.
3. Traditional Marxists would argue that because of the class conflict laws which are designed in the interest of the ruling class, laws are defined so that mostly working class people will be 'caught' and prosecuted over middle class crimes. For example, Snider argues that states are reluctant to push any law that would regulate business or restrict profitability. Laws like that against violence, street crimes, muggings, burglary and sex crimes are the most reported, it is hardly ever that the public is brought to the attention of white collar crimes. Therefore in terms of explaining crime in society, traditional marxists would argue that the laws are designed and defined to find more working class people guilty.
- a. However, not all capitalist classes have high crime rates of the working class or any class, for instance Japan or Switzerland. It is contradictory in a capitalist society to lock up all of the working classes because it would mean a reduced amount of labour and thus lower profits.
 - i. Although making crime seem like a working class phenomenon keeps the working class divided so that they do not rise up against the oppressive ruling classes. For instance if all crime is seen to be

committed by working class people then no one would suspect the ruling class of being criminals or illegitimate.

- b. + This is the first theory to identify a link between capitalism and crime
 - c. Functionalists would argue that crime is not caused by this class conflict, working classes make up the biggest proportion of offenders because they are poorly socialised. For instance Murray would argue the underclass are criminal, poorly socialised and irresponsible.
 - i. Although this is fundamentally wrong, for instance some poor people move in and out of poverty and some stay in it for life, both groups are not definitively criminal and not all of them commit crimes. There has to be something else not just class or poor socialisations from poverty.
4. Neo-Marxists would argue that crime and deviance in contemporary society is the result of a conscious choice to rise up against the capitalist regime and redistribute wealth from the richest in society to the poorest. Criminals are criminal because they are struggling up against the system. Taylor argued that what was missing from Traditional Marxist conflict theory was an element of labelling theory to understand the meaning of the label 'criminal' to a criminal.
- a. This cannot explain MC crime, people who live in the system and work it for their benefit would not actively try to destroy it
 - b. Left realists argue that Taylor is romanticising the working class criminals as 'Robin Hoods' when crime in the working classes is normally inter-class meaning working class people target working class, so there is no 'redistribution'.
 - c. Burke argues that this theory is both too general in explaining and tackling crime, therefore not useful.

“Feminism has revolutionised sociology by placing woman at the centre of its analysis of society. However, whilst all share this starting point, there are now many different 'feminists' within sociology.” Assess the contribution of Feminist theories and researchers to our understanding of society. (33 marks)

1. Radical feminists can explain the gender inequality faced in today's society because of its focus on the patriarchy and its oppression. For instance, Firestone believe that women are unequal on the basis of their biology; they get pregnant and become dependent on the man to provide for them, this gives men psychological dominance over them. They not only dominate the domestic world but also the social world, over time and through generations this dominance continues. Therefore radical feminists can explain the basis of gender inequality in society.
 - a. However this theory seems out of date, for instance there is now adoption or surrogacy that people especially women are taking up because of the numbers of children without parents. There is no longer a dominance relationship, we are already seeing the patriarchy creeping back.
 - b. Marxists would believe that the real oppressors are not men or gender but the capitalist class and the ruling elite.
 - i. Radical feminists would come back at this and argue that the elites/ruling class are men, women are not the ruling elite because there is a glass ceiling to break and women cannot get to the highest paid jobs, positions, or success because of this.
2. Liberal feminists can shed light on some of the solutions to gender equality. For instance, they believe that all humans should be equal under law, so laws against sexist discrimination in the workplace or education, as well as the equal pay act all help towards this ideal. Women having more rights actually helps men too because men can express their feminine identity. Being 'such a girl' or 'throwing like a girl' is only an insult because women are seen as the weaker gender and thus being compared to one is an insult. Making women equal would mean that women are no longer the weaker sex and those insults wouldn't exist, they can express their feminine side. Therefore they can explain ways in which to rid inequality.
 - a. + Recognises the importance and effects of policies
 - b. Although Walby (1997) argues that they offer no explanation for the overall status of gender inequality like radical feminists/marxist feminists can.
 - c. Liberal feminists can be accused of being over-optimistic in saying that the only barriers to gender equality are the laws and prejudice. This ignores the genuine deep rooted inequality within the structure of society.
 - d. Radical feminists argue that this simply does not go far enough, destroying the patriarchy is the only way of achieving gender equality.

3. Marxists feminists can explain a woman's position of the wife in capitalist society. For instance because women are seen as the lesser sex and less economically active, it would be ok to assume capitalists do not value women, however they do. For example M.F believe that women absorb anger that would otherwise be projected at the capitalist establishment in the form of an uprising. E. g Fran Ansley (1972) says that women are the 'takers of shit' for their husbands frustrations.
 - a. + Explains domestic violence as acts of aggressions and frustrations against capitalism
 - i. However this takes away the sense of blame from the men for their actions
 - b. Women are not just 'passive shit takers' they have free will and in these situations women can get out of them, yet capitalism doesn't fall.

4. Dual systems feminists combine feminisms with capitalism, in saying that they are both oppressive and exploitative, independent systems working together to oppress women. To understand women's subordination we have to understand the position they hold in the domestic division of labour and the paid workforce. E.g Hartmann argues that the patriarchy and capitalism are intertwined but independent systems which suppress women. This is a more comprehensive account of the subordination than radical feminists could offer just by focusing on the patriarchy.
 - a. This argument suffers because the patriarchy do not exist to the same extent it did decades ago. e.g women are breaking the glass ceiling, single motherhood is acceptable, gender roles are not as heavy and there is less of a constraint on them than 40 years ago.
 - i. However it does exist, women on TV are projected as mothers, feminine, caring and nurturing. These are distinct gender roles in the media which can affect every choice in life, even career choice. For instance there are more men than women in the army, more men than women in the construction business etc it cannot be denied that the patriarchy still exists, maybe not to the same extent but it is still oppressive.

5. Difference feminism is a critical feminist perspective of other feminists perspectives, it can shed light on recent events in the east in terms of feminism. Difference feminists argue that radical and liberal feminists are ethnocentric towards white, middle class, western women. They ignore different cultures ethnicities, age or classes. The previous theories are essentialists, seeing all women as essentially the same.

Problems faced by women in the west are not the same as those faced by women in other parts of the world. E.g a politician in the east has recently declared that the cause of the countries issues, a crisis and a flood were the result of women wearing 'immodest' skinny jeans. The thought process of men in those countries is not the same as men in the west, therefore the patriarchy is not the same over there as it is here. Difference feminism can highlight the need for more feminist movements in the East and can shed light on the reasons why women's rights groups are taking off in those countries.

- a. However Marxists feminists would argue that all over the world where there is capitalism there is oppression. White or not women are oppressed in the same ways by capitalism because they are the takers of shit. Marxist feminists do not ignore this.
 - i. Although even in non-capitalist states women are still oppressed. Even in some capitalist countries there is a much reduced rate of oppression because it is more equal e.g Sweden or Finland. There there is something more that Marxists cannot comprehend.
6. Feminist theories have highlighted malestream structures in society like sociology. Male stream is the notion that sociology is dominated by men, written by male researchers, researched on men and to explain male issues. Newbury (2007) argues that women are invisible in criminology. Feminist theories through highlighting this have lead to a fresh new focus on women in sociology, in this case female offending and female experiences in the CJS. This focus has lead to existing theories being adapted and changed to take into account women's experiences which would overall make them better theories.
- a. However it could be argued that sociology is not malestream especially criminology and the focus on men is purely because men commit more crime than women and so making theories about male crime is more useful and adequate explanation of crimes than a female centric theory.
 - b. Marxists would argue that malestream sociology is a system to divide the working classes. They argue that WC women would separate themselves from WC men, back when sociology first came about men were the ones doing the jobs and so the difference in gender was less noticeable, not this has continued it is a tool to oppress the working class women.
7. Feminist theories also have perspectives on the differences in crime itself as well as the study of crime. For instance patriarchal control theory is used to explain why even

if women wanted to women could not commit crime. Heidensohn argues that socialisation, social circumstance and informal/formal controls all lead to differences in crime. He believes that women commit less crime because they have far less controls in their lives than men, in the work, home and public spheres. For example at the home women have to cook, clean, look after the kids etc and have no time to commit crime. At work women cannot commit white collar crime because there is a glass ceiling preventing them from getting there. And in public 54% of women report being afraid to go out at night from fear of sexual violence. Therefore feminists can help explain the lack of crime reported from women.

- a. + Heidensohn shows that there is still some control of the patriarchy over women
- b. In modern times women are not controlled by the heteronormative living standards and there are far less controls in the home from gender roles. For instance in Sweden the roles sometimes are reversed so much so that men stay at home and look after the kids whilst the women goes out to work. Yet there is still this crime difference. There must be something more to it than gender.
- c. Underplays free -will and choice in offending by saying that women are controlled and determined by the patriarchy

Using material from Item A and elsewhere, assess sociological views of the relationship between crime and the mass media. (21 marks)

1. The media gives a distorted view of crime. They over-represent violent and sexual crimes, portray criminals as white middle class men (breaking bad etc) when criminals are actually younger working class and probably from an ethnic minority. They exaggerate the police's success in catching criminals. For example, in Sweden the prosecution/arrest rates of violent crimes are only 6%, that 94% of violent crimes going unresolved. Cohen and Yuomg argue that the media manufacture news to sell papers.
 - a. However, whilst crime may not occur all the time, for instance in my perception crime is non-existent because of the rural neighbourhood I live in. However if I went into a poor inner city estate then I perceive crime rates to

be much higher. Its easy to say that media exaggerate crime rates and the fear of crime when sociologists live in white middle class neighbourhoods.

- b. + Can explain how/why people are afraid to go out alone at night. For example 54% of women are afraid to go out at compared to only 14% of men.
 - i. However it cannot be argued that this is the media's fault entirely, the peopel who are afraid to go out would stay in and watch TV and the media ad subject themselves to far more exposure of crime than people who do go out, thus their fear of crime is greater then it would be for anyone else.
2. Media can actually cause crime. To explain horror films such as childs play influenced the killers of James Bulger, violent video games have also caused significant levels of aggressive in children. TV has also influenced copy cat killers who have seen extensive coverage of killers in the news and media and copied their methods. For example Bandura found that children who watched violent TV compared to children who did not showed higher levels of aggression even after just watching it for a small amount of time.
 - a. However the rates of copy cat killers themselves are exaggerated, just like violent murders do not happen every day, neither do copy cat killers. So the idea that media causes crime through influencing copy cat killers is not a very representative idea and canot explain a great deal about media's overall influence.
 3. The main relationship between media and crime is that of moral panics over crime, a big part of this is how media reports crime. In the past media has had the power to exaggerate crime to such an extent that the public rise up in panic about, because they feel like it is a much bigger problem than it is. For instance, Stanely Cohen researched 'folk devils and moral panics' surrounding the mods and rockers phenomenon in the 1960's. He found that there was a small clash between mods and rockers on a beach once, but the media calculated vast numbers to what was actually there, they sensationalised the day so much that headlines of 'day of terror' arose. The sensationalisation brought the trend to more and more people making it seem exciting for young people of the time, thus more and more mods and rockers grew out of that media covered. Soon there was an organised fight between mods and rockers where hundreds of police were flown in by plane to tackel it in a form of crackdown. What actually happened was an over-use of police force, massive wasting of public money on a problem the media caused themselves. Therefore the

media has a big relationship in that it can sensationalise crime, make it seem accessible and exciting whilst causing massive moral panics about the values of society being crushed in a single act.

- a. However, it assumes societies reaction to a crime is always an over reaction- who is to decide what is an overreaction and what is the real problem? **Left realists** argue that fear of crime is irrational.
 - b. It can't explain why some issues are amplified and others are not.
 - i. **Traditional Marxists**, would be very clear that the reasons why mods and rockers are singled out and focused on in the way Cohen shows, it is because they are working class; the forces of law and order do not exert anything like as much concern in investigating the crimes of the rich and powerful.
 - c. **McRobbie and Thornton** argue moral panics have less impact in today's modern world as we are all used to 'shock, horror' stories and so don't react.
 - d. It is harder for the media to create moral panics but there is little agreement about what is and what is not deviant and this is constantly changing. For example, single motherhood was seen as deviant in the 50's but now is seen as acceptable.
 - e. Although Cohen takes an interactionist approach, the picture he presents of moral panics and deviance amplification seems to be **very structural**.
 - f. This means that in practice, Cohen's explanation suggests that the mods and rockers have no freedom in their actions; they are portrayed as powerless victims in the face of media distortion and public outrage.
- Conclusion: Many sociologists (perhaps including Cohen himself) would point out that since the 1960s, society has undergone considerable social change. **Sarah Thornton's study, 'Club Cultures'** is perhaps the best summary of criticisms aimed at the relationship between media and moral panics. Thornton argues that Cohen makes a mistake in assuming that there is simply one uniform response to moral panics. She points out that we now live in a more fragmented society, and that there may be very many different reactions to moral panics. Thornton argues that we should see the targets of moral panics as not always passive victims of the media and a uniform public reaction. She argues that the example of rave music in the late 80s and early 90s shows how 'deviant' groups can seek out notoriety and moreover use it to create their own oppositional and non-conformist identity. Equally though, she also points out that nowadays the line between deviance and normality is increasingly

blurred, since she thinks it is the case that to be 'normal', and not to drink under-age, would be deviant.

Assess the strengths and limitations of subcultural theory in explaining deviance (21)

Subcultural theories attempt to find the source of deviance within the forming of groups which exhibit deviant behaviours in our society. Sociologists have long looked at the working class to find answers on this matter as they are the biggest proportion of criminals in the official statistics. Cohen suggests that they feel a status frustration in not being able to gain status the legitimate way and so turn to alternative status hierarchies in deviant subcultures for recognition. Whereas Cloward and Ohlin suggest that it is not just one large working class delinquent subculture but there are different subcultures due to social circumstance. Both build and criticise Merton's strain theory, which looked at the individual responses to legitimate means and goals and the responses when means are blocked. In this way subcultural theories are good at explaining what Merton could not, but still have limitations.

First Cohen looks at delinquent subcultures and how working class boys feel status frustration about being blocked by deprivation in terms of gaining legitimate goals. This theory argues that the reason there are higher proportions of WC boys who are deviant is because they form together in groups to find status, turning the dominant values on their head and doing the opposite as its the only way to gain. For example, Cohen suggests that they have an alternative status hierarchy, valuing a disrespect for others property and people above the norms of respect in wider society. This way Cohen explains why there is deviance like graffiti and vandalism as it is a form of gaining status illegitimately.

This subcultural theory is valued in that unlike Merton who looks at the individual responses to legitimate structures being blocked, Cohen explains why specifically WC groups are turning to crime and deviance. Merton's use of the individual is not useful when we want to understand why WC specifically commit more crime than most. Therefore this is a strength of Cohen's subcultural theory as it explains the already existing official statistics.

However Cohen's focus on WC and their rejection of dominant values can be argued false. To explain Miller argues that this subcultural theory is wrong to assume that WC boys reject

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

values, as the the implication would be that they want the same but can't get them legitimately. Miller argues that the WC already have their own values, he calls this focal concerns, and so they are not rejecting the dominant values but over conforming to their own. For example values of resentment for authority, lack of respect for others and their property ect. Therefore this is a weakness of this subcultural theory as it could be seen to to wrongly assume that dominant values are held by the WC and rejected. Alternatively Cohen might argue that regardless whether the working class had these values before or after they still suffer from status frustration and want to gain it, the only way they can is illegitimately. Therefore Cohen's ability to explain the WC over-representation in official statistics and the way Cohen might refute Miller out weights Millers initial claim that WC have their own focal concerns.

Although it could also be argued that Cohen's theory doesn't investigate the differences in delinquent subcultures and just assumes they all form the same way and act in the same manner. Whereas other subcultural theorists like Cloward and Ohlin would suggest that there is a difference in delinquent subcultures and they are not all the same. In fact there are three.

Cloward and Ohlin see the hole in Cohen's theory in suggesting that there is only type of 'delinquent subculture' when there are many illegitimate opportunity structures out in the world. Cloward and Ohlin suggest that there are three due to difference social circumstance. The first is a criminal subculture; where a community already has a adult criminal illegitimate opportunity structure which values criminal deviance above lower forms of deviance such as vandalism. The second is a conflict subculture where a community faces high population turn over where the structure from the first subculture response cannot be enforced. Petty crimes, muggings and gang warfare take over. The third is a retreatist subculture similar to Merton's retreatist individual response. This group has failed both legitimately and illegitimately and so turns to drugs and small crime. This helps explain what Cohen can't in that there are many subcultural responses not just one.

Therefore this is a strength of this subcultural theory in that it explains what both Merton and Cohen can't about the differing groups, and thus the differences in crime in the official statistics. Although, it could be argued that regardless of this sociologists say that Cloward and Ohlin over-exaggerate the difference between the three subcultures. For example, utilitarian crimes like dealing drugs for money is found in all three subcultures, so maybe there isn't such a difference in the ones being put forward. This would further not explain the diversity in subcultures.

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

Both Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin are very deterministic in that they assume because of being blocked by deprivation that all working class people will become deviant and even criminal. Whereas this is simply not the case. Cohen might argue that they don't feel status frustration and so do not form into groups as they don't fit with the illegitimate opportunity structure. But Cloward and Ohlin's retreatist subculture would fit them as they failed both illegitimately and legitimately, and that group commits crime. But as stated not all WC do commit crime, so they don't fit into Cloward and Ohlin's group either as they may not automatically use drugs either. So the working class who are blocked and do not do drugs are not included in the mainstream or subcultures, where do they go? This determination does not work as the non-deviant working class are still blocked but are not deviant. So these theories are less useful because they cannot explain this, or do not try to.

On top of this, Merton, Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin as well as other criminal theorists ignore the crimes of the wealthy of those who are not in the working classes. For instance subcultural theories focus on WC people, especially boys and so ignore other types of crime. However it can be argued that the WC represent a huge proportion of crime compared to corporate white collar crime and so these theories are useful in that aspect. Although when comparing to other theories like Interactionist's labelling theory we could see that potentially it is not a formation of delinquent subcultures which cause deviance and so there is more deviance because of focal concerns, but that the police stereotype and label the working class as deviants and 'catch' them being more deviant. This is a weakness of subcultural theory as it assumes the official statistics and in deed other reports of crime are correct, and that working class do take up a lot and are caught vandalising and committing deviant acts. Whereas in actual fact these working class subcultures may not commit deviant acts to the same scale, but are just assumed to. So trying to use subcultural explanations of crimes and deviance that doesn't exist is not useful at all as it is explaining phenomena that isn't there.

In conclusion subcultural theories explain deviance in two ways, through status frustration and through three diverse subcultures. Even if both do explain what Merton and other theorists cannot about the WC in official statistics the limitations far outweigh the strengths. The most dominant limitation would be that these theories assume that the working class do commit more crime as a whole, but they may not, they could just be labelled and seen to do so. If they do not actually commit more crime, then these theories are useless. Although subcultural theories have been useful if we do take the stats at face value in aiding policy making, in that it can target these delinquent groups and provide legitimate opportunities to

get them out of crime for good. If we know that the working class face blocked opportunities than unblocking them would prevent deviance.

18/21

Assess the view that positivist methods are inappropriate for investigating society. (33 marks)

and

Assess the relative importance of the different factors that affect sociologists' choice of research methods and of topics to investigate. (33 marks)

and

Assess the view that interpretivist methods are the most appropriate methods for researching society. (33 marks)

This essay plan I feel has been massively over done, this essay plan relates to every single question that is about 'methods of investigation' or the factors influencing a researchers use of certain methods etc. This is basic essay plan that can apply to interactionist essays as well and the two above. You can also bring in the debates, such as sociology as a science or values in sociology etc.

1. **Objectivity vs Subjectivity:** which is going to get the information the perspective/researcher/employer wants. Is society subjective (a creation of meanings) or objective (full of social facts)?
2. **Micro vs Macro:** if the approach/employer/researcher wants to study the over all society and its structures then maybe a macros approach is better, but if they want to study individuals then a micro approach is better. Which do the researchers believe society is, made up of structures or made up of action.
3. **Determinism vs Free-will:** Do they believe peoples actions are determined or free (as this will change whether someone just looks at official statistics to find patterns because they believe behaviour is determined or whether someone goes and talks to people because they believe behaviour is free) . If they like structuralist then they

are very deterministic, and if they favour action theories then they promote free will. Which is more beneficial to have in society? Which method will tell us more about society, or if we use one or the other are we ignoring the bigger picture (or the smaller picture)

4. **Scientific vs unscientific:** if a researcher/employer/approach wants to use scientific objective methods then are these useful if you have decided earlier in the essay that society is made up of individuals meanings? Use the example of the red light; science only studies objectively observable phenomenon such as external forces making water boil at 100 degrees, so science cannot explain why drivers stop at red lights, the red light is not forcing through energy the drivers to stop but they do because they have attached meaning to it. Debate whether science is appropriate to study society and whether the approach or researcher in question in the essay would favour it or not.
5. **Deductive vs inductive:** Positivists use hypothetic-deductive arguments, meaning they have a hypothesis before they start researching, is this appropriate? Does this impose researchers bias and own thoughts? Or does inductive bottom up interactionalist approaches remedy this? But does first hand interviewing also bias results? Debate which is better, the pros and cons of each and why the researcher/perspective/approach would want to use it
6. **Qualitative vs Quantitative data:** Here you can debate the pros and cons of each method, which employers/approach/researcher would favour which and what would that mean, think reliability, validity etc and how these are appropriate or not depending on what you argued earlier.

‘Sociology can be value-free and should be value-free.’ To what extent do sociological arguments and evidence support this claim? (33 marks)

OMG WHAT THERE IS NO PLAN WTF

Assess the contribution of Marxism to our understanding of society. (33 marks)

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

Remember in these types of essays you can use all of your Alevel course, so education, wealth, poverty and welfare, crime AND the theory itself as well as your other module (global development).

1. Traditional Marxists can explain why people turn to crime in that capitalism is in its very structure criminogenic. This means that because of the way it works crime is an inevitable and functional part of the system. For instance Capitalism is based on success, greed and wealth, but also a lack of regard on how to get rich fast. Davis argues that crime is a rational response to the capitalist system. Crime is out of necessity, they need to survive but are getting exploited by the successful so that they cannot themselves be successful. Therefore Traditional Marxists can contribute to our understanding of how capitalism causes crime in our society.
 - a. However this has been criticised because not all poor people who are unsuccessful turn to crime. Therefore this is not an adequate contribution to explaining crime, or lack thereof for all poor people.
 - b. This theory cannot explain all types of crime, for instance as Davis says crime is a rational response to capitalism and somehow that crime is out of necessity then it cannot explain non-utilitarian crimes like vandalism, or violent/sexual crimes. It also cannot therefore explain MC crime. Why would someone who has worked the system for their benefit need to offend to get by?
 - c. + However this is the first theory to find a link between capitalism itself and crime so kudos.

2. Marxism uses the three types of society to explain the evolution of exploitation we see today. The three types: Ancient societies exploited slaves which were legally bound to their masters. Feudal society where serfs were legally tied to the land (lords owned the land, serfs lived on it therefore were legally tied) and were exploited as farmers. Capitalist society is based on exploitation of free wage labour. This explains the system of exploitation today and the progression through history. This progression in the end, Marxists believe will lead the WC to rise up against them and overthrow for an exploitless communist society.
 - a. However, this is based on historical truths and is too simplistic. Weber argues that status and power inequalities are also important not just class divisions. For instance Feminists argue that another important divide is between women and men.

- b. Again is too simplistic in that Marx has the capitalist ruling class and free wage labours but that is not enough. Weber also argues that there needs to be a distinction between the skilled and un-skilled working class and for the MC a distinction between white collar, petty bourgeoisie and office workers.
 - i. Inadequate in explaining modern exploit in the 21st century.
 - Globalisation and fragmentation has occurred, there is more than RC/WC, the working class has shrunk and the MC has grown.
 - 1. However capitalism according to Marx does take into account these changes in its exploit. For instance, as the means of production are taken over by technological advances, the MC grows to design and manufacture technology (a new form of exploit) and the working class becomes de-skilled.
3. Marxism can explain why currently the WC have not risen up. This is because by the RC own the modes and means of production, the RC essentially own the thoughts of their labourers because the RC have control over all of the societies institutions. For instance the values of the RC have been filtered down through institutions like the family, education and work. This internalisation of values in the WC has created a 'false consciousness'. Only when the WC have sunk so low that they can see through the smoke screen of capitalism can they rise up. For example, Paul Willis studies a group of working class lads in school, they were poor and unacademic and were failing in school, they had sunk low enough to see through the smoke screen and see that working the system would make them fail as well as working outside of it. The only solution is to rise up against it.
- a. However this has not happened yet, Marx's predictions of a revolution have not come true. For instance he believed the rich western nations would revolt, but instead the poor Russian nations did in 1917.
 - b. This is outdated because we are not in a communist era, he was writing over 100 years ago and still no transformation. If anything we have gone through globalisation into a hyper era of mass capitalism.
 - c. Popper would argue that this theory has no falsifiability, for that reason it can never be proved wrong, for eternity Marx could be saying that the WC just haven't got there yet. In Popper's eyes this is not a good or useful theory.
4. Gramsci the humanistic Marxist can soften the outdated nature of Marxist theory because they can better explain the lack of revolution. He believes that a revolution cannot just come about from exploitation and low wages, the WC would need to

create a counter-hegemony. In this view once the WC have sunk under poverty they can see through the smoke screen and work the system to make it better. Instead of a coup to overthrow capitalism Gramsci wants the WC to form political parties which present an alternative to the normal exploit and get other WC on their side.

- a. However there is also evidence from Miller and Murray that say the WC already have different focal concerns and values. Murray argues that the underclass of the WC have their own characteristics such as irresponsibility and laziness, for this reason they have not 'worked the system' to change it.
 - i. However there is no revolution or change not because of laziness which is a harmful stereotype, but because the media presents the lower classes as scroungers, thugs and hooligans. The media is run by the RC and thus the RC create the division of the WC through turning them against each other so that they cannot create a counter hegemony and turn capitalism over.
 - b. However it could be argued that political parties already exist that pose a genuine alternative to the normal exploitation of capitalism yet we still have not changed and yet the working class are not rising up against their exploit.
 - i. Although, parties like the Green Party across the world are all posing the same revolutionary alternative, completely turning the structures of capitalist society on its head and creating a fairer non-exploitative society. These parties are growing in members, for instance the 'green surge' became a thing in the 2015 general election where membership for the party multiplied by 4 within a year and again so in the week of the election. The green party are now the third largest party in terms of numbers. Maybe Gramsci's predictions are accurate but it will take time for the whole working class to be convinced to change their lives.
 - c. However, Gramsci overemphasises the role of ideas of the WC and forgets the role for the state. The WC might want to overthrow capitalism in other ways but cannot because of the repressive state apparatus.
5. Marxist theory can also shed light on and contribute to society through explaining the role of education. For instance basing their theory on Althusser, they believe education is a form of ideological control. Education reproduces class inequality by transmitting ruling class values from one generation to the next, by failing each successive generation of W.C the WC can always be kept as a reserve army of labour for the owners of production. Education also legitimises class inequality by reproducing ideologies that disguise the true cause. It tries to make WC accept

subordination in society, so stops rebellion because they don't want to rebel even though they should. For example, Bowels and Gintis found correspondance between how school operates and the capitalist work force, they were teached obediance, submission and complience to authority.

- a. However Post modernists criticise Bowels and Gintis' correspondence principal on the ground that it is 'out of date'. In today's societies we do not need a obedient work force, we are past he stage of mass production assembly lines. Nowadays businesses require diversity and creative thinking which education produces.
 - b. There is digression between Marxist theories; Bowels and Gintis suggest pupils passively accept their fate and become an obedient workers for the work force. Whereas Paul Willis mentioned earlier, suggests the working class resist school but this leads them to working class jobs.
6. Another paragraph potentially on education, maybe the neo-marxist theory of crime or gloabl development

Using material from Item B and elsewhere, assess sociological explanations of ethnic differences both in offending and in victimisation. (21 marks)

This is the actual essay I did in a mock in January and got an A

There are two main theories for why ethnic minorities appear to commit more crime; the first is the Left Realist approach which argues that they simply do commit more crime and that they always have done. Then there is the Neo-Marixst perspective which argues that ethnic minority crime is overplayed and used as a way to assert ruling class hegemony.

Victimisation wise, ethnic minorities are often at the brunt of racially aggravated attacks or other crimes because they are being turned upon by the ruling classes and the structure of wider society.

The first view of why ethnic minorities appear to commit more crime is that of the Neo-Marxists. Neo-Marxist sociologists like Hall et al might argue that ethnic minority crime is vastly over played in an attempt to get the working classes and other social classes in society to turn against them and forget that the ruling classes are oppressing them. This way

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

the ruling class can maintain their rule without question. For example, back before 2000 there was a moral panic about a new type of crime; black muggings. This was mugging but with black people directly responsible for it. The media portrayed the image of the black mugger and said that rates of this crime were on the increase and that people should be afraid. Whereas in reality there was no 'new crime' because that type of crime had always existed and it was necessary that black people were at the root of it. Although the sociologists has said that ethnic minorities do tend to cause more crime because they are often in the more deprived (culturally and materially) areas and so this is a necessity. By saying black people commit more crime more of the countries attention will be on black people and their crime and so attention will be diverted off of the oppression they face on a daily basis from the higher classes. In the decade where this happened the ruling class hegemony was restored. Black people didn't commit more crime, they were just labelled to seem so

However this view can be criticised on grounds such as the fact it is a direct contradiction of itself. For instance Hall claims that there was a moral panic over the increase of black muggings and that black people were seen to be criminal, but then says that more black people than white people commit crime because black people and ethnic minorities are more likely to in situations where crime may be necessary. Which asks the question on whether black crime really did increase because of more poverty that they were facing.

It could be argued that if this is true and the ruling classes are trying to divide the working class in terms of race, why would they only choose black people over asian people? It is not plausible that they would only be racist to one ethnic group rather than them all. So perhaps it is not the ruling class but just an increase in the black ethnic minority otherwise other groups may have appeared to go up to.

Another criticism would be to say that today where there seems to be less oppression from the higher classes and where there seems to be less control from the ruling class and more oppertunities, why is there still an increase in black or ethnic minority crime than that of white crime. Although it could be argued that even though the ruling classes may not be as prevelant as they were before, they still exist and they still have the power to influence stereotypes and make police arrest them more than white people.

Left realists might argue that in fact the crime increases that the media were reporting back then were justified in that there were real increases and the official statistics were not influenced by the ruling classes but by the black and ethnic minority people committing the

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

offences. Left realists argue that if 90% of all crime is reported by normal every day people who fall victim or witness crime then it cannot be argued that the police have some agenda against black people or ethnic minorities because they aren't the one who is catching or witnesses the crime. With reference to Item B we can see that in 2007/8 black people were 4x more likely to be arrested and this is from it being reported to the police. Based on this and the victim surveys which say that the offender was more likely to be black than white it is credible to say that ethnic minorities really do commit the crime they are suggested to and it is not some form of ruling class oppression and turning the working classes on themselves.

However on this part it could be argued that police viciously stereotype even after the crime has been reported by the witness or victim. If we take a real life example we can see that a white family in america with an adopted black son called the police because they had been robbed and the burglar was still in the house. When the police eventually turned up they tackled the black son of the family and tried to arrest him, thinking that the white thief was part of the family. Some might say this is an easy mistake to make because you see a white family and assume because of genes etc that this person is not part of the family. However this is not the case, this boy was part of the family and the white thief was not. The statistic on the fact black people were arrested more than 4x more than whites may not be valid at all because of this. Another criticism would be that even though 90% of all crimes are reported to the police when questioned the victims often said that it was a black person when they were unsure of the ethnicity of a person. This is not to say that these witnesses have had a black attacker but that they too are quick to stereotype offenders. This may explain why when it gets to court Black and Asian people are more likely to be found not guilty and their cases dropped because the only evidence on them is racist and biased.

In terms of victimisation, ethnic minorities are not only victims of crime but of a racist criminal justice system. For instance with reference to Item B, the risk of being a victim of racially motivated crime was higher for ethnic minority groups. This may be because of the fact that we live in a white society that is inhabited by many different cultural and ethnic groups. The systems that we have in place are run by white middle class people, yet the most deprived of our country are those in ethnic minority groups. Some sociologists might argue that the reason there is such a high percentage of racially motivated crimes is because they have characteristics of a victim; they are easy targets, they don't have that much protection; and the fact they are also working class (important because most crime is intra-class and thus WC attack and steal from WC). Sociologists believe that some people are more prone to being a victim than others and the fact that ethnic minorities are one of the most deprived groups with little cultural experience and little in the way of material possessions they cannot

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

help but be the target of crime. Because ethnic minorities make up such a big proportion of the working classes and crime is a working class phenomenon it might explain why ethnic minorities are often the victim because there are simply more of them in a class which is high in crime already.

However it could be argued that whilst we see the ethnic minorities are relatively deprived, even in comparison to other people who are deprived and they are mostly in the working classes the extent of their victimisation is covered up by the police, by the state and by the official statistics, the people which are meant to protect and serve the public. For instance according to the official stats the rate of victimisation was relatively high at around 60,000 incidents, however when you compare this to the British Crime Survey which asked ethnic minorities on their rates of victimisation the figures jumped to almost double with 118,000. Although the numbers here may not be the actual numbers in the statistics and on the BCS the point still stands that the ones actually credited with attacks and the ones reported are far from each other. Showing that they are heavily targeted by people in racial attacks (which are specific to their group- because white people do not have anywhere near the same level of racially aggravated attacks in this country), but also ignored in their victim status by the police and judges.

Not only this but in reference to Item B and earlier in this paper the ethnic minorities are at the bottom and the people who are of power are at the top, the people in between face the most criticism and are mostly victims because they fit into neither group. For instance, 3% of mixed race people experienced a racially motivated crime in 2007/8 with less than 1% of such attacks being against white people. 3% is a ridiculously high number of people facing one type of crime. Therefore it is not only black ethnic minority groups that are the targets but mixed race too.

In conclusion, the reasons for ethnic minorities in offending and victimisation tend to stem from the structure of society which favours white people. Ever since the introduction of ethnic minority immigrants in the 40's there has been a steady increase of both poverty and crime, mainly because they face different kinds of oppression to white people in the form of racism, bias and stereotyping in policing.

Using material from Item A and elsewhere, assess different sociological explanations of suicide. (21 marks)

As shown in item A there are many perspectives for understanding suicide which is seen as an individual act. Durkheim focused on the reasons why people committed suicide by looking at the society around them and their experiences in it. Other sociologists have argued that the only real way to figure out why someone killed themselves would be to look at the meaning of suicide to the individual. Others say neither of these approaches work and we can only ever focus on how coroners identify which is a suicide or not.

First Durkheim believed that suicide was a social fact. This means that it is not an individual phenomenon which occurs when an individual is faced with certain factors or whether they are in a certain situation. It means that in a society regardless of who inhabits it suicide is inevitable and the rates are the same or relatively consistent throughout time in that society. For example, Durkheim's study on suicide looked at rates of suicide in European countries, and found that between countries suicide rates were different, but historically suicide rates had remained consistent. With reference again to item A, he established four types of suicide and they explain why someone would commit suicide in that society. The first is egotistic suicide which occurs mainly in industrialised societies and is a result of too little social integration because of the individualistic nature of that society. The second is a result of too much social integration in that country and this is altruistic suicide; willing to die for that society because you feel like you belong to it. The third type of suicide that Durkheim found was called Anomic suicide which resulted from too little moral regulation, again in industrialised societies the morals are blurred because of the rapid changes and societal fluxes that occur, leaving the morals of life blurred. The fourth and final type of suicide he found was fatalistic suicide which resulted from too much moral regulation and in fact certain societies hold too much control over people. This is shown in real life examples like prison or in Korea. Therefore in Durkheim's view from looking at a range of countries in Europe he identifies four types of suicide which are the result of social integration and moral regulation.

However there are some criticisms from other sociologists about this view, namely that back in the time Durkheim was writing the official statistics although being official were not collected as reliably and in the same format for each country. In fact there was no wide scale collection of this type of data in most countries and no administrative bodies to deal with this either. Therefore whilst it is good that he fulfils the positivist criteria that he should use qualitative data and collect data scientifically the data he collected was not reliable.

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

Therefore we cannot use this data in modern times; because the definition of suicide may have change, how we collect the data may have changed and it is now more reliable and validly collected.

Another criticism of this view might be that Durkheim does little in the way of operationalising integration, this means that whilst he talks about their being suicides that result from little or too much; regulation or integration he doesn't explain what exactly these are. Although other sociologists since his time have. Gibbs et al looked at operationalising integration and decided that the best way to do this would be to look at whether there are stable and lasting relationships in the society between the people. Although this does not help Durkheim's original theory.

Another criticisms more to do with the positivist approach would be that Durkheim does not look at the meanings behind suicide, he does not look into what the suicide meant to the individual or look at people who have failed their suicide attempt and ask hem why they did it. This would validate the statistics if he did this and ensure that his theory was correct. However he didn't and so we cannot infer from statistics that individual cases of suicide were down to these factors, it could be something else.

Another theory for explaining suicide would be Douglas' theory that suicide is to do with the self and it is to do with others. This means that he thought suicide was down to uncertainty about ones self and uncertainty about others. For example, whether you were sure you should live, or whether you were sure you had a point to your existence or whether you thought you were being thought of negatively by other people and never being able to know maddens you. These are examples of where people are uncertain. He found out these factors and explanations by looking at documents that suicide victims left behind after their death. It includes diaries and journals so that he could find a definitive reason behind suicide. In this way looking at the meaning behind a suicide is different to Durkheim because he only looked at statistics and inferred the social causes. A difference between these views would be that Durkheim thought suicide was a social fact, but by looking at individuals meanings Douglas found that suicide was a social construction. This means that there is no societal happening that causes suicides, it is the individual. Maybe an explanation for why suicide rates are steady across societies across time is because there are steady number of victims of the same factors that cause them to kill themselves. Looking at diaries and suicide notes will give us the reason why; uncertainty.

However this theory too has been criticised because where he disagrees that Durkheim was right in saying suicide is a social fact, other sociologists disagree with Douglas in that it is a social construction. For example Sainsbury et al and other sociologists looked at suicide rates of immigrants coming to the USA. They found that the rates of suicide matched their home countries/where they originated from. Therefore suicide must be a social fact because even when you leave that society for another society the rates match up.

As sociologists we may not know the influence of parents and family members on the coroners decision to rule it as suicide, some families may not want their child to be seen as a suicide case as it might affect them negatively so they might hide suicide notes or make it look like an accident or something else. So relying on these methods might not be the most valid indicator.

Positivists might criticise Douglas's view that looking at personal documents might help because it is qualitative data which needs interpreting. Sociologists may not be the best people to interpret the meaning behind words or phrases used in suicide notes to determine why they killed themselves. Maybe psychologists or psychiatrists are better suited for this job. Although because of the qualitative nature of the diaries etc there is less chance of the documents being reliable and so the interpretation which are biased by nature would not be reliable either. Therefore as his theory of certainty and uncertainty are based on this we cannot assume this theory has any reliability. Although potential validity by looking at actual documents by the victims.

Other explanations include ditching the idea that we can find meaning as to why someone committed suicide and argues instead that we should focus on how the coroners come to their decisions. Atkinson looked at coroners reports and found that they had a common sense based theory that suggested if there was evidence that suicide was present then it probably was a suicide. For instance if there was a suicide note, their mode of death (hanging, or electrocution in the bath might be an indication), their location when they killed themselves (in a deserted parking lot, or in the middle of nowhere), their life history (anything traumatic) and their mental health issues/history could be an indication. Atkinson also looked at judges ruling on whether something was a suicide or not across Britain and Denmark, he found that in Denmark if there was a high probability something was a suicide then they mark it as one. In Britain coroners have to have definitive proof and evidence that something was a suicide in order to rule it as one. Therefore there are differences between countries on how suicide is marked down; furthering the criticisms of Durkheim's view that suicide is comparable across countries when it isn't collected in the same way.

Although a criticism of Atkinson might be that he says we should not look at meanings because they are interpretations but then looks at coroners reports and infers and meaning from them. His theory/argument is self defeating. Also by looking at coroners reports we can never know whether they were right because we cannot ask the victim we just have to rely on inferences with some notes we found by the body. Taylor another sociologists argues that we should look also at para-suicides because those are people that tried and failed to end their lives and they would have a better insight into their reasons and whether they actually intended to end their life than a coroner or sociologists.

In conclusion we have seen two interpretivist explanations for why someone kills themselves and a positivist, although the positivist (Durkheim) has a better standing scientifically in his study he does not take into account the collection of statistics, or the meaning behind the death. Therefore his theory is redundant especially in today's society. The interpretivists however at least look at the meanings behind suicides and in this respect are more valid theories of suicide, however they lack the scientific and thus valid and objective nature of the positivist account and thus lack credibility and real life application. Therefore none of these theories of suicide discussed are relevant in today's society from a scientific but still meaningful standpoint.

Using material from Item A and elsewhere, assess different Marxist views of the relationship between crime and social class. (21 marks)

The two Marxist views are that of Traditional Marxism and Neo-Marxism; both have Marxist routes of working class oppression however they both differ. Traditional Marxism looks at the way crime in society is based on the capitalism system itself and wherever you go where there is capitalism, crime will surely follow because of greed and wealth but also a disregard for how to get it. It also focuses on how the laws are made in an ideological stance to benefit the ruling class and allow them to make more profit. However Neo-Marxists don't think this is enough, they believe that its too deterministic to say that all people in a capitalist class will be likely to turn to crime, Neo-Marxists like Taylor say that just looking at ruling class hegemony is not enough, to get a truly social theory of crime we need to look at the labelling process and what it means to commit a crime so adopting interpretivist approaches as well as a Marxist base.

Traditional Marxists think that social class and crime is criminogenic, meaning that crime from lower classes is an obvious response to the inequalities in society, with reference to item A. To explain, because of the wealth, greed, production and profit that accompanies a capitalist society some people will inevitably miss out and have no way to gain these things which are strived for. For example, David Gordan notes that crime is a rational response to capitalist systems, hence why it is found in all classes of society. Everyone feels the strain. Crime may be the only way to gain the material goods which are promoted. Therefore all social classes are prone to commit crime because it is rational. However there is a big reporting of working class offenders and crime in the official statistics. This is because the laws and enforcement are done in such a way as to overplay to working class crime so that no one suspects the ruling class who are oppressing everybody else of actually committing crimes themselves. To explain, by dividing the working class against each other by labelling groups within it as criminal they are preoccupied. Therefore we can see from the official statistics a big relationship between working class people (predominantly males) and crime, but this is simply a ruse to divert mass attention and maintain hegemony.

However it could be argued that the traditional Marxist view that working class crime is overplayed for the sake of hegemony is just wrong. Labelling theorists could argue that the working class do face a form of oppression but it is not from the ruling class. IT could be argued that instead police stereotyping of offenders is the oppression that working class people face on a daily basis and explains that stats. Piliavin and Briar (1964) found that decisions to arrest people were based on stereotypical things like dress, gender, class, ethnicity, time and place. So if you were a white, working class male in a hoodie alone or in a gang at time they would arrest you because they hold these stereotypical views of who is an offender. So the fact that police arrest more of these people and that these people are working class is an issue with the police not ruling class hegemony. Although it could be argued that the police are a service provided by the government or state, and so in a Traditional Marxist view they would say that as the ruling class have dominance over the state and the laws it makes, they effectively have governing powers over the police and may have told them to stereotype. Therefore it might not just be the police as an entity stereotyping but a wider structural issue. For example, W.G. Conan looked at 200 firms and found that they had all broken at least 1 health and safety law but only 1.5% had been prosecuted for it. Therefore this issue is actually a positive as traditional Marxism highlights a key link between social class and crime in the way of ruling class hegemony, even if there is no foreseeable solution aside from revolution.

Neo-Marxists argue that crime shouldn't just be looked at in terms of class conflict. They argue that interpretivist perspectives play a huge role in understanding why the lower classes appear to commit more crime than the upper classes. In reference to Item A, Taylor argues that the working class have a political motive behind crime, which is to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor. Working class criminals are deliberately trying and struggling to change society. Interpretivist perspectives like labelling theory argue that the reactions of the wealthy to the poor allow them to be labelled as criminal. It benefits the ruling class if the media creates a moral panic and portrays the working class as folk devils and create deviance amplification. This is because if there is deviance amplification and more working class people are reported and are committing crime, the label becomes true like a self-fulfilling prophecy and it is no longer a lie (like traditional Marxists argue the overplaying of WC crime is). Therefore Neo-Marxists and traditional Marxists both think that the working class are portrayed to commit more crime, but Neo-Marxists like Taylor think there is a political motive behind it and people are not blind, they see the inequality in society and fight back.

However, inevitably there are some criticisms of this view; this viewpoint that Taylor puts forward is based on the assumption that working class people have a political motive and want to stop the inequality. The implication of this assumption is that the working class would most likely target the wealthy or the people on top in order to show them that they are serious and want a fairer society. However this premise is false because if we look at statistics and assume they are correct then working class people are most likely to commit crime against other working class people. Therefore if the stats are correct there isn't an evident political motive behind crime because they would not target the poor if there was. However it could be argued that the official statistics are wrong as well because the RC want to appear like most crime is intra-class when it is not, this is another ruse to divide the working classes against each other. If they believe that they are the criminal but also the victim of crime then they won't focus on the crimes from the upper classes like white-collar crime. Another criticism of the Neo-Marxist position is from the Left Realists who argue that Taylor is romanticising the criminals and offenders in society as being 'Robin Hoods' who distribute to the poor and take from the wealthy and so not really taking an objective standpoint to develop his theory.

It could also be argued for both Marxist positions that not all capitalist societies have high crime rates, so if it is in the structure of capitalism to have high crime then that might be wrong. For example, Japan and Switzerland have high functioning capitalist societies but have relatively lower crime rates compared to US, UK or other western capitalist countries. It

could be that they have a different ruling class with different ways of oppressing the working class, and if that is the case the ruling class should adopt these to stop crime. But it could also mean that there is something else in our society which is causing the dramatic rises in crime rates in post-modern times. Things that Marxist theories may be at odds to explain.

In conclusion we can see that both the Marxist perspectives believe that the working class are facing a lot of oppression, but they differ on the ways in which the working classes deal with this. Taylor believes that they will struggle against the hegemony and triumph eventually, but this is just seen as a romanticism. The Traditional Marxist view of oppression and overplaying working class crime could be seen as wrong and just a flaw in the way policing works in society, but also could be seen as right in that the ruling class effectively rule the police and so their views are being transmitted. Either way they have different views on the relationship of social class and crime and neither are totally correct or totally flawed, but what we need is a less romanticised, evidence based modern Marxist theory which takes into account different societies, which takes into account different types of criminal but also how the official statistics can be social constructions.

Using material from Item A and elsewhere, assess the usefulness of functionalist approaches in explaining crime. (21 marks)

In reference to Item A functionalism is a consensus theory, stating that in society we are governed by a value consensus that we all share. This means we all are socialised into the shared values, beliefs and norms of society. Functionalism uses this idea of value consensus to explain how crime is the result of not following this. It also explains how crime has functions in society and how it can play an integral part in society.

Functionalists believe that crime is the effect of inadequate socialisation. This is because we are all individuals with our own experiences and families which raise us all differently whilst still keeping in with the norms and values of society, the problem lies where families socialise their children poorly and the children feel a sense of anomie or normlessness from their society. Meaning that they do not feel connected to the values they were poorly raised into. For instance, Durkheim argued that people feel anomie for the values and this makes them commit crime because they do not know that they aren't supposed to, or that it is wrong. To them there is a blurred line between right and wrong. Therefore functionalism is

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

useful at explaining what crime is caused by. Functionalists also feel though crime has a function in society, 1. Boundary maintenance, meaning that public displays of punishment (public courts) are seen by all and the values that were broken by the crime are solidified as people join in outrage at the criminal. 2. Adaptation and change is also a function of crime and deviance, namely that without a little deviance from the norms society would stagnate causing nothing to happen and more crime to develop out of frustration. 3. Safety valve, following from adaptation and change Durkheim believes that society builds up frustrations and crime is a way to get some of these out without threatening the foundations of society. For instance, Davis argues that males use prostitution as a safety valve for their sexual frustrations without threatening the nuclear family. 4. Warning light is another function, in that if the crime rates of suicide and truancy go up it could indicate issues within society that need to be tackled.

However there have been some criticisms of this, first that it assumes there is a value consensus in society, yet Taylor argues that we are so multicultural and diverse that there is no one set of values and norms we all face, there are areas in the UK which are under Sharia law, so we can't even say that the law brings out cultural values together because some people don't follow it directly. As well as this there are more criticisms in that it cannot measure how much deviance is the right amount of deviance. For instance is there a numerical limit on the number of deviance before the police and other forces step in, in the same way there is a limit of how much your child can misbehave before the time out step can be enforced? If this assumption that there is a certain number of deviance that is functional is correct, then the implication is that police will not arrest or deal with a murder or sex crime if that crime is not the number which they can get to before they investigate. Crimes and deviant behaviours will be ignored which is arguably not functional for society. Also, functionalism tends to forget the main point about crime and deviance which is what function crime has on the victim. Arguably there is no function of crime to the victim, they have been involved in the bad end of a crime and they are left feeling isolated. In fact the function of crime is to isolate individuals not bring them together through boundary maintenance. However on the other hand it is useful in showing how crime is an integral part of society, whether that is right or wrong, it does explain what part it could play and why we let it happen in society.

Alternative to the functionalist perspective is Merton's strain theory which argues that the reason crime exists is not because of poor socialisation of individuals but instead, because of really great socialisation so much so that people feel a strain between what society wants them to achieve; riches, wealth and success; and what they can actually achieve

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

legitimately. Merton argues that crime is the result of an individual feeling the strain between legitimate shared goals in society and the legitimate means to get them. He identifies 5 responses to this strain which he believes explains crime more so than Functionalists can; 1. conformity, accepting the goals and the means, 2. innovation, accepting the means but not the ways of getting there because of socio-economic factors which prevent legitimate means (education), 3. ritualism, meaning they accept the means but have given up on the goals-teachers who give on student success but still do their job, 4. retreatism where they reject the means and the goals and drop out of society, turning to drugs, 5, rebellion rejecting both the means and values but creating new ones for themselves, e.g. hippies. Therefore if we assume that society is based on a consensus like the Functionalists do, we can also accept Merton's argument. However his perspective on crime is better at explaining the official statistics rather than poor socialisation. For instance the strain theory explains property crime well, the criminals want the goals of wealth and possessions but don't have ways to get them, so innovate and steal. Merton also gives a better explanation of why people turn to crime in the first place; strain, rather than poor socialisation. It is argued that Functionalists focus on the functions of crime rather than the cause and so for this Merton's explanation is more useful.

However there are some criticisms of this perspective as well, namely from Cohen who argues that crime is not an individual act in the official statistics, there are clear group patterns, for instance ethnic diversities are overrepresented in the prison system, and so are working class males. So both the Functionalists and Merton cannot explain why there is a group phenomenon in the statistics. Therefore they are both not very useful at explaining this. Although it could be argued that Functionalists do do this, in that poor socialisation may be a group phenomenon, for instance ethnic minorities at some point or another in the last 3 generations have come to this society, the first generation may still have clung onto their own societal values and beliefs and transferred them to the second generation who was more socialised into this culture however still with their parents and the same for the 3rd generation. Whilst they were born and live in this society, they may not be fully socialised and this could explain the group statistics from a Functionalists perspective and thus is still useful. However in further assessment, Merton doesn't explain why everyone facing the same strain of materials and lack of access to them don't commit crime, and Functionalists cannot explain the same, but just for poor socialisation but not criminal. If they are going to make a rule about crime it has to apply to all cases. Unless we accept that actually interactionist perspectives have it right and crime is an individual action with a complexity of reasons and excuses for it and we cannot apply a general rule because it could be about strain for someone, about socialisation for another and neither of the two for a third person.

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

In conclusion Functionalism is successful at navigating the functions of crime, however it could be argued that these aren't the purpose of crime but perverse latent consequences of crime in society. For instance it is perverse to argue that something like sexual assault has a positive function in society, it should be stamped out and the offenders reformed, not congratulated on helping relieve sexual frustrations without threatening the nuclear family. In the words of post modernism, Functionalism is just another meta-narrative and holds no more bearing in explaining crime than any other theory.

Using material from Item B and elsewhere, assess sociological explanations of the functions and forms of the punishment of offenders. (21 marks)

1. Functionists see the function of justice to bring back shared social solidarity because of the outrage people feel about crime will reinforce shared values. E.g Durkheim believes that there are two forms of punishment depending on the society, for traditional societies they had retributive punishment, ie an eye for an eye. In modern day societies they have restorative justice where the criminal makes up for their crimes and apologises to the victim. The function of retributive justice was to give an immediate form of justice, now it is all about reform, but instilling the value back into the offender.
 - a. However, Durkheim's distinction between restorative and retributive justice is blurred, some traditional societies still have retributive but others have restorative.
 - b. However crime doesn't bring people back together in society because it could isolate the victims.
 - i. Although in both types of society the victim could witness the case/hearing and could feel connected with other people because they all share the same moral outrage.

2. Marxists believe that forms of punishment are repressive state apparatus, punishment reflects the economy/structure. In other words in capitalist societies offenders are punished in a way to reflect the state's economic interests and punishment is to deter people from rising up against the capitalist system. For example Melossi and Pavarini (1981) see prison as reflecting production, in a

capitalist society time is crucial to a worker as they are paid by it and give up their time to work, so paying for crimes by having time taken away in prison is reflective of this.

- a. However how does this explain middle class crime, they don't go to prison yet they have committed crimes against the RC.
 - i. Although it could be argued that most middle class crime such as money laundering, embezzlement, fraud and other monetary crimes actually benefits the RC because they are getting more revenue.
 - b. This theory can only explain punishment in a capitalist society. For instance in some tribes in the Sub-Saharan Africa punishment involves getting the criminal in the middle of a circle full of all the tribes people, then those people say nice things about that person until that person realizes how nice they are and regrets deeply that they ever went against it. That is punishment for them, yet this theory cannot explain it at all.
3. Foucault believed that there were two forms and functions of punishment; sovereign power in pre-modern society acted as a way for the monarch to exercise power over the offenders body to show what a crime would do. E.g hanging, lashes, hand being chopped off etc. Disciplinary power is a way for the body and mind to be controlled. For example the panopticon
- a. However this explanation is not adequate because
 - i. The shift from corporal punishment to imprisonment isn't clear
 - ii. It ignores expressive elements, Durkheim does explain this
 - iii. Exaggerates control, Goffman (1962) argues that prisons are able to resist control in prison and mental hospitals
 - iv. Deterministic to say we have no control
 - b. However use Marxism to assess this- crime is not about control, it's about asserting the rule of the RC and submitting the WC. David Davis (2001) explains that there is an ideological function to make capitalism look successful, prisons soak up the unemployed (30-40%) so it makes the society look better and imposes RC values on those unemployed.
4. Conclusion, Punishment doesn't go far enough, there are two thirds of offenders who reoffend after prison, even though there was a 70% swell in incarceration (1993-2005). So people are being locked away but nothing is done to them inside, making it worse. The punishment needs to be reformative. The panopticon seems very unethical, even though someone has committed a crime, to be constantly (perceived

to be) scrutinised and watched is inhumane. Reform with with shared multi-culture is better.

Using material from Item A and elsewhere, assess sociological explanations of the role of the mass media in creating moral panics about crime and deviance. (21 marks)

Like mentioned in Item A a moral panic is where the media create a massive exaggeration of deviance, they create such a deviance that it is publicised and sensationalised creating more deviance which is close to their original exaggerations. More people join the group that have been demonized because they have been sensationalised by it, and this leads to justification for a crackdown on this behaviour which wasn't that bad in the first place. The moral panic creates confusion over that is deviant and what isn't, and the norms and values in society, the confusion this brings is aimed at the demonized group in the form of marginalisation and stigma.

The first argument for the role of mass media in creating moral panics about crime and deviance comes from the interactionist Stanley Cohen, he believes that there are three parts to the media's role; 1. Exaggeration and distortion media exaggerate numbers involved in an issue and sensationalise it, for instance using sensational headlines such as 'day of terror' to describe the Mods and Rockers scuff. 2. Prediction the media assume further conflict will arise because of their earlier exaggeration. 3. Symbolism, the media creates symbols to associated with certain groups, such as lifestyle, hair, vehicles and clothing. He believes that there is deviance effect of the media, because it creates a greater interest in the deviant group. This leads to deviance amplification where the problem becomes worse than it was before. For example the Mods and Rockers were seen to be a deviant group and the media targeted them, there was a small scuffle on a beach, but the media turned it into a massive riot where people were seriously injured and the streets were ruined. This lead to more people joining the group for notoriety, they planned a big fight on the beach to live up to the standards that the media had et for them, causing there to be a massive fight. The public react by being outraged and point fingers and stigmatise the deviant group. Therefore the media's role is to pick a deviant group/behaviour, sensationalise it all out of proportion which creates more deviance and in the end a show of police to reassert the values.

However, there are some criticisms of this for instance, the mods and rockers phenomenon was a few decades ago and times have changed now. For instance McRobbie and Thornton argue that we as a public have become desensitised to the shock horror effect of moral panics and so we do not react in the way we once did and neither do the deviant groups. Another argument is from Thornton herself, in arguing that in today's society we are so fragmented and distorted about our own views and beliefs that there is no one uniform response to moral panics anymore, groups react in their own way. For instance rave groups use the moral panics to gain notoriety and get more attention from the underground rave scene. There is also a blurred seem between what is deviant and what is not deviant, and so it is hard to say what the role of media is in creating moral panics about crime and deviance because lots of people disagree with what is deviant.

Another criticism of this role of the media is an internal critique of Cohens interactionist perspective. Namely that as an interactionist he should believe that both the deviant groups and the public have free will to react in their own ways. However he claims that when the media sensationalises something that the deviant group will get bigger, however this is implying some determinism on the deviant group in that they are powerless to stop themselves getting bigger and causing more issues. Also it implies some determinism on the public because they are expected to be outraged by the deviance and stigmatise and marginalise the deviant group, but whilst this is simply not the case in our post-modern society, it also goes against the free will principal of interactionism. This interactionist perspective on the role of media sounds very structural and whilst could be a good perspective in itself as an explanation, does not follow what it is supposed to.

It could also be argued that there is no way to now create a moral panic because the definitions of deviance keep changing, for instance single motherhood was deviant in the 50's and now it is accepted. The media's role therefore could be shrinking. This perspective also doesn't explain why some groups are targeted for moral panics and some aren't.

Alternatively Marxist perspectives have an answer this to criticism. They argue that the role of the media is to stigmatise the working classes, divide and conquer them in order to legitimise the capitalist rule over them. This would then explain the selection of groups for moral panics, they are usually working class deviant groups used to stigmatise the working classes. For instance the moral panic of the 'new crime' of black muggings in the 90's was used by the ruling class to legitimise their rule. Neo-Marxists like Stuart Hall argue that moral panics enforce the rule of capitalism in 3 ways; diverts attention away from capitalism, like crimes of the powerful, 2 divides the WC because it suggests other WC groups are to blame

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

for our problems and so the WC will blame them for their issues not the ruling class, 3 legitimises social control to stop these moral panics happening again. Using black muggings as an example it opens up the legitimisation of surveillance and CCTV. Therefore Cohen is wrong to say that the role of the media is just to sensationalise groups the the fun of it, but it is a ruling class tool of oppression.

Functionalists would argue against this however and say that the role of the media in crime and deviance is not to scapegoat the poor, but to reassert the values and norms of society. The role of the media is actually a positive function in society; moral panics arise out of anomie created by change, and if moral panics flourish in peacetime after war then there is a lot of change about, and therefore a lot of anomie. The media dramatises events, and this creates a class consciousness to reassert the values when they are threatened. So really both Marxists and Cohen are wrong, the media isn't some tool of destruction, but a constructive tool of social order and control.

However it could be argued that there is no positive function in creating more deviance through self fulfilling prophecy after a moral panic, which just creates a larger groups of deviants than there was before. Although it could be argued that the crack down of deviants after the moral panic serves this functionalist purpose and so increasing the group size just increased the crackdown and thus increases the reassertion of values.

In conclusion the interactionist perspective on the role of media in moral panics is confused as a structural theory and in essence is a good theory of the role, however falters on the fundamentals of its approach. The Marxist perspective seems too extreme and so would never make it into policy to change moral panics, and so the functionalist perspective seems to be the best one to select as it doesn't have the massive problems of the other two. However whether there is a collective consciousness of the whole population is up for debate too, and so maybe this perspective doesn't stand up to the try either.

Using material from Item B and elsewhere, assess sociological explanations of gender differences in the patterns of crime. (21 marks)

Gender differences in official statistics have been debated and argued over for a long while because there is no definitive answer for why there seems to be a difference. It is suggested

<https://simplysociology.com/a-level-sociology.html>

that 4 out of 5 crimes are committed by male offenders and by their 40th birthday one third of males have offended whereas it is only 1 out of 10 for woman. It is also suggested that males commit more serious and violent crimes, being 50 times more likely to commit sexual offences than woman. On the other hand woman are seen to commit less serious offences such as shop lifting. This essay will discuss why and whether these explanations are valid or not, before coming to the conclusion that it is probably the patriarchal nature of society as to why female crimes never make it to the official statistics.

In reference to item A there are feminist theories as to why there is a difference, one feminist theory suggests that it is patriarchal control which actually prevents females from committing crime. They are effectively blocked from committing crime because they are controlled in the home, at work and in public. Heidensohn argues that at home women simply do not have the time to offend because they are socialised to be the domestic goddess, who cooks, cleans and looks after the kids. In public woman are afraid to go outside from fear of being sexually and violently abused. As they are stuck inside they are less likely to go out and offend. At the work place male bosses dominate their time and supervision so they are not deviant, the glass ceiling also prevents females getting high enough to commit crimes such as white-collar crimes. Therefore one explanation for why there is a difference in gender and crime is because women are controlled by a patriarchal society and unable to do so. Whereas males are not controlled by the patriarchy and have the freedom to commit crime and offend.

However it could be argued that Heidensohn is effectively underplaying the amount of free will and choice that females have. Just because some woman are afraid of going out at night does not automatically mean that they loose the free will to go out and offend. Not only this but not all woman assume their destined gender roles. For instance many woman in modern day do 'male' things like have a full time job and are the 'breadwinner' for their household. This means that they are not conforming to the patriarchal control, but they are also not necessarily offending. So the underlying assumption that patriarchal control is stopping woman offending and without it they would, is false.

Alternatively it could be argued that this lack of offence and patriarchal control is only a modern day phenomenon. For instance using Adler's liberation thesis the wrong way, it could be suggested that women are more liberated and free of patriarchal control now since the 70's and not before. Although by using Adler's liberation thesis the right way we are also seeing a rise in female crime since this liberation and so actually it could be the patriarchal control stopping women from offending. For instance between the 50's and 70's

female crime rates rose from one in seven to one in six. Now although this has a good point about linking patriarchal control liberation and offending rates, it could be wrong in that female offending rates have been rising in the 50's before liberation. So it cannot just be patriarchal control alone.

Also it could be argued that males commit more crime not because they aren't controlled by the patriarchy but because crime is a way to express their (as Messerschmidt puts it) subordinated masculinity. That is to say that some males might not have the resources to get male paid jobs and do male things like be a breadwinner and so turn to crime which is an expression of aggression and toughness, which are associated with masculinity. However it could be argued that males are controlled by their own patriarchy to be masculine, to be tough and have breadwinner status and when they cannot achieve this they become deviant. Hence why males commit more crime than woman in modern day because woman are taking over the bread-winning roles and becoming more equal. Thus disrupting the male psyche that has been internalised and socialised into men about their masculinity. Sociologists like Winlow have found that males now have to find alternative ways to be masculine such as violence in work (bouncers at clubs) because of the post-modern society where woman are more equal.

With reference to item A it has been argued that official statistics actually under-estimate the amount of female crime that is taking place. There are two main reasons for why this is; that female crime is less likely to be reported as it is seen as trivial and less serious like shoplifting, and that females are less likely to be prosecuted. Therefore their crimes would never make it into the official statistics. One theory to support this would be the chivalry thesis. The chivalry thesis claims that woman do not get prosecuted because the criminal justice system is biased towards them, as it is dominated by males and males are socialised to be chivalrous towards females. Otto Pollak argues that men have protective attitudes towards woman which deters them from arresting or charging female offenders.

However, it has been argued that the CJS is actually more biased against women than for them because committing a crime is directly going against their gender domain of domestic goddess and so is even worse than just their crime. For example Carlen argues that it is not the crime woman are assessed on, it is their character and traditional role as a woman. She argues that even though male crimes on comparison are still more serious than female crimes, they are 'let off' because they are just overstepping their traditional roles not coming away from them completely.

On the other hand it could be argued that the chivalry thesis has some merit. For instance, the Home Office have suggested that women are always being treated more leniently than males by the law, and that first time offenders who are female are less likely to go to prison. This shows that reliable sources like the Home Office are supporting this theory. Although it could be argued that this is the case due to the fact that women may not commit serious enough offences not that they are given lee way. For instance, a female and her male counterpart might steal a TV on separate occasions but the male might also use brute force or come into physical contact with the owner. Therefore it may not be the leniency of the judge but the situation.

Alternatively there has been evidence that males are actually committing the acts which society would define as female, like shop lifting. In fact Buckle and Farrington found that whilst investigating shoplifting males were two times more likely to shop lift than females. So even crimes that are more female and trivial are being committed by men, so what crimes do females really do even if they are not reported? The answer in the OS says property crime, but the OS have been argued invalid from the bias nature of the CJS.

In conclusion, it seems that a running theme in explaining the difference between genders and patterns of offending is the patriarchy, but this is because we are assessing female crime and why it's less, and of course the inequalities in society are going to be a massive factor. This is because in today's society no matter how far we have come, there is huge gender inequality. This is more important than why males commit more crimes, it's why that even though crime is seen as a people thing rather than a male thing, females are still blocked from engaging in it for whatever reason. And this reflects the patriarchal nature of the structure of society, women are blocked from job opportunities and by gender domains and now even from committing illegal acts. Good or bad what the patterns (false or true) show is further sexist inequalities and this needs to be addressed.