Use the following past papers to practise your exam writing techniques and aid your revision.

- Make sure you look at the mark scheme for each question to assess your answer.
- Also check the ‘model answers’ from students to see where good AO1 and AO2 marks were scored.

**Crime and Deviance**

- Different theories of crime, deviance, social order and social control.
- The social distribution of crime and deviance by age, ethnicity, gender, locality and social class, including recent patterns and trends in crime.

- Globalisation and crime in contemporary society; the mass media and crime; green crime; human rights and state crimes.

- Crime control, prevention and punishment, victims, and the role of the criminal justice system and other agencies.

- The sociological study of suicide and its theoretical and methodological implications.

- The connections between sociological theory and methods and the study of crime and deviance.

**Sociological Methods**

- Quantitative and qualitative methods of research; their strengths and limitations; research design.

- Sources of data, including questionnaires, interviews, observation (participant and nonparticipant), experiments, documents, and official statistics; the strengths and limitations of these sources.

- The distinction between primary and secondary data, and between quantitative and qualitative data.

- The relationship between positivism, interpretivism and sociological methods; the nature of ‘social facts’. The theoretical, practical and ethical considerations influencing choice of topic, choice of method(s) and the conduct of research.

**Theories**

- Consensus, conflict, structural and social action theories.

- The concepts of modernity and post-modernity in relation to sociological theory.

- The nature of science and the extent to which sociology can be regarded as scientific.

- The relationship between theory and methods.

- Debates about subjectivity, objectivity and value freedom.

- The relationship between sociology and social policy.
The Exam!

You are answering ‘Section A’ – Crime & Deviance with Theory & Methods!

Do not answer Section B!

Do not answer both sections!

The questions you must answer:

Q1 – 30 minutes. (worth 21 marks)

Q2 – 30 minutes. (worth 21 marks)

Q3 – 20 minutes. (worth 15 marks)

Q4 – 40 minutes (worth 33 marks)
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- Examine some of the factors that may contribute to people becoming victims of crime. (12 marks)

Answers in this band will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding and will be largely successful in interpreting, applying, analysing and evaluating material. Material will be interpreted and applied appropriately to examine two or more factors which contribute to becoming a victim of crime. Concepts and issues such as the following may feature: age, gender, ethnicity, social class, British Crime Survey, domestic violence, patriarchy, violent street crime, situational crime, repeat victimisation, positivist victimology, critical victimology, victim as a social construct. However, not all of these are necessary, even for full marks. Analysis and/or evaluation will be relevant and explicit. Sources may include: Newburn and Rock; Wolfgang; Mawby and Walklate; Tombs and Whyte; Bowling and Phillips.

- Assess the usefulness of subcultural theories in explaining ‘subcultural crime and deviance’ in society today. (21 marks)

In this band, interpretation, application, analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant, and answers will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding of sociological material on subcultural theories of crime and deviance, drawn from Item A and elsewhere. This will be accurately interpreted and sensitively applied to meet the demands of the question. These answers will deal with two or more subcultural theories. Concepts and issues such as the following may appear: status frustration, illegitimate opportunity structure, delinquency and drift, subterranean values, anomie, cultural deprivation, alternative status hierarchy, criminal subcultures, conflict subcultures, retreatist subcultures, differential association, focal concerns, resistance through ritual, bricolage, style. Evaluation may be developed, for example, by locating the discussion within a debate between perspectives, or considering relevant methodological issues. Sources may include: A. Cohen; Cloward and Ohlin; Miller; Matza; Downes; P. Cohen; Hall; Hebdige; McRobbie and Garber; Sewell; Mac an Ghaill; Sutherland.

- Assess the strengths and limitations of using written questionnaires as a means of investigating prisoners’ experience of imprisonment. (15 marks)

This question requires you to apply your knowledge and understanding of sociological research methods to the study of this particular issue in crime and deviance.

Candidates will examine a range of relevant strengths and limitations of written questionnaires, explicitly interpreted and applied to research issues and characteristics relating to the particular issue of prisoners’ experience of imprisonment. These may include some of the following, and/or other relevant concerns, though answers do not need to include all of these, even for full marks:

- The research characteristics of potential research subjects: captive sample; problems of literacy levels of prisoners; prisoners’ hostility to authority; prisoners may want to give a
good impression to officers to gain favours; boredom; class; ethnicity; gender; age; relationship with prison staff.

- The research contexts and settings: prison as a closed setting; controlled nature of prison; variety of prison types; separation of genders in prison; hierarchical nature of prison; permission to access.
- The political and ethical sensitivity of researching prisoners within the prison system.

Strengths and limitations of the method: reliability; representativeness; generalisation; validity; response rate; sampling frame; operationalising concepts; anonymity; detachment; theoretical perspective; open and closed questions; mode of delivery.

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

Answers in this band will show good sociological knowledge and understanding. They will show a clear understanding of relevant debates and issues. These may include: positivist versus interpretivist debate; quantitative and qualitative data; scientific method; reliability; validity; objectivity and value freedom; postmodernism; social facts/social construction; realism; cause versus meaning; micro/macro; etc.

Answers will show both breadth and depth of knowledge of relevant theoretical and empirical material on positivist methods, although with some imbalances or shortcomings. They will show a sound understanding of important aspects of the question and of the issues that these raise. However, some significant aspects may be neglected or given limited attention.

At this level answers might include:

- conceptually detailed, accurate accounts of positivist methods but with more limited consideration of the disadvantages of these methods.

- conceptually detailed accurate accounts of the limitations of the use of positivist methods but with limited consideration of the advantages.
Examining the Reasons Why Females May Be Less Likely than Males to Commit Crimes
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Examine some of the reasons why females may be less likely than males to commit crimes. (12 marks)

Material will be interpreted and applied appropriately to examine two or more reasons for gender differences in offending. Concepts and issues such as the following may feature: social control of women; public and private spheres; gender and opportunity; workplace crime; primary socialisation; women’s nurturing role; status offences; accomplishing masculinity; domestic violence; biological and psychological factors; patriarchy and criminal career structures; delinquent male subcultures; patriarchy and women’s liberation etc. However, not all of these are necessary, even for full marks. Analysis and/or evaluation will be relevant and explicit. Sources may include: Carlen; Chesney-Lind; Connell; Heidensohn; Lombroso; Lyng; Moir & Jessel; Messerschmidt; Winlow.

Assess Sociological Views of the Relationship Between Crime and the Mass Media. (21 marks)

In this band, interpretation, application, analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant, and answers will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding of sociological material on the relationship between crime and the media, drawn from Item A and elsewhere. This will be accurately interpreted and sensitively applied to meet the demands of the question. These answers will deal with two or more views. Concepts and issues such as the following may appear: different representations, genres or media; folk devils and moral panics; stereotyping; amplification spiral; societal reaction; moral entrepreneurs; racism; hegemony; legitimation; consumption of crime; popular culture; copycat crime; media effects; fear of crime; relative deprivation; late/postmodernity; cybercrime; surveillance technology etc. Evaluation may be developed, for example by locating the discussion within a debate between perspectives, or considering relevant methodological issues. Sources may include: Bandura; Becker; Brown; Carrabine et al; S. Cohen; Goode & Ben-Yehuda; Hall et al; Lea & Young; McRobbie; Skidmore; Young.

Assess the Strengths and Limitations of Overt Participant Observation as a Means of Investigating Police Attitudes. (15 marks)

This question requires you to apply your knowledge and understanding of sociological research methods to the study of this particular issue in crime and deviance.

In this band, interpretation, application, analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant. Answers will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of the specified method. This will be accurately and sensitively interpreted and applied to the demands of the question.
Interpretation and application will be more fully focused and evaluation more thorough, and answers may show a clear rationale in the organisation of material leading to a distinct conclusion. Candidates will examine a range of relevant strengths and limitations of using overt participant observation, interpreted and applied to research issues relating to police attitudes. These may include some of the following, though answers do not need to include all of these, even for full marks.

**Strengths and limitations of the method:** verstehen/insight into actors’ meanings; getting in; staying in; going native; getting out; personal skills and characteristics of researcher; validity; reliability; representativeness and generalisation; grounded theory; informed consent; inadequate concept of structure; Hawthorne effect; cost; time.

**Research issues and characteristics:** formal permission to observe; dealing with different levels of hierarchy; police as a closed group; social characteristics of officers; need for prior knowledge; training and role-taking; front-stage/back-stage; impression management; problems of researching the organisation as a whole; over-identification; interpreting taken-for-granted meanings; researcher's class, gender and ethnicity; practical issues (potential dangers; shift work; coping with tedium).

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

They will show a clear understanding of relevant debates and issues surrounding choice of topic and of research method(s). These may include: practical, ethical and theoretical issues in choice of method and topic; reliability; validity; representativeness and generalisation; theoretical perspective; quantitative and qualitative data; social facts/constructs; hypothetico-deductive method; grounded theory; precedents of previous research; time; cost; researcher skills/characteristics; access; preferences of funding agency; personal/societal values; chance circumstance; informed consent; confidentiality; vulnerability; danger/harm to researcher or participants etc.

- Greater knowledge of the factors affecting choice of topic and method(s).

- Greater understanding of the implications of the issues raised by the question for debates about sociological knowledge.

In answering this question, candidates may refer to some of the following sources and/or relevant alternative ones: Becker; Blumer; Durkheim; Glaser & Strauss; Gouldner; Graham; Oakley; Humphreys; Milgram; Mayo; Tuckett; Weber.
Examine some of the ways in which crime and globalisation may be related. (12 marks)

Answers in this band will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding and will be largely successful in interpreting, applying, analysing and evaluating material. Material will be interpreted and applied appropriately to examine two or more ways in which globalisation and crime may be related. Concepts and issues such as the following may feature: risk society; late modernity; deregulation and privatisation; disorganised capitalism; crimes of the powerful; cybercrime; terrorism; human rights abuses; money laundering; intellectual property rights; smuggling, trafficking and migration; sex tourism; green crime; surveillance, regulation and policing etc. However, not all of these are necessary, even for full marks. Analysis and/or evaluation will be relevant and explicit. Sources may include: Bell; Braithwaite; Castells; Garland & Sparks; Giddens; Lash & Urry; Norris & Armstrong; Punch; Thomas & Loader; Toombs & Whyte; Webber; Young.

Assess the view that ethnic differences in crime rates are the result of the ways in which the criminal justice system operates. (21 marks)

In this band, interpretation, application, analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant, and answers will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding of sociological material on ethnicity, crime rates and the CJS, drawn from Item A and elsewhere. This will be accurately interpreted and sensitively applied to meet the demands of the question. These answers will deal with a range of ways in which the CJS operates in relation to ethnicity and crime. Concepts and issues such as the following may appear: differential enforcement, stereotyping, labelling, canteen culture, institutional racism, policing policy, strip-search, deaths in custody, sentencing policy, minority ethnic recruitment, capitalism, colonialism, relative deprivation, marginalisation, subculture, the role of the media etc. Evaluation may be developed, for example by locating the discussion within a debate between perspectives, or considering methodological issues relating to measures of offending.

Assess the strengths and limitations of unstructured interviews as a means of investigating victims of crime. (15 marks)

In this band, interpretation, application, analysis and evaluation will be explicit and relevant. Answers will show sound, conceptually detailed knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of the specified method. This will be accurately and sensitively interpreted and applied to the demands of the question. Answers will make appropriate use of material from Item B. Candidates will examine a range of relevant strengths and limitations of using unstructured interviews, interpreted and applied to research issues relating to victims of crime. These may include some of the following, though answers do not need to include all of these, even for full marks:
**Strengths and limitations of the method**: validity, reliability, representativeness, generalisation, theoretical perspective, grounded theory, interviews as interaction situations, interpretation of meaning, cost, time, scale, response rate, flexibility, ethics of researching sensitive subjects, privacy, informed consent, post-research effects on interviewees.

**Research issues and characteristics**: overcoming victim’s reluctance to talk, their relationship to offender, participation in criminal activity or responsibility for their victimisation, repressing the memory of victimisation, unawareness of being victimised, particular problems of interviewing child victims, dealing with traumatised interviewees, ethics of ‘guilty knowledge’ acquired in interviews etc.

> “Feminism has revolutionised sociology by placing women at the centre of its analysis of society. However, while all feminists share this starting point, there are now many different ‘feminisms’ within sociology.” Assess the contribution of feminist theorists and researchers to an understanding of society today. (33 marks)

Answers in this band will show good sociological knowledge and understanding. They will show a clear understanding of relevant debates and issues surrounding the question of feminist theory and research. These may include patriarchy, capitalism, dual systems theory, feminist debates surrounding modernity/modernism, feminist research methodology, value freedom versus commitment, the critique of malestream sociology, etc. Answers will deal with a range of feminist theories, eg liberal, radical, Marxist, difference/post-structuralist etc. Answers will show a thorough, accurate and conceptually detailed knowledge of a wide range of empirical and theoretical material on the set question and a sophisticated understanding of the question and of the issues that it raises.

At this level answers might include:

- Greater knowledge of different feminist theories, methodology and research
- Greater understanding of the implications of feminist theory and research for debates about sociological knowledge

In answering this question, candidates may refer to some of the following sources and/or relevant alternative ones: Ansley, Barrett, Beechey, Brownmiller, Bruegel, Butler, Delphy, Dworkin, Engels, Firestone, Greer, Hartmann, Mitchell, Oakley, Pollert, Rich, Rowbotham, Segal, Somerville, Walby.
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- **Examine the problems of using observational methods in the study of crime and deviance. (12 marks)**

  Answers in this band will examine a range of problems in using observational methods to study crime and deviance. These may include ethics (researcher involvement in deviant acts, deceit/informed consent, betrayal of confidences/informing the police), practical issues, going native, reliability, representativeness, validity, verstehen etc.
  
  Such problems will be clearly linked to the study of deviance. Answers will refer to more than one observational method (e.g., non-participant observation, overt and covert participant observation). Analysis and/or evaluation will be relevant, explicit and well developed, e.g., by locating the discussion within a theoretical debate, such as that between positivist and interpretivist approaches to researching deviance.

- **Assess the usefulness of realist theories for our understanding of crime. (40 marks)**

  Answers in this band will show a very good knowledge and understanding and will successfully meet the synoptic requirements of the question. These answers will show a thorough, conceptually detailed and wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of theoretical and empirical material on left and right realist approaches to crime. Answers will be broad ranging and will show a clear understanding of relevant debates and issues. These may include: street crime; consumerism, materialism and the media; late modernity; capitalism; relative deprivation; subculture; marginalisation; insecurity and instability (e.g., work, family life); the square of crime; victimology; risk taking; rational choice theory; costs and benefits of crime; the broken windows thesis; zero tolerance policing; the underclass; family structures, etc. A range of perspectives is likely to feature.
  
  Knowledge will be more comprehensive and detailed, and/or links between theoretical and empirical aspects more explicit and developed, and understanding will be clearer and more complex.

  In answering this question, candidates may refer to some of the following sources and/or relevant alternative ones: Becker; Cloward and Ohlin; AK Cohen; Durkheim; Herrnstein; Jones; Kelling; Lea & Young; Marx; Merton; WB Miller; Murray; Taylor et al; Young & Matthews, Walklate; Wilson.

- **The concepts of modernity and post-modernity have become increasingly useful to our understanding of contemporary society. To what extent do sociological arguments and evidence support this view? (40 marks)**

  Many candidates may approach this question by offering descriptions of the characteristics of modern and/or post-modern societies. However, better candidates will consider the concepts not simply in a descriptive manner, but also analytically. In this way they will draw out key differences and distinctions between the two forms. They may also highlight the degree of debate and uncertainty surrounding the use of the concepts and identify a range of authors and their
contributions to the debate. Candidates may draw empirical material from across the specification or, alternatively, may choose to focus on one particular topic area, such as religion. In answering this question candidates may refer to some of the following sources and/or relevant alternative ones: Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Parsons, Lyotard, Bauman, Baudrillard, Oakley, Foucault, Habermas, Castells, Beck, Giddens, Sweetman, Holland, Stacey.

Answers in this band will show very good sociological knowledge and understanding. The links between theoretical and empirical material will be made more explicit. Accounts of studies and theories will be more detailed and the understanding of the debates and their complexities made explicit.

At this level possible answers might also include some of the following:

- Greater understanding of the complexity of the ideological issues in sociological debates
- Greater understanding of the reactions to post-modernist views
- Greater awareness and understanding of attempts to update classical theories. eg neo-Marxism, post-structural feminism.

Evaluate the usefulness of quantitative methods in sociological research. (40 marks)

Many candidates will see this question as an opportunity to describe and list a range of quantitative methods such as social surveys, the use of statistics, questionnaires, structured interviews, structured observation, content analysis, etc. While this approach is clearly acceptable it is only a partial answer to the question set. Better candidates will combine their descriptions with a focus on the first part of the question. In this respect they will evaluate the methods concerned in ethical, practical and theoretical terms. Issues of reliability and validity may be discussed. Also, candidates may consider the appropriateness of different methods to different areas or types of research. Comparisons may be drawn with qualitative methods. Some candidates may introduce aspects of the sociology as a science. Debate but this can be only a partial response to the question set.

In answering this question candidates may refer to some of the following sources and/or relevant alternative ones: Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Parsons, Comte, Oakley, Holm, Willmott & Young, Feyerabend, Connor & Dewson, Cicourel, Graham, Whyte, Cumberbatch, Halloran, Gill.

The links between theoretical and empirical material will be made more explicit. Accounts of studies and theories will be more detailed and the understanding of the debate and its complexities made explicit.

At this level possible answers might also include some of the following:

- Greater awareness of the nature and complexity of sociology and sociological research
- Greater understanding of the ideological issues in the debates within sociology
- Greater understanding of the decision. Making processes within sociological research and of the pragmatic nature of many research decisions.
Model Answers – These are to help you understand how to structure your answer.

- Outline and assess the usefulness of consensus approaches such as functionalism in explaining the causes and the extent of deviance in society. (21 marks)

Consensus theories argue that society is based on a shared set of norms and values. They argue that these values operate for the shared or collective interest. Functionalist argue that we are socialised into a collective conscience (Durkheim) in order to prevent anarchy. Both Functionalist and the New Right argue that without collective values deviance and disorder would disrupt social harmony. However they do acknowledge that deviance exists in society, but they tend to see deviance—which is behaviour that goes against the norm as limited to specific social groups.

Durkheim explained the causes of deviance by reference to the social structure. This was a valuable insight as it helped to show that deviance was not caused by biological factors. He also showed that deviance was not connected to things like diet or climate. Durkheim's study of suicide attempted to show that deviance is not just an individual act but connected to the demands of society. Suicide is not widespread but it is a significant act. In order to preserve the consensus upon which order is built all societies must integrate and regulate their members. However some systems will over-regulate or under-regulate and some will over or under integrate. When they do this they will create certain types of suicide. Modern western societies are not very effective at integrating members and this produces anomic suicide as individuals feel isolated and disconnected from others. However a problem with this study is that Durkheim did not operationalise the concept of integration effectively as he looked at connections between family members. It could be argued that families may isolate their members and that friendship networks are more important in judging the extent of integration in society.

Despite this Merton would argue that Functionalism is still useful in explaining the causes of deviance. He believes that society in is consensus over values. In America everyone wants to succeed and they see success in terms of materialism. Merton argues that all Americans are socialised into the cultural goals of society but that some are not properly socialised into the institutional means (things like education as a mechanism of achievement). The result is that an individual’s desire to achieve success leads them into criminal and deviant activity. Most conform, the extent of deviance is not great but it is significant. Some become innovators, some retreatist and some rebel and completely reject the system. However Merton has been criticised by Feminists for ignoring the deviance of women. He only focuses on men. In addition he fails to explain non-utilitarian crime.

This is not, however a problem for Functionalist theory as a whole as A K Cohen does attempt to explain crime which has no monetary gain. Cohen argues that working class youths suffer from cultural deprivation and are unable to succeed in education. This means that they develop status frustration and invert society’s values. They invert the prevailing consensus in order to gain prestige amongst their peers and thus gain status from vandalism and graffiti. They destroy the thing they are denied by society. This deviance is limited to this group as it is a product of their
inability to reach the consensus. However Box argues that most delinquent youths do not originally accept mainstream values.

Matza however rejects this view. He argues that the idea that there are criminal and non-criminals is wrong. Individuals may drift into delinquency but they can also drift out. It is wrong to assume as Functionalists do that it is simply them and us.

On the other hand it is not just Functionalist writers who believe that society is based on a consensus. The New Right also argue that deviance is the result of individuals pulling away from the common values which preserve the social order. For instance Marsland and Murray argue that increased welfare and a growing climate of permissiveness from the sixties has encouraged deviance in the form of single parenthood and criminality. The consensus has been undermined and a growing underclass is steadily growing. This underclass is the location of most deviance in society. However this theory blames individuals for the choices they have made and it could be argued that it is reductions in welfare that create deviance and crime rather than the presence of welfare.

There are specific problems with many of the Functionalist studies but in general they can be cruised for failing to effectively explain the causes of deviance. Interactionists would argue that the assumptions of Functionalism are overly deterministic and that people are not just puppets of their socialisation. Individuals have consciousness and may react to socialisation in a variety of ways. Indeed the Functionalist approach is too large scale and it ignores individual interaction. Interpretivists like Becker would argue that individual interaction between those who have the power to label and those who are labelled helps to cause deviance. Some labels are so powerful that they become a Master status and influence how others around them act. Jock Young showed how labelling someone can amplify deviance. Labelling and not social structures are the cause of deviance.

Marxists would also argue that Functionalism ignores the true origins of crime. The capitalist system based on greed and exploitation forces proletarians to engage in crime to survive. Poverty not a lack of values causes crime. In addition some rebel against the system as a form of protest against the capitalist system.

Functionalism bases much of its work on official statistics. Durkheim used them to study suicide and later writers have used official statistics to establish trends and to measure the extent of crime in society. This positivistic use of the statistics has been heavily critised by anti-positivists. They would argue that the figures give a very misleading impression of the extent of deviance in society. Atkinson showed how the figures which measured the extent of suicide in a country are social constructs. They are only the interpretation of a coroner and thus a subjective judgement, as Cicourel shows in his study of crime statistics they to be the result of subjective judgement of police officers and probation officials.

In addition the Functionalist writers on crime tend to draw a false view of the extent of crime. As Marxists argue, Functionalists ignore white collar crime, corporate crime and also rely on the definitions of crime created by the ruling class. These definitions tend to criminalise working class activities and turn a blind eye to the activities of the ruling class. Thus Marxists would argue that
crime is distributed throughout society and Functionalists are wrong to assume that the extent of crime and deviance is limited to just the working class.

A final problem for Consensus theories in explaining deviance is that Post-Modernists would argue that the theory is out of date. It is no longer possible to argue that there is a consensus as the old meta-narrative has collapsed. In other words in our media rich age it is very difficult to establish a common agreement on what is right and wrong. As soon as one view is put forward it is challenged by another view. This means that if there is no agreement over what is normal then it is difficult to classify something as deviant. In the past sexuality was heavily controlled and the narrative of heterosexuality was widely accepted. However today no such consensus exists and sexuality is now a matter of personal preference, it is difficult to argue that “society” would classify a homosexual as deviant.

Overall Functionalist theory was a useful starting point. It got away from individualistic and biological theories. However it has been shown to be too deterministic in its assumptions about people and it has ignored many other possible causes of deviance. In addition it has relied far too heavily on the statistics. A more effective analysis should see deviance as a response to social deprivation and a consequence of the intervention of the agencies of social control. This can be seen in the work of the Left Realists.
**Key Terms** – You **must** understand each of these key terms before the exam!

**Crime and Deviance =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliation</th>
<th>Deviance</th>
<th>Rational Choice Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Status Hierarchy</td>
<td>Ethnomethodology</td>
<td>Right Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomie</td>
<td>Folk Devils</td>
<td>Risk Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>Globalisation</td>
<td>Retreatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Crime Survey</td>
<td>Green Criminology</td>
<td>Situational Crime Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Window Thesis</td>
<td>Hegemony</td>
<td>Social Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivalry Thesis</td>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>Status Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Interactionism</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Labelling Theory</td>
<td>Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Crime</td>
<td>Late Modernity</td>
<td>Victimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminogenic</td>
<td>Left Realism</td>
<td>Victimology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Criminology</td>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>White-Collar Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Prosecution Service</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Welfare Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>Postmodernity</td>
<td>Zero Tolerance Policing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Methods =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covert</th>
<th>Overt Role</th>
<th>Sample Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Pilot Study</td>
<td>Sampling Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Effect</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Secondary Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Primary Data</td>
<td>Social Facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposition Problem</td>
<td>Qualitative Data</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
<td>Quantitative Data</td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Bias</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Pluralism</td>
<td>Representative Sample</td>
<td>Verstehen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>