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Specimen
Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always whole marks (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded positively:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.
Using the mark scheme

The questions are marked using a generic analytic mark scheme, which separates the marks for the different assessment objectives (AO). The work is marked for each AO using generic levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response for that AO, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Indicative content is provided as a guide. Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may make some responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.
Indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘Global migration has only economic consequences for society.’ Evaluate this view.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key focus of question**
This question is about the consequences of migration and requires candidates to weigh the economic consequences of migration (positive and negative) against non-economic consequences, such as cultural and political consequences. Candidates may evaluate the view in the question by arguing that the economic consequences are linked to the political and cultural consequences so it is impossible for the consequences to be only economic.

**Indicative content**
For:
- Economic benefits of the migration of labour, including highly skilled workers such as doctors and low skilled workers such as service industry workers and manual labourers.
- The economic benefits of fee paying university students as a valuable source of income.
- Negative economic consequences relating to the dependency ratio in the countries people are migrating from as those emigrating are predominantly of working age.
- Negative economic consequences such as highly trained medical staff emigrating to work in another country, leaving their country of origin short of specialist skills, for example, Bulgaria.
- Sociological arguments highlighting the importance of economic aspects of migration for example Marxism and functionalism.
- An analysis of perceptions of the economic impacts of migration through popular discourse as opposed to empirical evidence.

Against:
- Political consequences of global migration such as a changing voting demographic as a result of migration, growing representation of a wider range of migrant groups in politics.
- The need to change social policy as a result of immigration, such as housing, health care and education provision.
- Political consequences such as the rise of nationalism and xenophobia as a result of perceived problems with immigration, hate crimes.
- The growth of global political organisations and social movements such as Black Lives Matter.
- Cultural consequences of migration such as the benefits of multicultural society.
- The increase in religious pluralism and the possibility of a lack of value consensus as different values and beliefs coexist.
- The cultural benefits of the contribution of migrants to cultural practices and national identity, such as music, food and the arts, the growth of hybrid culture or alternatively, cultural homogenisation/westernisation.
- Sociological theoretical interpretations of the political and cultural impact of migration such as Neoliberal, Marxist, Conservative, Social Democratic views.
- A discussion of the interconnected nature of political, cultural and economic consequences of migration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>‘It is becoming harder to detect and punish global crime.’ Evaluate this view.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key focus of question:**
This question is about whether changes linked to globalisation have made it more difficult to detect and punish crime. Candidates are likely to focus on examples of global crimes such as human trafficking and corporate crimes and explain why these crimes are difficult to detect and punish. Candidates should evaluate the view in the question by exploring the ways that changes associated with globalisation may make it easier to detect and punish crime, for example through increased global coordination by police organisations and increased surveillance.

**Indicative content**

**For:**
- Examples of crime with a global dimension with an explanation of why these crimes may be more difficult to detect and punish.
- The particular challenges of different legal/policing systems in different parts of the world, for example, crimes against the environment where this is not yet considered a crime.
- Increased freedom of movement resulting from globalisation allows criminals to travel and operate across borders more easily.
- Evidence that new technologies, such as the Dark Web and cryptocurrencies, have made it easier for criminals to operate globally.
- The movement of business activity to places where state rules are less strict to take advantage of weaker regulations without any punishment or repercussions, for example, where there are less strict health and safety regulations.
- The continued lack of regulation by internet service providers, search engines and social media of illegal activity on the internet.

**Against:**
- Global police organisations, for example EUROPOL and INTERPOL, are becoming more efficient in tracing and prosecuting global criminal networks for cybercrimes.
- The expanding role of surveillance by both the state and private companies, new legal possibilities and police powers.
- The increasing use of social media and global media to raise awareness of particular forms of crime as well as to catch particular criminals.
- Examples of changing policing practices and laws which attempt to respond to the changing nature of crime, such as global police operations working together to tackle global drugs networks and terrorism.
- The introduction of international laws and courts which hold transnational criminals to account, for example, the International Criminal Court, or the United Nations International Court of Justice.
- Examples which show that global criminal networks, such as drug cartels, are challenged through multinational campaigns with some success.
- Lack of agreement about what constitutes ‘global crime’ and shortage of clear evidence that so-called global crimes are increasing, partly reflecting differences in the way crime statistics are recorded in different societies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Global crime has a long history and we should be wary of underestimating the extent of such cross-border crimes in previous epochs, for example, raids by invading armies, piracy, slavery, transfer of wealth illegally seized, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>‘The hypodermic syringe model provides the best explanation of media effects.’ Evaluate this view.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key focus of question:**
The hypodermic syringe model is a media effects theory that argues that media messages are like a drug injected directly into the audience’s mind, changing their behaviour in a direct and tangible way. The model emerged amid concerns about new media forms and the idea of mass society in the USA and Western Europe in the 1930s and 1940s. There have been more recent developments of the theory, including cumulation theory and transmission models. The hypodermic syringe model has close links to the concept of mass society and the Marxist theory of mass manipulation. The hypodermic syringe model can be contrasted with indirect models of media effects, such as the cultural effects theory.

**Indicative content**

**For:**
- Some study evidence supports the idea of direct effects (Bandura, Belson).
- Subsequent developments of the hypodermic syringe model are more nuanced than the original version and therefore harder to dismiss.
- Evidence for indirect effects is, arguably, just as debatable as evidence for direct effects. It is very hard to isolate the variables involved in order to test whether, and how, behaviour is affected by exposure to the media.
- While it may be true that the media does not always have a direct effect, there may be some circumstances where the effect is tangible and immediate (such as examples of the spread of rioting, copy-cat crimes, and outbreaks of mass public mourning).
- Companies would not spend so much money on media advertising if it were not possible to influence audiences directly.
- Some groups may be particularly vulnerable to direct media influence; recent developments of the hypodermic syringe model have focused on this point, rather than assuming that the media has a uniform effect across all social groups.

**Against:**
- There are limitations with the evidence used to support the idea of the media affecting behaviour directly.
- The original hypodermic syringe model has difficulty explaining why some people appear to be influenced by the media more than others.
- Direct effect models wrongly assume that audiences are uncritical individuals easily influenced by the media.
- Fears about mass society and the power to control behaviour through the media proved greatly exaggerated.
- The media is more interactive today and audiences are smaller and more diffuse. Audiences are therefore less likely to be influenced in large numbers by the direct impact of the media.
- Where advertisements are effective, studies suggest the impact on audiences is more subliminal and indirect.
- Public protests directed at the media (or some elements of the media) occur quite frequently and it would be difficult to explain this using the classical hypodermic syringe model.
- There is evidence from studies to support indirect models of media effects (e.g. Kraeplin, Cohen, Stam, Glasgow Media Group).
### Question 4

‘The media reflects the interests of all groups in society equally.’

**Evaluate this view.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key focus of question:**

This question is about the influences of media content and how far that content reflects the interests of all groups in society as opposed to, for example, only the elite groups. The pluralist theory of the media supports the view that media content fairly reflects different interests in society. By contrast, the Marxist theory views the media as serving the interests of the ruling class only. The digital pessimism/optimism debate may also be relevant for this question, with the digital optimism case suggesting that the new media has opened up more opportunities for diverse groups and interests to influence media content, while the digital pessimism case suggests that the new media is controlled largely by the same powerful interests that exercise power over the traditional media.

**Indicative content**

For:
- Evidence of media campaigns to support vulnerable groups.
- Diversity of media content reflects the interests of diverse groups in society.
- The values associated with a ‘free media’ are highly valued and this lends some support to the pluralist view that the media is independent in seeking to represent different interests fairly and truthfully.
- Examples to show that the media can bring issues into the public domain and encourage debate incorporating different groups and interests (e.g. Watergate exposure, Thalidomide, discredited US and UK government claims about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, Pakistan Steel Mills scam).
- Discussion of how the new media provides many opportunities for individuals and diverse groups to shape media content and debate.
- Evidence of how liberalisation of media markets has undermined the entrenched power of some media organisations.
- Opportunities created by the new media for citizen journalism and other ways in which individuals and diverse groups can influence media content.

Against:
- Evidence of bias and distortion in the media that systematically favours some groups (the more powerful) over others (socially deprived and marginalised groups).
- The observation that measures such as liberalisation of media markets, government regulation and censorship have proved largely ineffective in curbing the powers of media moguls such as Rupert Murdoch.
- Arguments against the pluralist claim that the state acts to ensure that the media represents all groups in society fairly; the state may have its own interests which are expressed in the way it regulates the media and seeks to influence media content.
- The point that control over the media no longer lies within the nation state and that globalisation has weakened the scope to hold the media accountable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4        | • Arguments that the new media, far from being a democratising force, is merely an extension of the entrenched power of those who control the traditional media.  
• Challenges to the idea that a ‘free media’ exists which allows journalists and producers to fairly and truthfully represent different interests and viewpoints. For example, it can be argued that the majority of media organisations are focused almost exclusively on achieving commercial ends, and they are not truly committed to the idea of a free media that upholds liberal values and defends the rights and freedoms of the individual. |       |
Question | Answer | Marks
--- | --- | ---
5 | ‘Religion supports the interests of the rich and powerful.’ Evaluate this view. | 35

**Key focus of question:**
The question invites consideration of conflict theories of religion. An evaluation of the Marxist theory of religion could provide the basis for an appropriate answer. An evaluation of the feminist theory of religion would also be acceptable. Another way of approaching the question would be to consider sociological material pointing to entrenched privilege and exploitation in specific religious organisations/movements (Barker’s study of the Unification Church, for example). Sociological reflections on theocracies and the elite structures that such regimes may support should also be rewarded.

**Indicative content**

For:
- Evidence that men (often from privileged backgrounds) dominate the positions of power within many religious organisations.
- Examples showing correspondence between religious doctrine and practices and the interests of capitalism.
- Evidence showing links between privileged individuals and elite groups channelled through religious affiliation.
- Arguments that the growth of fundamentalist religions is best understood as a defence of entrenched power and privilege (particularly male power).
- Sociological material suggesting that NRMs often have hierarchical power structures that are exploitative and promote inequality.
- Defence of the idea that religion remains a powerful influence in society and therefore a way by which the interests of the rich and powerful can be supported.
- The argument that religion makes an important contribution to the cohesiveness of elite groups and thereby helps the rich and powerful to maintain power and retain wealth within their own group.

Against:
- Arguments that the Marxist theory of religion is too deterministic and exaggerates the extent to which religion directly serves the interests of the ruling class.
- The functionalist theory of religion, whereby religion contributes to social consensus and the fulfilment of common interests for all members of society.
- The view that religion serves individual needs and that people from all social backgrounds may benefit psychologically from the experiences of religious belief and worship.
- Examples of religion challenging entrenched interests and supporting the dispossessed and marginalised in their struggles, as with Liberation Theology for instance.
- Religion may not have that much influence on the less powerful groups in society; for example, evidence suggests that very few working-class people attended church in the nineteenth century and religion was not a significant influence on their behaviour and way of thinking.
- Postmodernist ideas about the significance of religion as a source of individual identity (as opposed to religion being a power structure imposed on society in a way that serves the interests of the rich and powerful).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5        | • The secularisation thesis would suggest that religion has little significance in contemporary societies and therefore lacks scope to support the interests of the rich and powerful.  
• Arguments that the power of established religious organisations is breaking down and privatised, consumer driven forms of religious practice may be on the rise. This might suggest less opportunity for the rich and powerful to exercise control through religion. |       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘Religion has lost its social significance.’ Evaluate this view.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key focus of question:**
The question invites an evaluation of the secularisation thesis. Good answers will examine the extent to which religious influence has declined in contemporary societies. This raises questions about how religion is defined and what indicators are used to measure religiosity. The importance of religion in public life (ceremonies, politics, moral debates, welfare, education) would also be a relevant topic to consider.

**Indicative content**

For:
- Religion no longer has a strong hold over people’s lives; belief today is a matter of individual choice and forms of religious practice are increasingly individualised.
- Religious organisations have been weakened and now often compromise with the secular world in order to retain/attract followers and to avoid criticism and censure; for example, acceptance of gay marriage, Sunday opening hours, female clergy.
- People are exposed to knowledge, such as scientific explanations or different cultural beliefs, that challenge religious ideas and weaken their power.
- Religious diversity in contemporary societies undermines the plausibility of any single religion, leading to a general decline in religious influence (lack of religious unity leads to loss of power and social significance).
- Many of the functions once performed by religion (education, welfare, communication, sanctioning of state authority) have been taken over by secular institutions.
- Evidence of decline in religious participation and membership is overwhelming (there may be scope to question some details of this decline, but the overall trend is clear to see in many societies).
- Sociological material that highlights the supposed loss of public functions of the established religions.
- Changes in religious organisations that may reflect a loss of influence in society, such as willingness to compromise on issues of theological significance in order to remain popular and retain/attract followers.

Against:
- It is difficult to measure the social significance of religion (i.e. religion can mean different things to different people and people may be religious in different ways) and it is therefore difficult to show convincingly that religion has lost its social significance.
- The influence of religion in the past may have been overstated and the contribution made by religion to contemporary societies understated (Stark). For example, religion provides the rationale for moral codes that form the basis of political life, and religion takes the lead in arguing for ethical practices to inform economic life today.
- There is a strong undercurrent of individual religious belief, even in secular societies.
- Declining congregations may be specific to Western Europe; church attendance is rising in the USA and in many developing countries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6        | • Only religious organisations that tried to accommodate to the secular world have seen declining membership; religious growth has occurred in fundamentalist organisations (Kelley).  
• Change in religious organisations represents evolution not secularisation or loss of power.  
• Examples of the ongoing importance of religion in public life.  
• The view that disenchantment with rationalisation and science is leading to a religious revival. | |
### Generic levels of response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3     | • Good knowledge and understanding of the view on which the question is based.  
     |       | The response contains a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory/research evidence. | 7–9 |
| 2     | • Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the view on which the question is based.  
     |       | The response contains either a narrow range of detailed points or a wider range of underdeveloped points, with some use of concepts and references to theory or research evidence. | 4–6 |
| 1     | • Basic knowledge and understanding of the view on which the question is based.  
     |       | The response contains a narrow range of underdeveloped points with some references to concepts or theory or research evidence. | 1–3 |
| 0     | • No knowledge and understanding worthy of credit. | 0      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>AO2: Interpretation and Application</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | • Very good interpretation and application of relevant sociological material.  
     |       | The material selected will be accurately interpreted and consistently applied to the question in a logical and well-informed way. | 10–11 |
| 3     | • Good interpretation and application of sociological material.  
     |       | The material selected will be accurate and relevant but not always consistently applied to the question in a way that is logical and clear. | 7–9 |
| 2     | • Reasonable interpretation and application of sociological material.  
     |       | The material selected will be mainly accurate but its relevance to the question may be confused or unclear at times. | 4–6 |
| 1     | • Limited interpretation and application of sociological material.  
<pre><code> |       | The material selected is relevant to the topic but lacks focus on or relevance to the specific question. | 1–3 |
</code></pre>
<p>| 0     | • No interpretation and application worthy of credit. | 0      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>AO3: Analysis and Evaluation</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | • Very good analysis and evaluation.  
       • Clear and sustained analysis of the view on which the question is based, with detailed and explicit evaluation.  
       • There is also likely to be a range of contrasting views and/or evidence discussed, demonstrating good understanding of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 12–15 |
| 3     | • Good analysis and evaluation.  
       • The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained, or it will rely on a good outline of contrasting views and/or evidence, clearly focussed on evaluating the view in the question.  
       • The response demonstrates some understanding of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 8–11 |
| 2     | • Reasonable analysis and evaluation.  
       • There is a description of some relevant contrasting views and/or evidence but these are only implicitly focussed on evaluating the view in the question.  
       • The response demonstrates some awareness of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 4–7 |
| 1     | • Limited analysis and evaluation.  
       • There are a few simple points of implicit or tangential evaluation.  
       • The response demonstrates little awareness of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 1–3 |
| 0     | • No analysis and evaluation worthy of credit. | 0   |