

GCE

Sociology

Unit **H580/02**: Researching and understanding social inequalities

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.













All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Sociological or methodological theory
	Sociological or methodological evidence: concepts / statistics / social policy
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way / detailed
	Underdeveloped: partially explained, requiring more depth
	Application/Interpretation: explicit engagement with the source or context of the question
	Q 3 and 4 for weaknesses of the method Q6 for arguments against the claim
	Q3 and 4: strength of the method Q6 arguments for the claim
	Lip service or implicit application
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense not creditable
	Repetition
	Not clearly focused on question set: tangential – sociological but not directly relevant
 Highlight	Q1 clear and explicit comparisons Q2 problem cited Q4 in the margin for description of method only AND in the answer for combination of methods Q5 area of inequality Q6 conclusion

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Summarise the data shown in Source A.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability by clearly and accurately summarising the data in Source A, for example by considering trends in the level of poverty in the two age groups shown and making some explicit comparison of them.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to summarise the data, e.g. by summarising the trends in the two age groups. Data should be accurately interpreted, may be less clearly expressed.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to interpret the data, for example a simple statement that pensioner poverty has decreased while poverty in the working population has increased. Data will be mostly accurately used and may be lacking detail.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to interpret data, for example by accurately stating the percentage in poverty of at least one group or identifying a simple trend in one group.</p> <p>0 marks No ability to interpret data shown, e.g. the candidate misunderstands the data or interprets it entirely inaccurately or may not state a trend or percentage.</p>	4	<p>Overall candidates may conclude the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty for working age has increased fairly steadily since 1982. • It increased faster 1982-1992 than 1992-2012 where there has been only a small increase. • Pensioner poverty decreased 1982-84 but then increased more sharply up until the late 80s. • Pensioner poverty then fell rapidly 1990-94. • Since then pensioner poverty has fallen more steadily with a small increase in 2004-06. <p>At the top level candidates should offer more detail for example pointing to periods in which levels of poverty in each group rose or fell particularly quickly or quoting statistics drawn from the graph to illustrate points. There should also be some explicit comparison, for example pointing out that from the mid-80s to 2004 pensioners were more likely to be in poverty than those of working age but that this has reversed since 2004.</p> <p>Candidates who simply read figures off the graph without actually summarising the information should not be placed above Level 2.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Explain TWO possible problems with the representativeness of the samples used in the research summarised in Source B.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding 2 marks The candidate shows a clear understanding of two problems.</p> <p>1 mark The candidate clearly explains one problem or shows a partial understanding of two problems.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply evidence using the source to support both reasons.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to apply evidence from the Source B, for example by showing a clear ability to support one problem and some evidence to support a second.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to apply evidence from the Source B, for example by using evidence to clearly support one of the problems cited or showing some ability to support two problems with lip service.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to apply evidence from Source B to support their problems, for example a brief reference to an issue such as age or</p>	6	<p>Candidates could consider problems of representativeness in relation to the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class/occupation - all social science students so not representing other courses or people who were not students. • Age – mostly 18-21 • Ethnicity – Overwhelmingly white • Gender – slightly more women than men • Location – 2 Sheffield Universities • Size – only 249 questionnaires / 23 interviews • Opportunity sampling – non-random – only those willing and available to take part at the time • Time period 2003/2004 <p>AO2 The candidate should engage with the context of the source i.e. women and gaming to receive full marks.</p>

		<p>ethnicity or opportunity sample. Typically reference made to the source may be lip service only to one problem.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of material from the Source</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to Source A, explain ONE advantage and ONE disadvantage of sociologists using quantitative data to study poverty.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability by using evidence from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to both the advantage and the disadvantage identified.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability by using evidence from Source A in answering the question. There is an attempt to apply the source material in relation to both the advantage and the disadvantage identified but it is likely to be clearer in relation to one than the other.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability by using evidence from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to either an identified advantage or a disadvantage or a less clear attempt to apply data to both.</p> <p>Level 1 : 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability by using evidence from Source A in answering the question. There will be some attempt to apply at least one aspect of the data but it will lack clarity</p>	10	<p>To gain full marks for application candidates must make reference to the data in Source A.</p> <p>Possible advantages might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If data is collected regularly, ability to see trends over time. • Ability to make comparisons between different groups in levels of poverty e.g. age groups. • Longitudinal study – ability to compare over time. • Support from positivists e.g. precision provided by quantitative data shows exact number in poverty in each group in different years. • Time and cost – collecting quantitative data tends to be cheaper and less time consuming. • Large sample sizes – Quantitative data typically derived from large scale surveys so more representative. Which may allow more generalisability. • Reliability – Possible to repeat research to compare with other statistics to find social facts about poverty. • Objectivity – quantitative data perceived as more objective than qualitative • Social policy – can be used to show policy makers which groups are most likely to suffer poverty. • Use to complement qualitative research e.g. knowing extent of poverty in certain groups can complement qualitative data e.g. on experiences of poverty. <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded.</p> <p>Possible disadvantages might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity – Statistics may not be based on a valid measure of poverty e.g. due to lack of depth or verstehen. • Interpretivist arguments e.g. statistics do not allow researchers to

	<p>or be of marginal relevance. Typically reference to the source may be lip service only.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of data.</p> <p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation Level 4: 5–6 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate the use of quantitative data to study poverty in terms of both an advantage and a disadvantage. Both points should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory. At the bottom of the level, one is likely to be less developed.</p> <p>Level 3: 4 marks The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate the use of quantitative data to study poverty in terms of both an advantage and a disadvantage, one of which will be supported by methodological concept(s) and or theory. The development of the evaluation is likely to be uneven.</p> <p>Level 2: 2–3 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate quantitative data to study poverty, i.e. a less developed evaluation of both an advantage and a disadvantage. Methodological concept(s) may be undeveloped or implicit. OR a clear and developed evaluation of either an advantage or a disadvantage with methodological concept(s) and theory</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate quantitative data to study poverty, for example a less developed evaluation in terms of either an</p>		<p>understand meanings of poverty or individuals' experiences of poverty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depth and detail – descriptive data, attitudes and feelings not available from quantitative data. <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>advantage or a disadvantage.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant evaluation.</p>		
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance	
4	*	<p>Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge, explain and evaluate the use of a combination of questionnaires and in-depth interviews for researching women’s involvement in digital gaming.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the nature, purpose and uses of questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The response will use a wide range of accurate methodological theory and concepts. There is a well–developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good understanding of questionnaires and in-depth interviews. Knowledge will have either range or detail. There will be some understanding of methodological concepts and/or theories but these may not be fully developed. Responses are generally clear and accurate, though may contain some errors. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most part relevant.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic understanding of</p>	<p>25</p>	<p>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</p> <p>Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by questionnaires and in-depth interviews. They may also make reference to concepts such as triangulation or methodological pluralism.</p> <p>Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability, interpretivism, and positivism in relation to questionnaires and in-depth interviews for this research problem is also expected.</p>

	<p>questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The response lacks range and detail and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited understanding of questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The response lacks range and detail and may show considerable inaccuracy and/or lack of clarity. The candidate may simply describe the method(s). The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to relate the use of questionnaires and in-depth interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching women’s involvement in digital gaming) in an explicit way. At the top of the level application will be wide ranging. The material is related to the question.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to relate the use of questionnaires and in-depth interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching women’s involvement in digital</p>	<p>AO2: Application</p> <p>Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of questionnaires and in-depth interviews to how these might be useful for researching women’s involvement in digital gaming.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from Source B in answering the question. For example questionnaires were used to measure how many females actually game whilst the in-depth interviews could give reasons behind the statistics, such as women explaining that they feel the games are made by men for a male audience.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>gaming) in a mostly explicit way. Some of the material may be more implicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to relate the use of questionnaires and in-depth interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching women’s involvement in digital gaming). Explicit application is likely to be very narrow. The material is related to the question occasionally and mainly implicitly.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to relate the use of questionnaires and in-depth interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching women’s involvement in digital gaming). Typically reference to the source may be lip service only. The material is only implicitly related to the question and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological application.</p> <p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation Level 4: 12–15 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of combining questionnaires and in-depth interviews for researching women’s involvement in digital gaming. Responses will include a wide range of explicit and relevant evaluative points and may make some comparison with other methodologies.</p>		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation Candidates should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of combining questionnaires and interviews, especially in relation to the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability, and relate this to the context of the question, that of researching women’s involvement in digital gaming. Excellent responses should not simply list the advantages and disadvantages of the two methods separately but should offer some evaluation of the benefits of combining the methods.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

	<p>The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to using a combination of questionnaires and in-depth interviews. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. The candidate may reach a critical and reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>Level 3: 8–11 marks The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of questionnaires and in-depth interviews for researching women’s involvement in digital gaming. Responses will include a range or depth of explicit and relevant evaluative points and may make some comparison with other methodologies. Responses will raise a few clear points of evaluation but may leave these only partially developed. The evaluation is not necessarily balanced. At the top of the level points start to be developed. The candidate may reach a critical but brief conclusion.</p> <p>Level 2: 4–7 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of questionnaires and in-depth interviews for researching women’s involvement in digital gaming. Responses are likely to offer a few generalised evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument or listing strengths and weaknesses all undeveloped. If present, different methodological approaches are likely to be juxtaposed simply and/or implicitly. At the bottom of the level there should be at least two evaluative points but these are likely to be undeveloped. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–3 marks</p>	<p>In terms of positive evaluation candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaires allow collection of quantitative data, allows researchers to see patterns (e.g. between males and females) in use of digital games, types of games played etc. • Questionnaires allow researchers to obtain basic factual information initially which can be explored in more depth in face-to-face interviews. • Questionnaires provide more objective/unbiased data because less chance of interviewer bias. • Issues of validity – using in-depth interviews allows respondents to explain their feelings / meanings more fully overcoming possible problems with only using questionnaires. • In-depth interviews allow collection of more in-depth/ qualitative data (e.g. about respondents’ feelings or experiences of digital games). • Combining methods/ triangulation allows for the strengths of one method to compensate for the weaknesses of the other. • Allows researchers to address concerns of both positivists and interpretivists. • Access to subjects for interviews relatively straightforward as derived from sample for questionnaires. • Issues of representativeness e.g. relatively large sample obtainable from initial questionnaires. • Relatively high in reliability, other researchers could replicate this kind of research. <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p> <p>In terms of critical points candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively small sample size for interviews mean they are possibly less representative. • Other issues concerning sampling e.g. lack of representativeness due to sampling method. • Issues of reliability – Research conducted on young, white university students, other researchers might obtain different
--	---	--

		<p>The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of questionnaires and in-depth interviews for researching women's involvement in digital gaming. Responses should include at least one point of evaluation; however this is likely to be minimal, unbalanced, assertive, one-sided or tangential to the main issue. Evaluation is implicit. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis.</p>		<p>results if conducting similar research on other social groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible ethical issues e.g. need for informed consent / confidentiality • Possibly more time consuming than just using one method therefore more costly. • Difficulties of analysis e.g. comparing/combining data from two different methods. <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p data-bbox="320 292 983 355">Outline ways that age is a form of social inequality in British society today.</p> <p data-bbox="320 395 831 459">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 10–12 marks</p> <p data-bbox="320 464 972 863">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways that age is a form of social inequality in British society today. The response demonstrates depth and breadth in both a range of areas and sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts; the material is accurate. At the top of the level there will be at least two age groups. At the bottom of the level evidence may be slightly less developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p data-bbox="320 903 584 935">Level 3: 7–9 marks</p> <p data-bbox="320 940 972 1370">The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of ways that age is a form of social inequality in British society today. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate depth or breadth of areas. There will be a range of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts but they may not be fully developed. Responses are generally clear and accurate, though may contain some errors. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p>	20	<p data-bbox="1155 292 2074 459">Candidates should show an understanding of the concept of age inequalities. Better answers should address age inequalities at different stages in the life course, for example disadvantages faced by children, young people, the elderly and possibly also those of working age.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 499 2040 563">There are a wide range of possible ways to respond to this question and candidates are only expected to explore some of these.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 603 1720 635">Possible areas of knowledge might include:</p> <ul data-bbox="1155 639 2063 1401" style="list-style-type: none"> • Age and life chances e.g. influence of child poverty on later life • Work related inequalities e.g. restrictions on ability to work for children and elderly. • Inequalities of wealth and income related to age e.g. extent of poverty in older and younger age groups. • Differences in market situation (including Weberian theory) • Differences in status (including exchange theory and labelling theory) • Ageism and age discrimination e.g. in the workplace • The digital divide • Subjective aspects of age and inequality e.g. differences in experience of different groups • Extent to which age inequalities affect different groups e.g. genders (including feminist approaches), ethnic groups and social classes. • Functionalist views e.g. that age inequalities are necessary and functional. • Disengagement theory: age inequalities reflect need to elderly to disengage. • Marxist theories: age inequalities exist to serve the needs of capitalism. • Arguments that apparently disadvantaged groups such as elderly

	<p>Level 2: 4–6 marks The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of at least one area and age inequality in British society today. The response lacks depth and breadth. Knowledge and understanding of evidence, theories and concepts may be partial, inaccurate, confused, implicit and/or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by some evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–3 marks The candidate shows limited knowledge and understanding of ways that age is a form of social inequality in British society today. The response may be narrow and undeveloped, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity. The information is limited and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant knowledge or understanding</p> <p>AO2: Application</p> <p>Level 4: 7–8 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply sociological knowledge. A wide range of material is explicitly and consistently related to the question.</p> <p>Level 3: 5–6 marks The candidate shows a good ability to apply sociological knowledge. A range of material is explicitly related to the question but this may not be consistently applied.</p>	<p>may be advantaged e.g. decline in poverty among elderly, the grey pound, SKIERs etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age and inequality e.g. through media representation, crime, family, education. <p>Possible studies/data which might be applied include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milne et al (divisions among the elderly) • Pilcher • Moore and Conn (covert participant observation of experience of being elderly) • Cummings and Henry (disengagement theory) • Phillipson (elderly as reserve army of labour) • Itzin (double standards faced by older women) • Turner (exchange theory) • Gentleman (article on elderly care home) • Opinion poll data, e.g. MORI survey of age discrimination • Statistical data on age inequalities e.g. IPPR research on youth unemployment, Joseph Rowntree Foundation and CPAG statistics on child poverty. • Case study evidence, e.g. Arlene Phillips or Moira Stewart as celebrity cases of alleged age discrimination. • Blaikie (positive aspects of ageing).
--	--	--

		<p>Level 2: 3–4 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to apply sociological knowledge. The material is related to the question occasionally and mainly implicitly.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks The candidate shows a limited ability to apply sociological knowledge. The material is only implicitly related to the question and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological application.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>* Assess the view that in the UK status and financial rewards are based on individuals' talents and efforts.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 13–16 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the view. The response demonstrates knowledge of a wide range of sociological evidence in depth, including clear understanding of sociological concepts and theory; the material is accurate. At the bottom of the level evidence may be slightly less developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p>	40	<p>Candidates should show an understanding that the statement in the question would be broadly supported by functionalist and/or New Right approaches. Postmodernism and Weberianism can be credited depending on its use. Candidates are likely to apply evidence relating to social class / economic inequalities and answers may also consider the relevance of other types of social inequality, for example gender, ethnicity and possible age.</p> <p>Relevant concepts which could be applied might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meritocracy • Value consensus • Functions of social stratification • Human capital • Natural inequality • Underclass

	<p>Level 3: 9–12 marks The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of the view. The response shows knowledge and understanding which is either wide-ranging or detailed. There will be some understanding of sociological evidence, theory and/or concepts but they may not be fully developed. Responses are generally clear and accurate, though may contain some errors. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p>Level 2: 5–8 marks The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of the view. The response lacks range and detail, and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate, and contain errors. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate and/or undeveloped. There may be reliance on anecdotal examples. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks The candidate shows a limited knowledge and understanding of the view. The response lacks range and detail, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity; the candidate may simply describe an aspect of inequality in general. There is likely to be a tendency towards common sense knowledge. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependency culture • Dysfunctions of stratification/ negative effects of social inequality • Class inequality • Market situation • Status • Power/ Party • Social mobility • Social closure • Unequal distribution of wealth and income • Life chances • Absolute and relative poverty • Gender inequality • Patriarchy • Ethnic inequalities • Host-immigrant model • Age inequalities • Gender/ethnic/age discrimination <p>Candidates might cite studies such as the following in support of the statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parsons • Davis and Moore • Saunders • Murray • Schlafly (in relation to gender inequality) • Patterson (in relation to immigrants) • Cummings and Henry (in relation to old age) <p>In critical evaluation candidates could draw on a variety of theoretical approaches including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxism • Weberian theory • Feminist theories
--	---	--

	<p>the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 7–8 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply sociological knowledge and evidence both for and against the view. The material is explicitly and consistently related to the question.</p> <p>Level 3: 5–6 marks The candidate shows a good ability to apply sociological knowledge and evidence to the question. Some material is explicitly related to the view.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to apply sociological knowledge to the question. The material is related to the view occasionally.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates show a limited ability to apply sociological knowledge to the question. The material is only implicitly related to the view and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological application.</p> <p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation Level 4: 13–16 marks Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the view. Responses will include a</p>	<p>Candidates might also offer evaluative points such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxist theory, inequalities related to needs of capitalism rather than meritocracy. • Weberian theory, inequalities reflect market situation of different groups e.g. ability of groups to operate closure or exert differing degrees of power in distribution of rewards. • Growth of economic inequalities seemingly unrelated to distribution of talent or effort e.g. rise of super-rich. • Evidence of how life chances are related to class/ gender/ ethnicity rather than meritocracy • Data on social mobility e.g. relative mobility rates • Data on poverty, e.g. growth of poverty in UK, impact of poverty on life chances • Tumin’s critique of functionalism • Wilkinson and Pickett’s analysis of effects of inequality. • Feminist arguments concerning gender inequalities being linked to patriarchy • Links between ethnic inequalities and racism • Dysfunctional aspects of ageism/age inequalities
--	---	---

		<p>wide range of sustained and explicit evaluative arguments with depth. There will be a discussion of different theoretical approaches. At the top of the level answers will reach a conclusion. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. The candidate may reach a critical and reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>Level 3: 9–12 marks Candidates show a good ability to evaluate and analyse the view. Responses will demonstrate range or depth of evaluation. At the top of the level there will be some discussion of different sociological evidence. The candidate may reach a brief conclusion.</p> <p>Level 2: 5–8 marks Candidates show a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the view. The response lacks range and depth. Responses are likely to offer a few generalised, evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument. If present, different sociological evidence is likely to be juxtaposed simply and implicitly. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks Candidates show a limited ability to evaluate the view. Evaluation is implicit, minimal, assertive, inaccurate or tangential to the main issue. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017



001