

GCE

Sociology

H580/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2024

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 2024

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING****SCORIS**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to scoris and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK PRACTICE AND STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the scoris 50% and 100% (traditional 50% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, email or via the scoris messaging system.

5. Crossed Out Responses

Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. Award No Response (NR) if:
 - there is nothing written in the answer spaceAward Zero '0' if:
 - anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.
8. The scoris **comments box** is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your Team Leader, use the phone, the scoris messaging system, or e-mail.


















9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- b. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Knowledge and Understanding: for example, studies or theories or concepts. Question 5 and 6 AO1: Knowledge and understanding point. Question 3 and 4: Strength of the method
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way/detailed Q1 – summary.
	Underdeveloped: Partially explained, but requiring more depth
	Unsubstantiated/undeveloped/implicit/accurate without explanation/little supporting evidence/knowledge
	Sociological or methodological evidence: concepts / statistics / social policy
	Application/Interpretation. Question 1, 2, 3 and 4: To indicate data taken from the source or explicit engagement with the source.
	Lip service
	Evaluation: Q4: Weakness of the method Q6: Critical evaluation point
	Example/Reference
	Juxtaposition of theories / ideas without direct evaluation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense/not creditable
	Irrelevant: not related to the topic area and/or non-sociological
	Repetition
	Not clearly focused on question set tangential – sociological but not directly relevant
	Blank Page
	Where a page has writing on, but it is not worthy of any credit.
	Highlighter tool: Q2 reason cited Q4 use of methodological theory Q5 area of inequality

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Summarise <u>two</u> conclusions which could be made about income inequalities in the UK using the data in <u>Source A</u>.</p> <p><u>AO2: Application</u> Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability by clearly and accurately summarising two conclusions in the data shown in Source A. At this level both points should explicitly refer to data in the source.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to summarise two conclusions which are supported by the data shown in Source A. At this level answers will typically summarise two conclusions but may only explicitly apply data in relation to one of them.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to interpret the data. Candidates will typically identify two conclusions but fail to explicitly apply any examples of data or they will clearly identify one conclusion and support it with relevant data.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to interpret data, for example by making some attempt to outline just one conclusion without supporting data or making some attempt to apply at least one aspect of information from the source.</p> <p>0 marks No ability to interpret data shown, e.g. the candidate misunderstands the data or interprets it entirely inaccurately.</p>	4	<p>Candidates should summarise conclusions from the source which are supported by the data.</p> <p>As there are no exact figures on the graph, approximations will need to be accepted.</p> <p>Conclusions should make an explicit comparison between income types or social groups.</p> <p>Conclusions which refer to the bottom earning the least income across all social groups and then state that the top group earn the highest income across all social groups can only be accepted as one conclusion.</p> <p>Possible conclusions might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a very large inequality between the top group and the bottom group in terms of original income. The top group's average original income is around 14 times as much as the average income of the bottom group ~£8000. • All income groups have higher gross incomes than original incomes suggesting that they all receive some benefits on top of their original incomes. However, the increase is greatest in the bottom group whose income is increased by ~£7,000 and then increasingly less with each group until the top group whose income only increases by ~£2,500. • All groups have lower net incomes than gross incomes suggesting they all lose some income through direct taxes. However, this decrease in income is smallest in the bottom group at ~£2,000. The biggest decrease is seen in the top group at ~£35000. • Benefits and taxes have some limited effect in redistributing incomes as the bottom group's net income is over £5,000 greater than their original income. All three of the top groups (3rd, 4th, top) are worse off in terms of net income compared to original income – this is most apparent in the top group who are ~£30,000 worse off.

					Stating the lower the social group the lower the income or vice versa is not a conclusion just repetition of the source.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to <u>Source B</u>, explain <u>two</u> reasons why sociologists might conduct interviews with groups.</p> <p><u>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</u> 2 marks The candidate shows a clear understanding of two reasons why sociologists might conduct interviews with groups.</p> <p>1 mark The candidate clearly explains one reason or shows a partial understanding of two reasons.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p> <p><u>AO2: Application</u> Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply evidence with a clear ability to support both reasons with material from Source B.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to apply evidence from Source B, for example by showing a clear ability to support one reason and some evidence to support a second, this is likely to be lip service .</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to apply evidence from Source B, for example by using evidence to clearly support one of the reasons cited or showing some ability to support two reasons but with lip service.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to apply evidence from the Source to support at least one reason. Reference made to the source is likely to be lip service only and only relate to one reason.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of material from Source B.</p>	6	<p>Examples of reasons why sociologists might conduct interviews with groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviewing groups allow researchers to observe group members interacting and comparing their views on a topic, which may produce different kinds of responses from individual interviews. • Groups offer a chance for researchers to explore issues and investigate what is important to respondents before exploring these in more depth in individual interviews. • Groups may throw up new issues or potential questions, which researchers had not thought about and these can be incorporated into the individual interviews. • Groups help with establishing verstehen. Researchers can start to understand the view of the world taken by focus group members which may help them understand meanings of respondents in individual interviews. • Individuals will feel more relaxed and comfortable if they are in a group environment, this will help to establish rapport and therefore more likely to open up. • Using more than one interview technique allows for triangulation so researchers can compare responses and create greater validity. • Interviews with groups can save time by interviewing people together rather than individually. <p>Examples of application of Source B might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interviews with groups helped them to identify themes and issues which were of interest to the researchers. • The use of co-researchers from the same community enabled them to build a rapport in the group interviews which then helped individuals to feel more comfortable in the individual interviews. • The interviews with groups enabled the researchers to develop the interview guide using the themes and issues that arose in the interviews with groups. <p>Lip service is when a reference or quote from the source is dropped in, and not applied to the reason that has been used for AO1.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to <u>Source A</u>, explain <u>two</u> strengths of using official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK.</p> <p>AO2: Application</p> <p>Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to both strengths identified.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is an attempt to apply the source material in relation to both the identified strengths but it is likely to be lip service in one of the strengths.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation one strength or reference made to the source material is lip service in both strengths.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to apply data from Source A in answering the question. Typically reference made to the source material is likely to be lip service.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of data.</p>	10	<p>To gain marks for application candidates must make reference to the data in Source A. Candidates who simply evaluate official statistics in general may score marks for evaluation but not for application.</p> <p>Possible strengths might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positivists' preference for statistics as precise scientific data (e.g. stats in Item a show precise difference between different income quintiles). • Ability to identify correlations in such statistics (e.g. between the level of income redistribution taking place between higher and lower income groups) • Validity of such statistics as they are likely to be a true measure of income (e.g. based on government statistics which record data such as benefits received and tax paid by households in different income groups with some accuracy). • Reliability of such statistics as data (e.g. data recorded in a consistent manner over time and between areas based on official rules laid down by government officials) • Representativeness of such statistics as collected across whole country so almost a 100% sample of the population is recorded (e.g. government departments have statistics on incomes benefits etc of almost every household). • Candidates may also refer to easy availability of such statistics and time and cost factors though these answers are less likely to be developed in terms of theories and concepts. <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded.</p>

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 5–6 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate the use of official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK by considering two strengths. Both points should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory with reference to using official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK. <i>At the bottom of the level, one is likely to be less developed.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 4 marks The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate the use of official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK by considering two strengths, one of which should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory with reference to using official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK. <i>The development of the evaluation is likely to be uneven in terms of coverage of the two points with one idea likely to be underdeveloped.</i></p> <p>Level 2: 2–3 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate the use of official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK. by considering EITHER two strengths but both are less developed. Methodological concept(s) may be undeveloped or implicit OR one clear and developed evaluation point with methodological concept(s) and/or theory. <i>At the bottom of the level there is likely to be one underdeveloped limitation and one undeveloped limitation.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate the use of official statistics to study income inequalities in the UK, for example a less developed evaluation in terms of just one strength.</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 semi-structured interviews with individuals to gather qualitative data on older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods.</p> <p><u>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</u> Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. 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. <i>There will typically be four well-developed methodological concepts and theory, or three well developed with theory towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. Knowledge will have <u>either</u> range <u>or</u> depth. 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 and supported by some evidence. <i>Typically there will be two developed or three underdeveloped methodological concepts or theory.</i></p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. The response lacks range and depth and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate, and contain errors; however, the candidate does establish the basic meaning of semi-structured interviews. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure.</p>	25	<p><u>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</u> Candidates do not need to show detailed knowledge of research on older people or gentrification but rather apply the material in Source B.</p> <p>Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by semi-structured interviews with individuals i.e. interviews where questions are to some degree standardised but where respondents are able to reply in their own words and interviewers can ask follow up questions.</p> <p>The question refers to interviews with individuals so material relating to group interviews is not relevant to this question.</p> <p>Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability in relation to semi-structured interviews is also expected. This should relate to consideration of the context of the research i.e. researching older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Candidates may also be rewarded for showing relevant understanding of other sociological concepts relating to methodology.</p> <p>Candidates should be rewarded for appropriate understanding of the relevance of theoretical perspectives to their discussion e.g. interpretivism and positivism.</p> <p><u>AO2: Application</u> Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews and how this might be applied to the study of older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from the Source in answering the question.</p> <p>Ideas for application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The older people in the study may have been distrustful of outsiders researching them. Using semi-structured interviews would help to create rapport and gain verstehen especially when conducted by fellow residents of a similar age.

	<p><i>Typically there will be one developed methodological concept or theory or two underdeveloped, concepts and theory may be implicit.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. The response lacks range and detail and may show considerable inaccuracy and/or lack of clarity. The candidate may simply describe an aspect of the method and/or research methods in general. 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. <i>Typically there will be one underdeveloped idea or one or more undeveloped ideas without methodological concepts and theory</i></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 semi-structured interviews with individuals to the context of the research in Source B (researching older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods) in an explicit way. At the top of the level application will be wide ranging. The material is related to the question. <i>At the top of the level material from the source should be explicitly applied on at least 4 occasions and on at least 3 occasions at the bottom.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to relate the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to the context of the research in Source B. Some of the material may be more implicitly related to the question. <i>There should be at least two explicit applications of the source material.</i></p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to relate the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to the context of the research in Source B. Explicit application is likely to be very narrow. The material is related to the question occasionally and mainly implicitly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the size and composition of the sample. Positively in terms of coverage of a diverse group of residents or negatively in terms of relatively small size. • The semi-structured interview guide would mean all the researchers explored common themes, responses could be compared and research would be more reliable. • The research appeared to produce positive responses from those who took part suggesting the method was successful in establishing rapport. • Using residents to conduct interviews as part of participatory research would draw on their existing knowledge of the area and help to create rapport with participants in the interviews. <p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation Candidates should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative methods, especially in relation to the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability, and relate this to the context of the question, researching older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods.</p> <p>In terms of positive evaluation candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretivism is associated with such methods and suggests they allow for empathy and verstehen of subjects. Helpful in understanding the viewpoints of older people who may be marginalised and ignored. • Validity – Such methods are likely to gain rapport with subjects and therefore more valid/ more likely to gain truthful accounts. • Validity – Using participants' own words is likely to provide a richer and more colourful account than purely quantitative data. • Reliability – Using semi-structured interviews with individuals in combination with group interviews allowed the researcher to triangulate and check hypotheses and may therefore produce a more reliable response, allows for respondent validation. • Using older residents from the area to conduct interviews meant that there was likely to be a higher degree of rapport with interviewees and this might increase the validity of responses. • Ethics – Semi-structured interviews when conducted sensitively allow researchers to gain informed consent and space for interviewees to withdraw or avoid answering questions if they wish to.
--	--	--

	<p><i>There should be at least one explicit application of the source material.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to relate the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to the context of the research in Source B. The material is only implicitly related to the question and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance. <i>There will be one or more attempts to apply material from the source but this will be merely lip service or irrelevant to the point being made.</i></p> <p>0 marks - No relevant sociological application.</p> <p><u>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</u></p> <p>Level 4: 12–15 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. Responses will include a wide range of explicit and relevant evaluative points and may make some comparison with other methodologies. There will be a discussion of semi-structured interviews in relation to the purpose of the research. The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to using of qualitative methods in this research context. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. The candidate may reach a critical and reasoned conclusion. <i>There will typically be four well-developed evaluative points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 8–11 marks The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. Responses will include a wide range <u>or</u> 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 but will include at least one strength and one weakness. The candidate may reach a critical but brief conclusion. <i>There will typically be three developed evaluative points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be two developed or four underdeveloped points with some use of concepts/theory.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access – Using semi-structured interviews within a participatory framework would make access to the community easier as those involved would be more trusting of researchers drawn from their own community. • Values - Using residents to develop the interview guide would help to avoid imposition by the researchers of their own values or what they considered important. <p>Possible weaknesses/criticisms might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity – Semi-structured interviews rely on the truthfulness of participants. Subjects may give partial or misleading accounts if they dislike or do not trust researchers. • Analysing data – Because respondents replied in their own words rather than choosing standardised responses as in a questionnaire, it would be harder to analyse results e.g. to discern patterns or to produce quantitative data, which would be preferred by positivists. • Positivism – Data collection methods may be seen as unscientific e.g. interviews were not conducted by professional social scientists so more chance of bias. • Semi-structured interviews reveal subjective meanings of respondents but may not be able to explore more structural issues of which respondents are unaware e.g. impact of wider social and economic changes in society on their locality. • Representativeness – The researchers only interviewed 30 respondents so the sample may not be representative of the diversity of older people in the community. • Generalisability – The research focused on just one locality in Manchester so may not be generalizable to other parts of the UK or even other parts of Manchester. • Practical issues – Studies using semi-structured interviews are typically time consuming and therefore potentially expensive. Researchers also need considerable skill in establishing rapport and maintaining good relationships with subjects. More time would be needed in training local residents to conduct interviews. • Researcher effects are likely to have occurred. While older people might respond more positively to being interviewed by other older residents they also might be influenced in their responses by the characteristics of those conducting the interviews.
--	---	---

		<p>Level 2: 4–7 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. Responses are likely to offer a few generalised evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument or listing strengths and weaknesses. If present, different methodological approaches are likely to be juxtaposed simply and/or implicitly. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p><i>There will typically be three underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points at the top of the level. At the bottom of the level there should be at least two evaluative points but one of these is likely to be undeveloped.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–3 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate and analyse the use of semi-structured interviews with individuals to research older people in gentrifying neighbourhoods. 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. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or assertion.</i></p> <p>0 marks - No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliability – Very difficult to replicate this kind of study as it is very unique so difficult to check or compare findings. <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 *	<p>Outline ways in which social class can influence a person's life chances.</p> <p><u>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</u> Level 4: 10–12 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways in which social class can influence a person's life chances. The response demonstrates a wide range and depth of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts with material relating to at least two aspects of social class and life chances; the material is generally 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. <i>There will typically be four well-developed knowledge points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 7–9 marks The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of ways in which social class can influence a person's life chances. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate <u>either</u> depth <u>or</u> range relating to at least two aspects of social class and life chances. 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. <i>There will typically be three developed knowledge points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p> <p>Level 2: 4–6 marks The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of at least one way in which social class can influence a person's life chances. The response lacks depth or range. Knowledge and understanding of evidence, theories and concepts may be partial, inaccurate, confused, implicit and/or undeveloped. The information has</p>	20	<p><u>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</u> Examples of ways which might be considered would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to achieve high pay or other rewards e.g. ONS data on income inequality. • Research on social class and educational outcomes e.g. official statistics on lower attainment of free school meal pupils or specific sociological studies of social class and education. • Impact of child poverty on children's life chances e.g. health, education etc. • Influence of social class on health and life expectancy e.g. ONS statistics on social class and life expectancy or sociological studies on social class and specific aspects of health e.g. diet, smoking etc. • Research on social mobility e.g. extent to which working class people able to undergo long range social mobility, data on relative chances of upward social mobility. Work of Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission on links between poverty and lack of social mobility. • Opportunities to access elite positions in society e.g. data on proportions of privately educated attaining top jobs. Role of cultural and social capital in helping to access higher paid/higher status jobs. • Importance of inherited wealth in transmitting advantage/disadvantage across generations e.g. Rowlingson and Mullineux report (2013), Atkinson (2013). • Evidence relating to social class and criminalisation e.g. studies of policing focused on working class crime or relative invisibility/lenient treatment of white collar and corporate crime. • Greater impact of crime/chances of victimisation in poorer communities e.g. data from Crime Survey of England and Wales. • Links between occupation/social class and chances of unemployment e.g. ONS data. • The digital divide, e.g. data on how children from poorer backgrounds struggled to access digital learning technology during lockdown. Barnard

	<p>some relevance and is presented with limited of structure. The information is supported by some limited evidence. <i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–3 marks The candidate shows limited knowledge and understanding of ways in which social class can influence a person's life chances. The response may be narrow and undeveloped, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity; the candidate may simply describe an aspect of inequality without linking it to social class. 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. <i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or a vague representation.</i></p> <p>0 marks - No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2: Application 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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may also consider how members of higher social classes may enjoy advantages in terms of life chances. <p>Some candidates may attempt to apply theoretical approaches to social class inequalities. These may be credited as long as candidates link material to the issue of life chances. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weberian theory e.g. links between social class and market situation meaning working class people are in a weaker position to secure more desirable positions in the labour market. • Evidence of working class people predominating in secondary sector of a dual labour market so struggling to access well-paid, secure jobs. (Barron and Norris 1979). • New Right theory e.g. Murray's argument that member of the underclass struggle to escape from poverty because if perverse incentive created by the welfare state. • Interactionism/labelling theory, evidence of stereotyping/labelling affecting life chances e.g. studies of workplace or education. <p>Any other reasonable answers should be credited.</p> <p>AO2: Application To achieve marks for application candidates should apply evidence about social class inequalities to explaining how they affect life chances. Answers which simply show knowledge of social class inequalities without relating them to life chances should not receive application marks.</p>
--	---	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 *	<p>Evaluate New Right explanations of different types of social inequality.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Level 4: 13–16 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of New Right approaches to explaining different types of social inequality. At this level candidates should show knowledge of more than one type of social inequality (e.g. social class, gender, ethnicity or age). The response demonstrates knowledge of a wide range of sociological material in depth, including clear understanding of sociological concepts and theory; the material is generally accurate. At the bottom of the band material 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><i>There will typically be four well-developed knowledge points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 9–12 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of New Right approaches to explaining different types of social inequality. The response shows knowledge and understanding which has <u>either</u> range <u>or</u> depth. There will be some understanding of sociological evidence, theory and/or concepts but more superficial and under-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><i>There will typically be three developed knowledge points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p> <p>Level 2: 5–8 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of the view. The response lacks range and depth, and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate, and contain errors. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, inaccurate and undeveloped or omitted. 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>	40	<p>In terms of knowledge, candidates should show understanding of material based on New Right approaches. However, some candidates may use functionalist theory in support of New Right approaches. This should be used to explicitly support New Right explanations rather than simply juxtaposed. Candidates may consider any type of inequality including social class, gender, ethnicity and age.</p> <p>Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saunders on the inevitability of social inequality and advantages of free market system. • Murray on the underclass. • Schlafly's anti-feminist view of gender roles. • Sewell on black masculinity and educational under-achievement. • Functionalist approaches to youth e.g. Parsons and Eisenstadt which see lower status of young people as necessary as they are still becoming fully integrated into society as adults. • Functionalist theories of social inequality used to support New Right e.g. Davis and Moore on universal need for social stratification or Parsons on functionality of separate gender roles. <p>Any other relevant studies or evidence which can be applied in support of New Right approaches may be credited.</p> <p>In evaluation candidates might consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxist approaches, i.e. that inequalities are not necessary and that capitalism is an exploitative system. • Weberian approaches, i.e. that inequality is not necessary but benefits privileged groups. • Feminist approaches i.e. that gender inequalities are not necessary or beneficial to women but reflect patriarchy. • Anti-racist approaches, i.e. that ethnic minorities are not to blame for ethnic inequalities as these are due racism and discrimination (e.g. Rex and Tomlinson).

		<p><i>There will typically be one developed point or two or more underdeveloped points.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks The candidate shows a limited knowledge and understanding of the view. The response lacks range and depth, 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 the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. <i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or a vague representation.</i></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. The candidate will make explicit reference to the theory in the question and link material to it in a number of places.</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 theory.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to apply sociological knowledge to the question and the answer will be lacking focus. The material is related to the theory occasionally and mainly implicitly.</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 theory and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks - No relevant sociological application.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criticisms of Murray e.g. evidence that the poor are not part of a dependency culture e.g. Macdonald's study of working class youth. • Criticisms of Sewell e.g. that he blames black communities for underachievement rather than institutional racism in education and the wider society. • Criticisms from feminists of New Right and functionalist theories of gender inequality e.g. that gender inequalities are not biological/natural/necessary for society but rather reflect patriarchal nature of society. • Wilkinson and Pickett's Spirit Level study showing that high levels of inequality are not functional but correlate with a variety of social problems. <p>Any other evaluation which uses sociological theories or evidence to criticise New Right approaches in a relevant way may be credited.</p> <p>Candidates should be rewarded for application where they have clearly explained how theories and/or evidence support the view rather than simply outlining different approaches.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 13–16 marks</p> <p>Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse New Right explanations of different types of social inequality. Responses will include a wide range of sustained and explicit evaluative arguments with depth. There will be a discussion of different sociological approaches supported by sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts. At the top of the level answers may reach a conclusion. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be lacking depth and/or detail at times. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed.</p> <p><i>There will typically be four well-developed evaluative points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 9–12 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the view. Responses will demonstrate range <u>or</u> depth of evaluation. At the top of the level there will be some discussion of different sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts. The candidate may reach a brief conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be three developed evaluative points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p> <p>Level 2: 5–8 marks</p> <p>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, sociological evidence is likely to be juxtaposed simply and implicitly. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative rather than evaluative.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks</p> <p>Candidates show a limited ability to evaluate and the view. Evaluation is implicit, minimal, unbalanced, assertive or tangential to the main issue. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or assertion.</i></p> <p>0 marks - No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2024 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.