

GCE

Sociology

H580/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for November 2020

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 2020

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Knowledge and understanding point Q3 and 4: strength of the method
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way / detailed Q1 Interpretation/drawing conclusion from the data
	Underdeveloped: partially explained, but requiring more depth
	Q1 – 4: To indicate data taken from the source to support the point On other questions: explicit application to the question (optional)
	Critical evaluation point Q3 and Q4 for weakness of the method
	Juxtaposition of alternative theories/ideas without direct/ explicit evaluation
	Unsubstantiated/ undeveloped/ implicit / accurate without explanation/ substantiation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense/inaccurate
	Irrelevant material/ not clearly focused on question set
	Repetition
	Q5 highlight the social group
	Anecdotal/ common sense/ asociological point

<div data-bbox="244 180 311 225">L</div>	Q1 – 4: lip service to the source
--	-----------------------------------

MARK SCHEME H580/2 2020 (Paper A)

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Using data from Source A, outline two conclusions which could be drawn about the effects of poverty on people living on low incomes.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability by clearly and accurately outlining two conclusions which could be drawn about the effects of poverty on people living on low incomes and showing how this conclusion is supported by the data. At this level, both conclusions should explicitly use information from the source.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to outline two conclusions which are supported by the data. At this level answers will typically outline clear conclusions but may only explicitly apply information from the source to support one of the conclusions.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to interpret the data. Candidates will typically either outline a conclusion or information from the data without linking source information together in a coherent summary.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to interpret data, for example by making some attempt to summarise the data or making some attempt to</p>	4	<p>Candidates should draw clear and coherent conclusions from the data, which are supported by the quotes. The best answers are those which are able to identify a theme or similarity between the five quotes. Candidates who simply quote from the source without actually drawing any coherent conclusions should not be placed above Level 2.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to outline how the quotes provide evidence that poverty may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead to feelings of social exclusion. • Curtail or limit the leisure opportunities available to those on low incomes compared to those who are better off. • Lead to a change for the worse in the opportunities or social circumstances of those in poverty compared to their earlier lives when they were better off. • Any other reasonable conclusion should be credited so long as it is supported by the data in the source.

		<p>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>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to Source B explain two ways in which the government, universities or schools and colleges might make use of the findings of this study.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding 2 marks The candidate shows a clear understanding of two ways in which the government, universities or schools and colleges might make use of the findings of this study.</p> <p>1 mark The candidate clearly explains one way or shows a partial understanding of two ways.</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 with a clear ability to support both ways 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 way 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 ways cited or</p>	6	<p>Detailed understanding of educational policies is not required by this question but candidates should show an understanding of how patterns and trends in statistical data may be useful in understanding aspects of social inequality and in developing policies to overcome these.</p> <p>To gain application marks candidates should consider how the findings of this study might be used rather than simply suggesting policies for improving access to HE for specific groups of students.</p> <p>A wide range of possible responses could be credited. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying groups who are disadvantaged, such as those from state comprehensive schools and from areas such as the North of England might assist the government in targeting resources or other assistance to try and improve access to HE for these groups. Understanding which groups face barriers to access might help Russell Group universities to design entry policies which give priority to disadvantaged students or to develop outreach programmes targeting schools and colleges which are shown to perform less well in achieving places. Schools and colleges identified in the report as less likely to send candidates to Russell Group universities might consider policies which could help raise students' aspirations for example advice for students on the difference between different types of universities and how to successfully apply to Russell Group institutions. Government might develop new policies to aid disadvantaged students identified in the report. Any other reasonable response should be credited.

		<p>showing some ability to support two ways with lip service.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to apply evidence from Source B to support at least one way. Reference to the source is likely to be lip service only and only relate to one way.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of material from Source B.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to Source A, explain one advantage and one disadvantage of sociologists using semi-structured interviews to study the effects of poverty.</p> <p>AO2: Application 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 the advantage and the disadvantage 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 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 to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to either an identified advantage or disadvantage or showing some ability to support two issues with lip service.</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 and refer to either the strength or the weakness.</p>	10	<p>To gain marks for application candidates must make reference to the data in Source A. Candidates who simply evaluate semi-structured interviews in general may score marks for evaluation but not for application.</p> <p>Possible advantages might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to interpretivist theory and search for meanings. • Use of descriptive data brings to life the reality of living in poverty. • Validity of such data. • Using direct quotes means less chance of misinterpretation of data/researcher imposition. • Process of obtaining qualitative data (e.g. through interviews) allows researchers to establish rapport/empathy. <p>Possible disadvantages might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to positivist theory, e.g. unscientific nature of qualitative data, lack of precision provided by statistics. • Harder to identify patterns and trends in poverty using qualitative data, e.g. changes over time, incidence of poverty in specific social groups. • Lack of ability to quantify levels of poverty or identify extent to which issues mentioned by individual respondents are typical of poor people generally. • Lack of reliability, e.g. data may be the result of interaction with individual interviewers and might not be replicated by other researchers and so incomparable. • Small sample sizes typical of qualitative studies mean that research is less representative/generalisable. <p>Any other reasonable response should be credited.</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 sociologists using semi-structured interviews to study the effects of poverty by considering 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 sociologists using semi-structured interviews to study the effects of poverty by considering 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 in terms of coverage of the two points with one idea likely to be underdeveloped.</p> <p>Level 2: 2–3 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate sociologists using semi-structured interviews to study the effects of 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 disadvantage or a disadvantage with methodological concept(s) and/or theory.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate sociologists using semi-structured interviews to study the effects of poverty, for example a less developed evaluation in terms of either an advantage or a disadvantage.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant evaluation.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p data-bbox="362 229 1043 395">Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge, explain and evaluate the use of secondary quantitative data to investigate the influence of type and location of school on entry into top universities.</p> <p data-bbox="362 434 871 494">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 4–5 marks</p> <p data-bbox="362 501 1043 801">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of secondary quantitative data to investigate the influence of type of school and location on entry into top universities. 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 data-bbox="362 839 1021 967"><i>There will typically be four well-developed methodological concepts or theories, or three well-developed with theory towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p data-bbox="362 1005 593 1034">Level 3: 3 marks</p> <p data-bbox="362 1040 1043 1378">The candidate shows a good understanding of the use of secondary quantitative data in this context. Knowledge will have either range or 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.</p>	25	<p data-bbox="1202 229 2087 325">AO1: Knowledge and Understanding Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by secondary quantitative data.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 363 2087 596">Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability in relation to secondary quantitative data is also expected. This should relate to consideration of the context and the aspect of inequality and difference under consideration, i.e. investigating the influence of type of school and location on entry into top universities, although a detailed understanding of this topic is not expected.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 635 2087 766">The response may also relate the selection or choice of methods to the research aim. Candidates should be rewarded for appropriate application of theoretical perspectives to their discussion e.g. interpretivism and positivism.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 804 2087 970">AO2: Application Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of secondary quantitative data and how this might be applied to the study of the influence of type of school and location on entry into top universities.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 1008 2087 1273">Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from the Source in answering the question. For example, they might point to evidence that the secondary quantitative data allowed the researchers to identify patterns and trends in university applications, e.g. independent school candidates more likely to apply to Oxbridge and to establish correlations with the data e.g. higher success rates of independent school pupils in gaining places at Russell Group universities.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 1311 2087 1407">AO3: Analysis and evaluation Candidates should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using secondary quantitative data, especially in relation to the</p>

		<p><i>There will typically be 2 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 secondary quantitative data in this context. 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 secondary quantitative data. 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><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 secondary quantitative data. 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.</p> <p><i>Typically there will be one underdeveloped idea or one or more undeveloped ideas without methodological concepts and theory.</i></p>	<p>concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability, and relate this to the context of the question, investigating the influence of type of school and location on entry into top universities.</p> <p>In terms of positive evaluation candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positivist theory – Preference for objective statistical data seen as more scientific/ unbiased. • Representativeness - Sample covered all candidates applying to universities in the selected cycles so completely representative. This could not have been achieved with a survey of candidates. • Generalisability – Findings would be generalisable to the whole of the UK as the research was not focused on one geographical area or social group. • Reliability – Data is relatively objective and collected from UCAS forms so unlikely to be influenced by the researchers of the context in which the data was collected and thus comparable. • Validity – The statistics could be seen to measure what they claim to measure e.g. valid measures of success rates of different groups of applicants. • Time and cost – Data was relatively easy to access from UCAS who also assisted in analysing it so the researcher would have needed to spend relatively time and effort in producing results. • Ease of analysis - The data lent itself to relatively straightforward analysis, e.g. correlating variables such as type of school/college and place of residence with success in applications to different types of universities. • Policy making -The research was able to reach clear conclusions and provide recommendations, which might help policy makers to devise policies to improve access to higher education for groups identified as being disadvantaged. • Ethical issues – Candidates had already consented to UCAS using their data so this was not a problem. Data was already
--	--	---	---

		<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 secondary quantitative data to the context of the research in Source B (investigating the influence of type of school, place and entry into top universities) 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 secondary quantitative data to the context of the research in Source B (investigating the influence of type of school, place and entry into top universities) 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 secondary quantitative data to the context of the research in Source B (investigating the influence of type of school, place and entry into top universities). 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 secondary quantitative data to the context of the research in Source B (investigating the influence of type of school, place and entry into top universities). The material is only implicitly related to</p>		<p>anonymised, Subjects were not likely to be harmed or upset by the use of their data in this way.</p> <p>In terms of critical points candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretivism – using more qualitative methods would allow a richer/deeper understanding of subjects' social worlds giving a more valid insight into their social reality e.g. considering reasons why some social groups do not apply to Russell Group universities rather than simply measuring how often they do. • Limitations of quantitative data, e.g. the data provides statistical measures and correlations, any explanation of reasons for these patterns is purely extrapolation as subjects were not interviewed or asked to provide their views. Candidates may consider the benefits which might be obtained from primary research on university applicants e.g. interviews which might provide a fuller picture than purely secondary quantitative data. Candidates may also discuss advantages of triangulating with qualitative data. • Lack of verstehen – This type of study treats subjects as purely units for quantitative analysis. Researchers have no direct contact with subjects so cannot establish rapport or understanding of their meanings and motivations • Lack of control over how data was collected/categorised – e.g. the study correlates success in applying to Russell Group universities with factors such as type of school and where candidates lived but does not consider factors such as social class or different types of state comprehensive school presumably because UCAS did not or could not provide a breakdown to allow this. • Possible bias – The researcher or the Sutton Trust may have a political agenda or bias, e.g. may have deliberately selected data which suggests that the university applications system is unfair to state school applicants. Critics might argue that state school applicants simply choose to apply to non-Russell group
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>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 secondary quantitative data to investigate the influence of type of school, place and entry into top universities. Responses will include a range of explicit and relevant points evaluating such an approach and making some comparison with other methodologies. There will be a discussion of the methods in relation to the purpose of the research. The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to the research context. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. The candidate may reach a critical and reasoned conclusion.</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: 8–11 marks The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of secondary quantitative data to investigate the influence of type of school, place and entry into top universities. Responses will include a wide 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</p>		<p>institutions rather than failing to get places because of bias in the system.</p> <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>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><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: 4–7 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of secondary quantitative data. 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. 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><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–3 marks The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of secondary quantitative data. 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>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p data-bbox="264 229 293 245">*</p> <p data-bbox="362 229 1043 325">Outline ways in which discrimination can affect the opportunities of different social groups in work and employment.</p> <p data-bbox="362 363 873 427">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 10–12 marks</p> <p data-bbox="362 434 1043 900">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways in which discrimination can affect people's opportunities in work and employment. The response demonstrates a wide range and depth of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts relating to different forms of discrimination; the material is accurate. There will be reference to at least two social groups (eg genders, ethnic groups, age groups or social classes). 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="362 938 1043 1072"><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 data-bbox="362 1110 627 1142">Level 3: 7–9 marks</p> <p data-bbox="362 1149 1043 1410">The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of ways in which discrimination can affect people's opportunities in work and employment. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate depth or range within at least two social groups. There will be a range of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts but they may not be fully developed.</p>	20	<p data-bbox="1202 229 2085 568">Candidates should show an understanding of the concept of discrimination and may consider different forms of discrimination e.g. racial discrimination, sex discrimination and age discrimination. Better answers may also consider how different forms of discrimination intersect. Such knowledge should be rewarded but is not a prerequisite for a top level answer. Candidates do not have to cover all forms of discrimination to achieve high marks and might show excellent knowledge of just one form of discrimination provided they demonstrated both breadth and depth of sociological knowledge and understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 600 2085 734">There are a wide range of possible ways to respond to this question and candidates are only expected to explore some of these. However, candidates should focus on evidence of discrimination rather of social inequalities in more general terms.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 766 1547 798">Social class discrimination</p> <ul data-bbox="1202 804 2085 1410" style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of social closure (e.g. studies such as Mooney showing how attending private schools and Oxbridge Universities may provide easier entry into elite positions). • Role of cultural and social capital (Bourdieu) and how this may mean working class people face a form of discrimination in competing for top jobs. • Discrimination in education, studies of labelling and teachers' expectation disadvantaging working class students meaning less chance of reaching top positions (e.g. Gillborn and Youdell on setting and streaming, Dunne and Gazeley on teacher's expectations) • Concept of social reproduction (e.g. Bowles and Gintis on myth of meritocracy, Willis on why working class kids get working class jobs). • Some candidates may also quote statistics e.g. on the proportion of private school pupils attending Oxbridge universities or achieving different elite positions to suggest a degree of social class discrimination.

		<p>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: 4–6 marks The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of at least one way in which discrimination can affect people's opportunities in work and employment. The response lacks depth and range. Knowledge and understanding of sociological 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 limited evidence.</p> <p><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 way in which discrimination can affect people's opportunities in work and employment. The response may be narrow and undeveloped, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity; the candidate may simply describe an aspect of discrimination. The information is limited and communicated in an</p>		<p>Gender discrimination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the gender pay gap (ONS, Fawcett Society) suggesting women earn less for work of equal value. • Statistics on proportion of women in senior positions e.g. directors of FTSE 100 companies (EHRC). • Evidence of women being sacked or losing out on pay or promotion because of pregnancy (UK Feminista). • Evidence of sex discrimination in recruitment criteria or selection processes (EHRC reports). • Evidence of sexual harassment directed at female employees (TUC/EHRC report). • Some candidates may also consider evidence of sex discrimination against males (e.g. Benatar arguing that boys do worse at school than girls because the system is now designed for females). <p>Racial/ethnic discrimination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher rates of unemployment for some ethnic minorities (may quote ONS stats). • Evidence of discrimination in relation to recruitment (e.g. Wood et al). • Evidence of ethnic penalty (Heath and Yu) and minority ethnic graduates more likely over qualified (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Battu and Sloane). • Discrimination against Pakistani and Bangladeshi women e.g. women removing hijab to get jobs (Dodd). • Earnings deficit, especially for minority men compared to white men (JRF) • Higher levels of poverty among minority ethnic groups (JRF). • Limited rates of social mobility for some minorities e.g. African Caribbeans, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis (Platt). • Evidence of institutional racism/ethnocentric curriculum in education affecting employment opportunities (Gillborn and Youdell, Mirza, Mac an Ghail).
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p><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>		<p>Age discrimination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence from covert PO of different responses to elderly (Moore) • Higher rates of unemployment among youth possibly due to discriminatory assumptions by employers about young people. • Age discrimination now largest category of discrimination cases (MORI). • Compulsory retirement ages in some occupations. <p>Candidates may also cite individual case studies of one or more types of discrimination.</p> <p>Any other reasonable responses should be credited as long as candidates show relevance of their evidence to the questions.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

--	--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Evaluate different sociological explanations of age inequalities.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 13–16 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of sociological explanations of age inequalities. 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 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><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 The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of sociological explanations of age inequalities. The response shows knowledge and understanding with range or depth. 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>	40	<p>Candidates should show an understanding of sociological explanations of age inequalities. Good and excellent answers should draw on relevant sociological theories, concepts and studies.</p> <p>Candidates might consider the following explanations.</p> <p>Functionalism (Parsons) - different roles for different age groups e.g. youth making transition to adulthood, elderly need to move out of work roles but may take on new roles e.g. as grandparents. Evaluation: treats age groups as homogenous, tends to see society as consensual ignoring conflicts between age groups, ignores negative aspects of ageing.</p> <p>Disengagement theory (Cummings and Henry) – elderly inevitably have to disengage from social roles to make way for younger generation. Evaluation: ignores degree to which different individuals disengage at different ages and in different ways, ignores dysfunctional aspects of disengagement e.g. older workers pushed out of positions while still competent, ignores extent to which some older people remain highly engaged well into later life. Cross cultural evidence can be used e.g. gerontocracies show the elderly are not biologically less able.</p> <p>Marxism (Townsend, Phillipson) – Role of young workers and older people as source of cheap labour acting a reserve army of labour benefiting capitalism. Use of hegemonic/ideological beliefs e.g. about elderly as a dependent group who contribute little to society to legitimate inequalities and create false consciousness. Evaluation: Tend to see age groups as homogenous, macro approach ignores subjective and diverse experiences of different groups of older people, ignores advantaged position of some elderly and economic power of some elderly (grey pound).</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 sociological explanations of age inequalities. The response lacks range and depth, and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate, and may contain errors. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate and/or 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> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited knowledge and understanding of sociological explanations of age inequalities. 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.</p>	<p>Feminism (Arber and Ginn, Itzin, Daly) – Inequalities experienced by older women are related to gender/patriarchy as well as age. Women's status linked to reproduction and devalues after childbearing age. Higher physical standards expected of older women than men, pressures of cosmeticisation. Evaluation: Tends to blame patriarchy for age inequality, ignoring role of capitalism and economic factors, some feminists fail to consider diversity/lack of homogeneity among older women (e.g. issues of class, ethnicity etc.), many inequalities affect men equally e.g. growing pressure of male cosmeticisation.</p> <p>Weberian theory (Weber, Parkin, Turner) – Weaker market situation and lack of status and power of both young and elderly put them at a disadvantage. Elderly can be seen as a negatively privileged status group. Exchange theory suggests low status of elderly In Western societies is due to their perceived inability to offer resources in exchange for what they receive so perceived as dependent and burdensome. Cross cultural studies show differing age and status relationships dependent on location. Evaluation: While exploring meanings given to ageing, tend to ignore structural reasons for age inequality e.g. capitalism and institutional ageism, for feminists fail to consider gendered aspects, tend to ignore positive aspects of ageing and focus on negative status, exchange theory ignores positive contribution of many elderly to society.</p> <p>Interactionism (Havinghurst, Victor, Cohen) – Activity theory suggests elderly suffer inequality because of decline in social interactions. Process of labelling based on ageist stereotypes leads to self-fulfilling prophecy whereby elderly come to believe they are useless and necessarily dependent. Moral panics about youth deviance may also create negative stereotypes of youth. Evaluation: Activity theory tends to ignore economic barriers to increasing social interactions e.g. poverty of some older people, not all elderly accept labels and stereotypes e.g. may recreate themselves or find new roles, stereotypes may be changing from</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><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 both for and against the explanations considered. 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 understanding age and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological application.</p>		<p>dependent and useless to more active and involved e.g. SKIERs and GRUMPYs.</p> <p>Postmodernist approaches (Laczco and Phillipson, Featherstone and Hepworth, Blaikie, Powell and Biggs) – Although these do not provide an explanation of age inequalities some candidates may draw on them in order to criticise other approaches e.g. by arguing that boundaries of age are more imaginary than real or pointing to ways in which new technologies may be used to fight against ageism.</p> <p>This is a very broad question so candidates should not be expected to consider every explanation of age inequalities Answers which show an understanding of a range of key theories and concepts and apply them in a relevant way should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation Level 4: 13–16 marks</p> <p>Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate different explanations. Responses will include a 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 may reach a conclusion. 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>Candidates show a good ability to evaluate and analyse different explanations. Responses will demonstrate range or 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 one or more explanations. Responses are likely to offer a few generalised, evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument. If present, different sociological evidence is likely to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>be juxtaposed simply and implicitly. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks Candidates show a limited ability to evaluate and the view. Evaluation is implicit, minimal, 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>		
--	--	---	--	--

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

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

GCE

Sociology

H580/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021

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 2021

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Knowledge and understanding point Q3 and 4: strength of the method
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way / detailed Q1 Interpretation/drawing conclusion from the data
	Underdeveloped: partially explained, but requiring more depth
	Q1 – 4: To indicate data taken from the source to support the point On other questions: explicit application to the question (optional)
	Critical evaluation point Q3 and Q4 for weakness of the method
	Juxtaposition of alternative theories/ideas without direct/ explicit evaluation
	Unsubstantiated/ undeveloped/ implicit / accurate without explanation/ substantiation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense/inaccurate
	Irrelevant material/ not clearly focused on question set
	Repetition
 Highlight	Q5 highlight the social group
	Anecdotal/ common sense/ asociological point
	Q1 – 4: lip service to the source

MARK SCHEME

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Summarise two patterns or trends in 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 two patterns or trends shown in Source A. At this level, both will be supported by data from the source.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to summarise two patterns or trends shown in Source A. Data should be accurately interpreted but may be less clearly expressed. At this level answers will typically summarise two patterns or trends but may only support one of them with data from the source.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to interpret the data. Data should be accurately interpreted, may be less clearly expressed. Candidates will typically either outline just one pattern or trend supported with data or two patterns with neither supported by data.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to interpret data, for example by outlining just one pattern or trend without supporting data or alternatively accurately citing one or more pieces of data without showing how it is part of a pattern or trend</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 identify two patterns or trends in the source which are supported by the data.</p> <p>Where candidates summarise more than two patterns or trends marks should be credited for the two best developed points.</p> <p>Examples of trends which might be summarised would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hourly rates of pay have increased between 2013 and 2017 for most ethnic groups with the largest increase for Indians (£1.85 per hour) and Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, Black and other minorities all seeing some increase overall in hourly pay. One group which has seen their hourly pay fall between 2013 and 2107 is the Mixed group where their pay fell from £11.57 to £10.85 between 2013 and 2015. Since then it has increased to £11.26 in 2017 but this remains a lower rate than what they received in 2013. <p>Examples of patterns which might be summarised would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indians consistently enjoy the highest hourly rate of pay at £11.29 in 2013 rising to £13.14 in 2017 while the Pakistani/ Bangladeshi group has consistently the lowest rate of pay at £8.27 in 2013 and £9.52 in 2017. The gap between the hourly rate of Indians and Pakistanis/ Bangladeshis has therefore widened between 2013 and 2017. In 2017 the hourly rate of whites (£11.34) was higher than all the ethnic minorities except Indians. Pakistani/ Bangladeshis had the lowest hourly rate at £9.52, while Indians earned more than all other ethnic groups (including whites) at £13.14.

					Any other reasonable pattern or trend should be credited, so long as it is supported by the data in the source. However, candidates need to summarise data in some way to reveal a pattern or trend rather than merely reading off statistics from the table.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to Source B, explain two ethical issues which sociologists studying young offenders in a Young Offenders Institution would need to consider in their research.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding 2 marks The candidate shows a clear understanding of two ethical issues which sociologists studying young people in a Young Offenders Institution would need to consider in their research.</p> <p>1 mark The candidate clearly explains one issue or shows a partial understanding of two issues.</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 with a clear ability to support both ways using 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 issue 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 issues cited or showing some ability to support two issues with lip service.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark</p>	6	<p>Examples of ethical issues which candidates might consider would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed consent - Gaining permission from the authorities to undertake the research in the first place would be part of the process of obtaining informed consent. The source states that “the researchers had to obtain permission from the management of the YOI. They eventually convinced them of the value of the project after some negotiation.” The offender themselves were also told they could withdraw from the study at any time. • Avoidance of harm - The Source states that “All of the prisoners had negative life experiences and some had a range of problems such as mental health issues and learning difficulties.” This would mean that the researchers would need to be extremely sensitive in how they dealt with the participants in the survey to avoid upsetting them or exacerbating mental health problems. • Avoidance of harm - The researchers felt some guilt and unease about leaving the YOI, not knowing what would happen to the young offenders after their departure. This suggests that they had some ethical concerns about upsetting the offenders they had worked with by leaving the prison and perhaps never seeing them again. • Confidentiality - The source states that while the participants were assured of confidentiality during the research, the researchers warned those involved that if they informed them of something that would put others in danger, they would have to inform the authorities.” There might therefore be some difficult ethical choices over whether to maintain confidentiality or inform the authorities, for example if one of the participants suggested they might be planning to harm someone else.

		<p>The candidate shows a limited ability to apply evidence from Source B to support at least one issue. Typically reference made to the source is likely to be lip service only and refer to only one issue.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of material from the Source.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidance of deception – The researchers tried to be honest with the participants, for example they explained exactly how long they would be working with them. <p>Any other reasonable response should be credited.</p> <p>To gain application marks candidates should consider specific examples of ethical issues which were raised in this piece of research rather than just discussing ethical issues in general.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to Source A, explain one strength and one weakness of using official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay.</p> <p>AO2: Application 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 the strength and the weakness 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 strength and the weakness 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 to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to either the strength or the weakness or showing some ability to support two issues with lip service.</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 data is likely to be lip service and refer to either a strength or a weakness.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of data.</p> <p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</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"> • References to positivist theory and the use of such data to identify patterns and trends such as the extent to which ethnic differences in pay are increasing/ decreasing. • The objective nature of such statistics as they are collected as part of a government sponsored survey. • The ability to quantify the extent of inequality. Using such data allows us to see the precise extent of the pay gap between ethnic groups and the extent to which it is changing. • The representativeness of such data as it is likely to be based on a large and nationally representative sample. • The reliability of the research. Government surveys are usually carried out every year using similar methods and produce consistent findings suggesting it is reliable. • The research is valid as it accurately measures what it aims to. It is likely to provide accurate data on the earnings of different ethnic groups which allows for valid comparisons to be made. <p>Possible weaknesses might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to interpretivist theory, e.g. this type of data fails to understand subjective aspects of ethnic differences in pay, for example the meanings and interpretations attached to their level of pay by members of different ethnic groups. • The data from the survey is purely quantitative and qualitative data, for example on workers experiences of inequalities in pay would offer a richer and more detailed understanding of the issue.

		<p>Level 4: 5–6 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate of the use of official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay considering both a strength and a weakness. 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 official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay by considering both a strength and a weakness, one of which will be supported by methodological concept(s) and or theory. 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.</p> <p>Level 2: 2–3 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate using official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay i.e. a less developed evaluation of both an advantage and a disadvantage. Methodological concept(s) may be undeveloped or implicit. OR the candidate may consider only a strength or a weakness offering a clear and developed evaluation supported by methodological concept(s) and or theory.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate using official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay. Candidates will typically present a less developed evaluation of either a strength or a weakness.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant evaluation.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data from the survey is purely descriptive of the extent of the ethnic pay gap and does not offer an explanation of it or why it may be decreasing. • Issues of validity, for example does this data fully represent individuals earnings as it may not cover earnings not disclosed to tax authorities e.g. pay from informal work or self-employment. • Validity of ethnic categories – The data is classified according to official government categories which may not be particularly useful, for example Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are categorised as one group and Black-Caribbean's and not distinguished from Black Africans nor are White British distinguished from other white groups. • Issues of representativeness. We do not know the size of the sample or how the data was collected so it may not be nationally representative. The survey presumably only covers employees so may not reflect the earnings of other groups such as the self-employed or the unemployed. <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	*	<p>Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge explain and evaluate the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. 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><i>There will typically be four well-developed methodological concepts or theories, 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 qualitative methods to research young people in this context. Knowledge will have either range or 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.</p> <p><i>There will typically be 2 developed or three underdeveloped methodological concepts or theory.</i></p>	25	<p>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by qualitative methods. Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability in relation to the relevant qualitative methods is also expected. This should relate to consideration of the context of the research i.e. researching young people in a Young Offenders Institution.</p> <p>The response may also relate the selection or choice of methods to the research aim. Candidates should be rewarded for appropriate application of theoretical perspectives to their discussion e.g. interpretivism and positivism.</p> <p>AO2: Application Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of the use of qualitative methods and how these might be applied to the study of young offenders in a Young Offenders Institution. Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from the Source in answering the question. For example, they might point to evidence that the mixture of qualitative data allowed the researchers to gain a deeper and more detailed understanding of the lives of the young offenders and their reasons for offending. The best candidates are likely to consider the unique difficulties of researching in a Young Offenders Institution and apply this to their discussion of the methods employed.</p> <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 young people in a Young Offenders Institution.</p> <p>In terms of positive evaluation candidates might include:</p>

		<p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic understanding of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in this context. 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 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> <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 qualitative methods. 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.</p> <p><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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretivism – using qualitative methods allows a richer/deeper understanding of subjects' social worlds giving a more valid insight into their social reality/meanings e.g. young offenders were able to talk about their experiences in their own words in a relatively informal manner. • Validity – using qualitative methods is likely to produce more valid responses because the researchers built rapport with their subjects and sought to establish empathy with them. • Reducing distance/barriers between the researchers and the researched – by making it clear they were not prison staff by using first names and adopting an informal style of research the researchers brought themselves down to the level of their subjects allowing for greater rapport. • The study was successful in giving a voice to a group of young people who might normally be misunderstood or marginalised. This was probably only possible using this type of methodology, e.g. some offenders may have struggled to complete a questionnaire because of literacy problems and many would have been reluctant to open up in a formal interview. • Ethics - The methods used in the study were ethically sensitive, for example respecting confidentiality and trying to minimise any risks of harm to the subjects. • Representativeness – although subjects were not selected using a random sampling method and were only drawn from one institution, the insights from them might be generalisable to other young offenders assuming that what the researchers observed was typical of other offenders and other institutions. • Practical issues – Although the research took some weeks to complete it was relatively small scale so would have not been too costly in terms of time and money. The constraints of the institutional setting and the nature of the subjects also meant that the methods adopted were probably more practical than possible alternatives. • Candidates may also consider why the researchers did not consider alternative methods e.g. questionnaires or
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution 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 qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (young people in a Young Offenders Institution) 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 qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (young people in a Young Offenders Institution). 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 qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (young people in a Young Offenders Institution). 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>structured interviews and point to the idea that these would be less likely to elicit positive responses from the young offenders or provide the kind of detailed insight being sought by the researchers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for policy making – Research on young offenders might help to give an insight into reasons for their offending and how they might be turned away from offending. • Triangulation – Using a variety of methods would allow researchers to triangulate and compare data drawn from one method such as interviews with another such as observation. <p>In terms of critical points candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positivist theory – Would have preference for objective/statistical methods. The study could be seen as too subject to bias and based on personal interpretations of the researchers. • Representativeness – The sample was very small (18 offenders in 1 institution eventually reduced to 14) and was based on volunteers who might not be typical of all inmates. • Generalisability – Findings would not be generalisable to all young offenders as the research was based on just one YOI which might not be typical. • Reliability – The study was very dependent on the personalities of the researchers and the way they interacted with their subjects. This would be difficult to replicate and a similar study carried out by other researchers might produce very different results. • Validity – We cannot be sure of whether the researchers gained a truthful picture of their subjects. The nature of the institution and the fact that the young people were offenders might mean that they held back a lot of information from the researchers or were not entirely truthful about some issues. • Time and cost – Although not as costly as large scale surveys, the study was quite time consuming and subjects might only have started to open up to the researchers in the later stages of the study.
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 12–15 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. 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 qualitative methods in relation to the purpose of the research. The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to using qualitative data 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.</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: 8–11 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. Responses will include a wide 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><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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of data – This type of study would produce a whole range of qualitative data which would be complex and time consuming to analyse. Conclusions drawn from the data would also be dependent on the choices made about which data to select or emphasise meaning a risk of bias from the researchers. • Ethical issues – although the research was ethically sensitive it was clear that some of the young offenders were upset when the offenders departed and this was an ethical issue that the researchers themselves were concerned about. <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Level 2: 4–7 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. 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. At the bottom of the level there should be at least two evaluative points. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–3 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. 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</p> <p>No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	*	<p>Outline ways in which gender can influence a person's life chances.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 10–12 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways in which gender can influence a person's life chances. The response demonstrates a wide range and depth of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts the material is generally accurate. There will be reference to at least two areas of social life (e.g. education and income). 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><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 gender can influence a person's life chances. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate either depth or a wide range. 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> <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</i></p>	20	<p>Candidates should show an understanding of the concepts of gender and life chances. Better answers may also consider how gender intersects with other inequalities (e.g. social class or ethnicity) to create disadvantages in life chances. Such knowledge should be rewarded but is not a prerequisite for a top level answer. 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>Most candidates are likely to focus on ways on which women have poorer life chances than men, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life chances in work and employment e.g. men more likely to be in paid work, men more likely to gain higher level jobs/become senior managers or directors, risks of losing job through pregnancy, effect of childcare and domestic responsibilities on women's chances of working full-time or seeking promotion. Candidate may reference a wide range of sources e.g. ONS, EHRC, Fawcett Society, UK Feminista. • Life chances in terms achieving high incomes and wealth e.g. gender pay gap, higher chances of women suffering poverty, more women on minimum wage, higher proportion of very wealthy people are male, women more likely to head lone parent families with greater chances of poverty. Again a wide range of sources could be applied e.g. Low Pay Commission, Fawcett Society, DWP. • Some candidates may also offer more theoretical or conceptual answers, for example referencing the impact of the dual labour market (Barron and Norris), vertical and horizontal segregation or women's position in the reserve army of Labour (Breugel). Such responses should be focused on how gender affects women's life chances. • Chances of upward mobility e.g. studies such as Li and Devine, Savage. • Women's responsibilities in relation to family life and childcare and how these impact on life chances in other areas, candidates may consider concepts such as dual

		<p><i>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 gender can influence a person's life chances. The response lacks depth and range. Knowledge and understanding of sociological 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 limited evidence.</p> <p><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 way in which gender 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 gender inequality without linking it to life chances. 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><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or a vague representation.</i></p> <p>0 marks</p>		<p>burden, triple shift and the unequal domestic division of labour, cite statistical evidence from sources such as the BSAS and/or more theoretical approaches e.g. Delphy and Leonard.</p> <p>Some candidates may also consider how men's life chances are affected by their gender, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Males more likely to be criminalised and labelled as deviant, candidates may reference Home Office crime statistics, concept of crisis in masculinity (e.g. Mac an Ghail), studies of gangs (e.g. Harding). • Educational achievement – Candidates may cite data on exam results and HE entry (e.g. DfE statistics), statistics on school exclusions and levels of literacy (National Literacy Trust). May also reference studies on school subcultures (e.g. Willis, Mac an Ghail) and boys attitudes to education (Francis). • Health chances and mortality – Longer life expectancy of females (Department of Health, ONS), higher risks of heart disease and certain cancers for men (ONS), higher suicide rate for males (ONS), higher chances of drug and alcohol problems for males (ONS). • Workplace inequalities – higher chances of industrial accidents and deaths for males (HSE), longer working hours for men (ONS), least desirable and most dangerous jobs done mainly by men (Benatar). • Family life – men having less chance of time with families because of long working hours (EOC), fathers less likely to gain custody of children following divorce, men have less parental rights e.g. in relation to leave from work than women. <p>Although there is little material in textbooks, some candidates may consider the life chances of trans people or those who reject binary gender categories and how this may impact on life chances e.g. in relation to work, education, family life or other areas.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>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>		<p>Any other reasonable responses should be rewarded, though candidates should focus material on the question (the influence of gender on life chances) and support points with evidence.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	*	<p>Assess Weber's view that inequalities in society are explained by differences in class, status and party.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 13–16 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of Weber's concepts of class, status and party and how they explain inequalities in society. 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 level 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 The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of Weber's concepts of class, status and party and how they explain inequalities in society. The response shows knowledge and understanding with range or depth. 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><i>There will typically be three developed knowledge points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the</i></p>	40	<p>Candidates should show an understanding of Weber's concepts of class, status and party. Good candidates may also consider related concepts such as market situation, life chances, social closure and power (though this is not essential for a good answer). Better answers may refer to more recent theories or studies of inequalities in British society today which have been influenced by Weber.</p> <p>Candidates may also consider how Weberian theories could be applied to understanding different types of social inequalities, i.e. social class, gender, ethnicity and/or age.</p> <p>To achieve full marks, candidates must explicitly refer to all three concepts of class, status and party.</p> <p>Candidates might consider the following in support of Weberian theories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of social class – based on market situation, four class model, possible comparison with Marxist theory, influence on later occupational/multi class models e.g. Hope-Goldthorpe scale, NS-SEC classification. Relevance of concept of middle class to UK society e.g. growth of service economy/non-manual employment. Relevance of division between wealthy upper class and petit bourgeoisie e.g. survival/growth of small businesses and self-employed in UK. • Concept of life chances in relation to social class – Candidates may cite a wide range of evidence on social class and its influence on life chances linking it to Weber's original concept. May also link Weberian theory to social mobility research (e.g. Goldthorpe's use of multi-class model based on market situation of occupational groups). Some candidates may also discuss the extent to which social groups operate closure in order to defend their own privileges or opportunities.

		<p><i>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 The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of Weberian concepts. 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> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks The candidate shows a limited knowledge and understanding of Weberian concepts. 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.</p> <p><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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of status – Importance of status divisions cutting across class divisions, candidates may refer to examples of gender, ethnicity or age creating status distinctions separate from social class. Parkin's concept of negatively privileged status groups. • Concept of party/power – Evidence that power may be separate from class position/ economic wealth e.g. role of political parties, pressure groups, trade unions, new social movements. Emergence of new political identities separate from social class (e.g. Beck). • Candidates may also consider how Weberian concepts have been used in understanding gender inequalities (e.g. Barron and Norris, dual labour market theory), ethnic inequalities (e.g. social closure and discrimination against minorities, Rex and Tomlinson and underclass theory), and age inequalities (Parkin, old age as a negatively privileged status or Turner's exchange theory) • Some candidates may also refer to cross-cultural material e.g. how status plays a significant role in caste type systems e.g. India, in 'race' based systems e.g. apartheid/ segregation in Southern USA, or in gerontocracies and societies practising senicide. <p>In critical evaluation candidates could apply a variety of theoretical approaches including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxist theory (e.g. Westergaard and Resler) – Weberian theory obscures fundamental importance of social class and economic inequalities by focusing on other aspects. Over-emphasises the role of social groups pursuing their own interests rather than of capitalism in creating social inequalities. • Feminist theories (e.g. Abbott and Wallace) – Weberian theory gives insufficient attention to issues of gender e.g. Goldthorpe's mobility research only based on men. Concept of life chances originally mainly applied to social class rather than gender. • Functionalism – Weberian concepts tend to imply that social inequalities are designed to benefit privileged social groups
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>AO2: Application</p> <p>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</p> <p>Level 4: 13–16 marks Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse Weber's concepts of class, status and party and how they explain inequalities in society. Responses will include a 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.</p>		<p>while functionalists (e.g. Davies and Moore) argue they are functional and beneficial to society as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functionalism/New Right – Social inequalities can be seen to be derived from natural/biological differences rather than socially constructed differences such as class/status/party. • Postmodernism – Theories of social class including Weber's are now out of date as society has become increasingly individualised with stratification based on cultural rather than economic differences (Pakulsi and Waters, Beck). • Candidates may also offer critical evaluation of specific applications of Weberian theory by modern sociologists. For example, dual labour market theory criticised by radical feminists for blaming gender inequality on the working of the labour market (class/market situation) rather than on patriarchy, Rex and Tomlinson's underclass theory exaggerates the importance of racial divisions (based on status) between different groups and workers and ignores the extent to which all workers are equally exploited by capitalism, social action approaches deriving from Weber e.g. of age inequality can be criticised for adopting too micro sociological an approach and ignoring the importance of structural features creating social inequalities. <p>This is a very broad question so candidates should not be expected to consider every form of social inequality. Answers which show an understanding of the key concepts and apply them in a relevant way should be rewarded.</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 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, 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 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><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks Candidates show a limited ability to evaluate and the view. Evaluation is implicit, minimal, assertive or tangential to the main issue. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or assertion.</i>		
		0 marks No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis		

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

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

GCE

Sociology

H580/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2022

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 2022

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING

SCORIS

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *scoris 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 space

Award 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:

- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- 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 point Q3 and 4: strength of the method
	Anecdotal/common sense/asociological point
	Q1-4: lip service to the source
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way / detailed Q1 Interpretation/drawing conclusion from the data
	Underdeveloped: partially explained, requiring more depth
	Q1 – 4: To indicate data taken from the source to support the point On other questions: explicit application to the question (optional)
	Critical evaluation point for Q6 Q4 for weakness of the method
	Juxtaposition of alternative theories/ideas without direct/ explicit evaluation
	Unsubstantiated/ undeveloped/ implicit / accurate without explanation/ substantiation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense/inaccurate
	Irrelevant material/ not clearly focused on question set
	Repetition
	Q4 highlight use of methodological theory

Highlight	Q5 highlight the way a person's age may affect opportunities in work and employment.
-----------	--

MARK SCHEME

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Summarise two conclusions which sociologists might reach about patterns and trends in women graduating in STEM subjects from the data shown in Source A.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to clearly and accurately summarise two conclusions which sociologists might reach from 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 sociologists might reach from the data shown in Source A. At this level answers will typically accurately summarise two conclusions but may only explicitly apply data in relation to one of them or accurately summarise one conclusion with data and one comparison of data without linking to a conclusion.</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 identify any examples of data or they will clearly identify one conclusion and support it with relevant data or two comparisons of data without linking to conclusions.</p>	4 AO2 1b	<p>Candidates should identify conclusions from the source which are supported by the data.</p> <p>Candidates may base their conclusions on patterns, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2017-18 a larger proportion of women graduated in physical and mathematical sciences at 42% and 39% respectively) than in engineering and technology or in computer science (both at 15%). <p>Or trends, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proportion of women graduating in STEM subjects changed very little between 2015-16 and 2017-18 with no change in Mathematical Sciences, Engineering and Technology, a small increase of 2% in physical sciences and a small decrease of 1% in computer sciences. <p>Any other reasonable conclusion should be credited, so long as it is supported by the data in the source. However, candidates need to summarise data in some way to draw a conclusion, rather than merely reading off statistics from the graph.</p>

		<p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to interpret data, for example by outlining just one conclusion without supporting data or alternatively accurately citing a comparison of data without linking it to a conclusion.</p> <p>0 marks No ability to interpret data shown, e.g. the candidate misunderstands the data or interprets it entirely inaccurately.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to Source B, explain two reasons sociologists need to consider representativeness in a large-scale study of unemployment in Britain.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding 2 marks The candidate shows a clear understanding of two reasons sociologists need to consider representativeness in a large-scale study of unemployment in Britain.</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>AO2: Application 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 reasons 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</p>	<p>6</p> <p>2 AO1 2a/2b</p> <p>4 AO2 1b</p>	<p>Examples of reasons sociologists need to consider representativeness include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that relevant groups within the population under study are adequately represented. For example in the source it cites the numbers in each category in the sample and the researchers appear to have tried to include representation of most of the main ethnic groups on the UK. Candidates may also refer to representation in terms of social class, gender, age or other social characteristics though some of these may be harder to evidence from the source, However, the fact that the source cites data about unemployment levels of men compared to women suggests that both genders were adequately represented in the sample. To allow for comparisons between groups. The discussion of findings in the source compares unemployment levels for different groups. This would only be possible if the authors had included a representative sample of different ethnic groups. In order to generalise from the data. Although there are less than 3,000 in each of the minority samples and less than 42,000 in the White British Sample (both small fractions of the numbers in the whole UK population) it is possible to make generalisations, for example about the risks of unemployment for different groups if the samples truly represent members of their larger ethnic group in the UK population. In order to exert a more powerful influence upon social policies e.g. by revealing the extent to which ethnic minorities have higher levels of unemployment. <p>Any other reasonable response should be credited.</p>

		<p>to support two reasons but with merely lip service to the source.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to apply evidence from Source B to support at least one reason. Typically reference made to the source is likely to be lip service only and refer to only one reason.</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 two advantages of using quantitative data to study gender inequalities.</p> <p>AO2: Application 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 advantages 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 advantages 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 to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation one advantage or a less clear attempt to apply data to both with lip service.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to apply data 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 and it likely to be lip service only.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of data.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>4 AO2 1b</p>	<p>To gain marks for application candidates must make reference to the data in Source A. Candidates who simply evaluate quantitative data in general may score marks for evaluation but not for application.</p> <p>Possible advantages might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to positivist theory and the use of such data to identify patterns and trends for example the data in the source shows trends over 3 years and patterns comparing different subjects. • The ability to correlate quantitative data, for example to show a relationship between gender and subjects studied at university. • The objective nature of such statistics as they are collected by reputable/official organisations such as UCAS. • The ability to quantify the extent of inequality. Using such data allows us to see the precise extent to which women are under-represented in STEM subjects. • The representativeness of such data as it is likely to be based on a large and nationally representative sample. For example UCAS is likely to have collected data from all the universities in the UK • The reliability of the research. UCAS appears to collect such data every year using similar methods and produces consistent findings suggesting it is reliable. • The research is valid as it accurately measures what it aims to i.e. the percentage of women graduating in each type of STEM subject. <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded.</p>

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 5–6 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate the use of quantitative data to study gender inequalities by considering two advantages. Both points should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory with reference to the study of gender inequalities. At the bottom of the level, one is likely to be less developed.</p> <p>Level 3: 4 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate the use of quantitative data to study gender by considering two advantages. At least one point should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory with reference to the study of gender inequalities. However, 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.</p> <p>Level 2: 2–3 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate using quantitative data to study gender inequalities by considering two advantages with a less developed evaluation of both. Methodological concept(s) may be undeveloped or implicit.</p> <p>OR the candidate may consider only one advantage, offering a clear and developed evaluation supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate using quantitative data to study gender inequalities. Candidates will typically present a less developed evaluation focusing on just advantage.</p>	<p>6 AO3 1/2</p>	
--	--	--	----------------------	--

			<p>0 marks No relevant evaluation.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p data-bbox="255 212 293 236">*</p> <p data-bbox="356 212 1066 347">Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge, explain and evaluate the use of longitudinal research for researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment.</p> <p data-bbox="356 395 801 459">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 4–5 marks</p> <p data-bbox="356 467 1066 746">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of longitudinal research for researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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 data-bbox="356 754 1066 858"><i>There will typically be four well-developed methodological concepts or theories, or three well-developed with theory towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p data-bbox="356 938 560 962">Level 3: 3 marks</p> <p data-bbox="356 970 1066 1329">The candidate shows a good understanding of the use of longitudinal research for researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. Knowledge will have either range or 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.</p> <p data-bbox="356 1337 1066 1393"><i>There will typically be two developed or three underdeveloped methodological concepts or theory.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1088 212 1126 236">25</p> <p data-bbox="1088 459 1167 515">5 AO1 2a/2b</p>	<p data-bbox="1223 212 2007 387">AO1: Knowledge and Understanding Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by longitudinal research i.e. research typically based on a social survey conducted on the same group of people over an extended period of time.</p> <p data-bbox="1223 427 2007 603">Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability in relation to longitudinal research is also expected. This should relate to consideration of the context of the research i.e. for researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment.</p> <p data-bbox="1223 643 2007 715">The response may also relate the selection or choice of methods to the research aim.</p> <p data-bbox="1223 754 2007 858">Candidates should be rewarded for appropriate understanding of the relevance of theoretical perspectives to their discussion e.g. interpretivism and positivism.</p>

		<p>Level 2: 2 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic understanding of the use of longitudinal research for researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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 longitudinal research. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. <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</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited understanding of the use of longitudinal research. 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</p> <p>No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p>	5AO 2 1b	
--	--	--	-------------	--

		<p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability to relate the use of longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment in an explicit way. At the top of the level application will be wide ranging. The material will be related to the question.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to relate the use of longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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 longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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 longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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>	15 AO3 1/2/3	<p>AO2: Application Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of the use of longitudinal research and how this might be applied to the study of ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from the Source in answering the question Ideas for application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longitudinal approach allowed the researchers to analyse how levels of unemployment for different ethnic groups changed over time and the extent to which certain ethnic minorities were more likely to remain stuck in unemployment. • Size of sample important for comparing ethnic groups, to represent and compare • The research uses relatively objective measures such as being unemployed or level of income • Longitudinal research allowed different groups to show unemployment levels over a number of years whereas a conventional social survey merely offers a snapshot at one point in time, which showed spikes such as recession times and their long term effect • Ethically sensitive area which may affect research choices
--	--	--	-----------------	--

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 12–15 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of the use of longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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 longitudinal research in relation to the purpose of the research. The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to using longitudinal research 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.</p> <p><i>There will typically be four well-developed points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p>Level 3: 8–11 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. Responses will include a wide 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><i>There will typically be three developed evaluative points or six underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be two developed points or four underdeveloped points with some use of concepts/theory.</i></p>		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Candidates should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using longitudinal research, especially in relation to the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability, and relate this to the context of the question, researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment.</p> <p>In terms of positive evaluation candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positivism – Longitudinal surveys typically produce quantitative data which can be analysed to discern patterns and trends and may be seen as more objective or scientific. • Representativeness – Where a large sample representing many different groups (e.g. ethnic groups) is used, as in this survey, it is possible to make generalisations. • Reliability – This type of research is likely to produce similar results if repeated by other researchers using similar methods as the research uses relatively objective measures such as being unemployed or level of income. • Longitudinal research enables researchers to study changes and developments over time. • Longitudinal research allows researchers to assess the impact of variables such as becoming unemployed on the experience of individuals and groups some years later. • Ethics - a study of this type would be likely to pose few ethical issues as the original researchers would doubtless have obtained informed consent and would design their questions sensitively. <p>In terms of critical points candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longitudinal surveys tend to be expensive and time consuming. • Representativeness - longitudinal surveys often suffer from sample attrition.
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Level 2: 4–7 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the use of longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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. 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 usefulness of longitudinal research to researching ethnic inequalities in relation to earnings and unemployment. 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</p> <p>No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretivists might argue that large-scale longitudinal surveys reflect the preconceptions of the researchers who design them since they decide what questions to ask and what data to collect. • Lack of validity • Secondary data – In this study secondary data was used from the UKLHS. This would mean that Li and Heath would have no control over what data was collected or how. <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	*	<p>Outline ways that a person's age may affect their opportunities in work and employment.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 10–12 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways that a person's age may affect their opportunities in work and employment. The response demonstrates a wide range and depth of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts material relating to at least two aspects of age inequalities in work and employment; 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 that a person's age may affect their opportunities in work and employment. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate either depth or range relating to at least two aspects of age inequalities in work and employment. 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 a range evidence. <i>There will typically be three developed knowledge points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the</i></p>	<p>20</p> <p>12 AO1 1a/1b</p>	<p>Examples of ways which might be considered would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on hours of employment for under 16s e.g. 14 and 15 year olds can only work up to 12 hours in school weeks. While 16-17 year olds can only be in full-time work if they are undergoing training such as an apprenticeship. • Younger people earn lower wages than older age groups. National Living Wage for those aged 25 is £8.72 (from April 2020), those aged 16 to 17 £4.55 per hour and those on the apprentice rate £4.15 per hour). • Young people are much more likely to be unemployed than older age groups. According to the Labour Force Survey Dec 2019 the unemployment rate for 18-24 year olds was 11%, for 35-49 year olds only 3.2%. • During the recession from 2008 onwards unemployment for all age groups was much higher but the gap between young people and older age groups was even greater. • Age 50-65 are much more likely to experience long-term unemployment. 2019 survey by Rest Less • Older people are most likely to experience age discrimination in the workplace 2019 Aviva survey • Compulsory retirement ages in some jobs mean that older workers may be excluded from work. • Age inequalities affects certain groups of older people e.g. women who may face ageism because of the premium attached to sexual attractiveness in some service occupations or working in the media. • Young people are over represented on zero hour contracts e.g. 10% of all zero hour contracts are made up of young people in full time education, whilst 16-24 year olds make up 36% of those on zero hour contracts. • 38% of discrimination cases in tribunals now relate to age discrimination.

		<p><i>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 that a person's age may affect their opportunities in work and employment age inequalities may affect the opportunities for different age groups in relation to work and employment in the UK today. 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 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 way in which age inequalities may affect the opportunities for different age groups in relation to work and employment in the UK today. The response may be narrow and undeveloped, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity. The candidate may simply describe an aspect of age inequality without linking it to work and employment. 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>8 AO 2 1a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are encouraged into vocational training where there is a disparity between the number of students training and the number of available jobs e.g. 94,000 girls train in hair and beauty for just 18,000 jobs (IPPR). While only 123,000 were trained in the construction and engineering sectors for an advertised 275,000 jobs. <p>When considering the accuracy of statistics, it is important to note that candidates may have referred to different years and/or different sources.</p> <p>Some candidates may attempt to apply theoretical approaches to age inequalities. These may be credited as long as candidates link material to the question. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disengagement theory – (Cummings and Henry). • Marxism - both older and younger workers provide part of the reserve army of labour (Phillipson). • Weberian theory – older workers like ethnic minorities are a negatively privileged status group (Parkin) • Interactionist theory – Both older and younger workers may face negative labelling and stigmatisation, (Victor).
--	--	--	----------------------	--

		<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>		<p>AO2: Application The selected knowledge should be directly related to the specific question.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	*	<p>Assess the view that Marx's theory of social class is still relevant for understanding class inequalities in the UK today.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 13–16 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the view that Marx's theory of social class is still relevant for understanding class inequalities in the UK today. 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. <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 The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of the view that Marx's theory of social class is still relevant for understanding class inequalities in the UK today. The response shows knowledge and understanding which has either range or 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</p>	<p>40</p> <p>16 AO1 1 a/1b</p>	<p>In terms of knowledge candidates should show understanding of Marxist theory and associated concepts but this should be focused on showing why it may still be relevant for understanding class inequalities in the UK today. The following are examples of points which might be covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK continues to be a class divided society, for example unequal distribution of wealth and income, limitations on social mobility and inequalities in life chances. • Westergaard and Resler (or other relevant studies) social class inequalities are actually widening as Marx predicted. • Polarisation of social classes (Braverman, Crompton and Jones). • Hegemony and false consciousness e.g. role of mass media, religion or nationalism • Gramsci hegemony • Globalisation and capitalism (Sklair) • Marxist feminist theories on gender inequality (Benston, Breugel) • Marxist theories of ethnic inequality (Cox, Castles and Kosack) • Marxist views on age inequality (Phillipson). <p>In evaluation candidates might consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weberian theory – arguing that status and party are separate forms of stratification which exist alongside class. Candidates may use examples such as ethnicity or age to illustrate how status may derive from sources other than social class e.g. Parkin's work on negatively privileged status groups. • Contemporary models of social class as more relevant to the UK today – for example occupational scales such as the NS-SEC classification, Goldthorpe's notion of the service class compared to Marx's ruling class or the classification used by the Great British Class Survey.

		<p>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: 5–8 marks 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. <i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point.</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</p>	<p>8 AO2 1a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functionalist theory – Modern societies are no longer divided by social class but more meritocratic hierarchies (Davis and Moore). • New Right approaches – Saunderson's critique of Marxism arguing that social equality is only possible in a coercive social system. • Feminist approaches – Traditional Marxism fails to address gender inequalities and patriarchy as a form of power. • Walby's intersectionality - Marx neglected to note how social class intersects with other forms of inequality • Giddens or Beck to argue that in late modernity new forms of politics and social conflict are emerging e.g. concern with risk society rather than material divisions. • The failure of Marx's predictions – the polarisation of social classes and proletarian revolution • Embourgeoisement and the growth of the middle classes. • Democracy rather than a ruling class • Postmodernism– UK is a postmodern society where notions of social class and class struggle are outdated. • Social class identities are fragmenting or disappearing (Pakulski and Waters on consumption based identities)
--	--	---	---------------------	---

		<p>No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2: Application</p> <p>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 view 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 view.</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 view 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 view and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological application.</p>	<p>16 AO3 1/2/3</p>	<p>AO2: Application</p> <p>The selected knowledge should be directly related to the specific question.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------	---

		<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 13–16 marks Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the view that Marx’s theory of social class is still relevant for understanding class inequalities in the UK today. Responses will include a wide range of sustained and explicit evaluative arguments with a reflective tone throughout. 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 lacking depth and/or detail at times. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. <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 The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the view. Responses will demonstrate range or depth of evaluation. Different theoretical approaches and/or evidence are likely to be compared briefly. The candidate may reach a 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 one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></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,</p>		<p>AO3: Evaluation</p> <p>Evaluation points should be applied to show how they suggest that Marx’s theory no longer relevant rather than simply showing knowledge of alternative theories</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>sociological evidence is likely to be juxtaposed simply and implicitly. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative rather than evaluative. <i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks 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. <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/ocrexams



/ocrexams



/company/ocr



/ocrexams



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 2022 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.

GCE

Sociology

H580/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2023

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 2023

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING : RM Assessor³**

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 RMA³ and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 5 PRACTICE AND 10 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 RMA³ 50% and 100% (Batch 1 and 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 RMA³ 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 RMA³, 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, 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 space
- Award 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 RMA³ **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.**
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:
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
 - 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
	Question 5 and 6 AO1: Knowledge and understanding point. Question 3 and 4: Strength of the method
	Sociological or methodological evidence: concepts / statistics / social policy
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way / detailed Q1 – summary.
	Underdeveloped: partially explained, requiring more depth
	Question 1, 2, 3 and 4: To indicate data taken from the source or explicit engagement with the source.
	Evaluation: Q3 and Q4: Weakness of the method Q6: Critical evaluation point
	Juxtaposition of alternative theories / ideas without direct explicit evaluation
	Unsubstantiated / undeveloped / implicit / inaccurate without explanation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense not creditable
	Not clearly focused on question set: tangential – sociological but not directly relevant
	Repetition
 Highlight	Q2 reason cited Q4 – use of methodological theory Q5 area of inequality
	Lip Service (AO2)
	Blank Page
	Example/Reference
	Irrelevant
	Noted, but no credit given

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Using data from Source A, summarise two patterns or trends in the gender pay gap in the UK workforce.</p> <p>AO2: Application Level 4: 4 marks The candidate shows an excellent ability by clearly and accurately summarising two patterns or trends 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 patterns or trends which are supported by the data shown in Source A. At this level answers will typically summarise two patterns or trends 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 patterns or trends but fail to explicitly apply any examples of data or they will clearly identify one pattern or trend 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 pattern or trend 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 identify patterns or trends from the source which are supported by the data.</p> <p>Possible trends are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biggest fall in the gender pay gap was in skilled trades where it reduced by 1.8% but there were also significant reductions in the gender pay gap for professional occupations and for administrative and secretarial occupations where it decreased by 1.6% in both cases. In two occupations the gender pay gap actually increased these were: managers, directors and senior officials where it increased by 2% and caring, leisure and other service occupations where there was a small increase of 0.1%. <p>Possible patterns might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biggest gender pay gap is to be found in skilled trades occupations at 22.4%, followed by process, plant and machine operatives at 18.1%. The smallest gender pay gap is to be found in sales and customer service occupations 4.1% followed by administrative and secretarial occupations 4.9%.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to Source B, explain two reasons why reflexivity might be important to sociologists in their research.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding 2 marks The candidate shows a clear understanding of two reasons why reflexivity might be important to sociologists in their research.</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>AO2: Application 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 reflexivity might be important to sociologists in their research include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers need to be reflexive about how their gender may affect how their subjects respond to them, for example Poulton was concerned that men in a hyper-masculine subculture might not open up to her as a woman. • Researchers need to be reflexive about their presentation of self, for example Poulton needed to think carefully about how she dressed for her first meeting with the hooligans so she did not provoke a negative response adding to validity. • Poulton kept a research diary and by keeping a journal which is reflexive the researcher can look back and recall their thoughts and feelings and how they might have influenced their research at particular points. • Reflexivity is a means by which a researcher can be honest about any biases or personal influences on their research. For example, Poulton might have disapproved of the behaviour of the hooligans she was studying and could be reflexive about how far this might have influenced her interpretation of her data making sure her findings are valid. • By being reflexive Poulton was able to evaluate which approaches to this type of research were most successful to help her and other researchers in future. For example, she comments on ways in which she was able to use being a female and an academic to her advantage in some ways. <p>Any other reasonable response should be credited.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to Source A, explain two limitations of using quantitative data on the UK gender pay gap for measuring the extent of progress towards gender equality.</p> <p>AO2: Application 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 limitations 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 limitations, 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 to apply data from Source A in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation one limitation or a less clear attempt to apply data to both.</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.</p> <p>Candidates who simply evaluate quantitative data in general may score marks for evaluation but not for application.</p> <p>Possible limitations might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to interpretivist criticisms of quantitative data e.g. failure to capture subjects' personal experiences of the gender pay gap/gender inequality The need for qualitative data to provide a more rounded picture of gender inequality e.g. descriptions by employees of the impact of pay inequality in their workplace. Such data is based on official statistics which may lack validity e.g. companies may not give accurate data in responding to a survey. Official statistics may lack reliability e.g. different companies may report pay levels in different ways. Other kinds of quantitative data may give a more rounded picture of progress towards gender equality e.g. data on proportion of women in senior positions/extent of gender segregation in the workforce etc. Generalised quantitative data on differences in hourly pay may fail to reveal more detailed differences in pay e.g. differences between age groups/ethnic groups. Some workers' wages may be cash in hand/undeclared meaning stats are less valid. <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 quantitative data to study gender inequalities by considering two limitations. Both points should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory with reference to using data on the gender pay gap for measuring the extent of progress towards gender inequality. <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 quantitative data to study gender by considering two limitations, one of which should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) &/or theory with reference to using data on the gender pay gap for measuring the extent of progress towards gender inequality <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 using quantitative data on the gender pay gap for measuring the extent of progress towards gender inequality by considering one clear and developed evaluation with methodological concept(s) and/or theory OR two limitations which are likely to be underdeveloped and methodological concept(s) may be undeveloped or implicit. At the bottom of the level there is likely to be one underdeveloped limitation and one undeveloped limitation.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate using quantitative data to study gender inequalities. for example, a less developed evaluation in terms of just one limitation.</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 qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 4–5 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism. 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 theories, 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 qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism. Knowledge will have either range or 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>There will typically be 2 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 qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism.</p>	25	<p>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding Candidates do not need to show detailed knowledge of studies of football hooliganism but rather apply the material in Source B.</p> <p>Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by qualitative methods i.e. methods involving collecting data based on words rather than numbers. Candidates may make reference to the specific methods used in the study in Source B, (in-depth interviews; informal interviews; and participant observation).</p> <p>Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness, and generalisability in relation to qualitative methods is also expected. This should relate to consideration of the context of the research i.e. studying football hooliganism.</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>The response lacks range and depth and may occasionally be unclear and/or contain errors; however, the candidate does establish the basic meaning of qualitative methods. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. <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 qualitative methods. 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 qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (researching football hooliganism) in an explicit way. At the top of the level application will be wide ranging. The material is related to the question. <i>Typically at the top of the level there will be 4 clear and explicit applications of the source.</i></p>		<p>AO2: Application Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of the use of qualitative methods and how this might be applied to the study of football hooliganism. Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from the Source in answering the question. Ideas for application:</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>Level 3: 3 marks The candidate shows a good ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (researching football hooliganism). Some of the material may be more implicitly related to the question. <i>Typically, there will be 2 clear and explicit applications of the source.</i></p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks The candidate shows a basic ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (researching football hooliganism). Explicit application is likely to be very narrow. The material is related to the question occasionally and mainly implicitly. <i>Typically, there will be 1 explicit application of the source.</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark The candidate shows a limited ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (researching football hooliganism). The material is only implicitly related to the question and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance. <i>Responses are likely to be only lip service.</i></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 the use of qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Football hooliganism is a deviant form of behaviour and deviant groups may be more responsive to qualitative methods such as participant observation and informal interviews than more formal methods such as questionnaires or structured interviews. Qualitative methods allowed Poulton to gain the trust and rapport with two gatekeepers which gave her an entry into the world of the hooligans. Participant observation by Poulton when attending a film screening allowed her to interact with a larger group of hooligans than her two key informants possibly making her research more valid and/or representative. Qualitative methods allow the researcher to be more reflexive, e.g. Poulton kept a research journal where she reflected upon her experience. Qualitative methods such as participant observation could involve danger to the researcher when studying violent individuals therefore raising ethical issues. Qualitative methods rely on gaining a good rapport and blending in with the group. Poulton clearly did not find this easy as evidenced by her agonising over what to wear to her first meeting. In using qualitative methods the researcher's personal characteristics can influence what kind of response they receive from their subjects e.g. Poulton was concerned that her status as an academic and female might make gaining rapport with the hooligans problematical. <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</p>
--	---

<p>Responses will include a wide range of explicit and relevant evaluative points and may make some comparison with other methodologies.</p> <p>There will be a discussion of qualitative methods in relation to the purpose of the research.</p> <p>The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to using of qualitative methods in this research context.</p> <p>At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. The candidate may reach a critical and reasoned conclusion.</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: 8–11 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism.</p> <p>Responses will include a wide 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.</p> <p>The evaluation is not necessarily balanced.</p> <p>At the top of the level points start to be developed. The candidate may reach a critical but 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 two developed points or four underdeveloped points with some use of concepts/theory.</i></p> <p>Level 2: 4–7 marks</p> <p>The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the use of qualitative methods for researching football hooliganism.</p> <p>Responses are likely to offer a few generalised evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument or listing strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>the context of the question, research on football hooliganism.</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, especially important in studying deviant or misunderstood social groups. • 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 and describing observations of behaviour as first hand is likely to provide a richer and more colourful account than purely quantitative data. • Reliability – Using a combination of qualitative methods over a period of time allows the researcher to triangulate and check hypotheses and may therefore produce a more reliable response, allows for respondent validation. • Reflexivity – These methods allowed for a high degree of reflexivity so the researcher was able to highlight any possible biases or issues relating to how they interacted with or presented themselves to their subjects. • Ethics – although participant observation was used, the researcher was overt about her role and treated the two key informants as equal participants in the research process. • Access – It is unlikely that other more formal methods would have allowed her to access the world of the hooligans. Key informants acted as gatekeepers enabling her to observe other members of the hooligan firm. • Postmodernism suggests all accounts are partial and subjective and that the account of one researcher is
--	--

	<p>If present, different methodological approaches are likely to be juxtaposed simply and/or implicitly. <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 The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of qualitative methods. 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. <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>	<p>just as valid as any other narrative. This type of research when combined with other similar accounts can provide us with a range of voices from which we can draw our own conclusions.</p> <p>Possible weaknesses/criticisms might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity – Informal and unstructured interviews rely on the truthfulness of participants. Subjects may have exaggerated or misled the researcher or underplayed the degree of violence they had taken part in, possible influence of demand characteristics. • In using qualitative data gained from a number of methods the researcher may have a large amount of data which may be difficult to analyse or they may select data which largely supports their own interpretations. • Positivism – Lack of quantitative data in such research means that it is difficult to see patterns and trends. Data collection methods may be seen as unscientific. • Interpretivism focuses on the subjective interpretations of participants e.g. how hooligans view their own behaviour, however, this cannot analyse factors or issues which they are unaware of e.g. structural reasons why certain groups turn to hooliganism. • Representativeness – Qualitative data is usually based on small, often unrepresentative samples e.g. Poulton relied mainly on accounts of two retired hooligans and observed members of only one firm. • Generalisability – Poulton's findings may not be generalisable to other hooligan firms. Also the age of her key informants may mean that findings are more relevant to the past and not generalisable to the present. • Practical issues – Studies using such methods are typically time consuming and therefore potentially expensive. Researchers also need considerable skill in
--	--	---

			<p>establishing rapport and maintaining good relationships with subjects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Researcher effects are more likely with qualitative methods e.g. Poulton's status as a woman may have affected what respondents told her/ how they interacted with her.• Reliability – Very difficult to replicate this kind of study as it is usually unique to one researcher and the specific group they studied.• Any other relevant points should be rewarded.
--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5*	<p>Outline ways in which ethnic inequalities still exist in the UK today.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 10–12 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways in which there are inequalities between ethnic groups in the UK today. The response demonstrates a wide range and depth of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts with material relating to at least two aspects of inequalities between ethnic groups; 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 there are inequalities between ethnic groups in the UK today. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate either depth or range relating to at least two aspects of inequalities between ethnic groups. 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</i></p>	20	<p>Examples of ways which might be considered would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in levels of unemployment (e.g. ONS data). • Discrimination in recruitment to jobs (e.g. Wood et al 2009, Heath and Yu 2005) • Evidence of minorities being over-educated/over-qualified for jobs (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2007, Battu and Sloane 2004) • Discrimination specifically against BAME women (e.g. Dodd 2012). • Differences in earnings/ethnic pay gap Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2007, ONS data) • Inequalities in opportunities for social mobility (Platt 2005, Sedghi 2014) • Inequalities in proportion of ethnic groups in senior positions, vertical segregation, glass/concrete ceiling (e.g. ONS data). • Racial harassment in the workplace (e.g. Ashe 2019). • Ethnic inequalities in income and wealth and prevalence of poverty in certain minority ethnic groups (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2007, Rowlingson and McKay 2012) • Ethnic inequalities in opportunities for social mobility (Platt 2005) • Ethnic inequalities in educational attainment (e.g. DfE stats, Strand 2008 or many other studies). • Ethnic inequalities within the criminal justice system (e.g. data on stop and search, sentencing, imprisonment, Ministry of Justice 2017). • Ethnic inequalities in housing (e.g. Gulliver 2017, ONS 2018) • Ethnic inequalities in health (e.g. Becares 2013)

<p><i>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 there are inequalities between ethnic groups in the UK today. 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 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 there are inequalities between ethnic groups in the UK today. 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 ethnicity. 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</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnic inequalities in media representations (e.g. Van Dijk 1991, Malik 2002, Hall 1995)
---	--	--

	<p>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>		<p>Some candidates may attempt to apply theoretical approaches to ethnic inequalities. These may be credited as long as candidates link material to the question. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of ethnic minorities as a reserve army of labour (Castles and Kosack (1973). • Evidence of minorities predominating in secondary sector of a dual labour market (Barron and Norris 1979). <p>Any other reasonable answers should be credited.</p>
--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6*	<p>Assess the sociological view that social inequalities are functional for society.</p> <p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 13–16 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the view that social inequalities are functional for society. 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. <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 The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of the view that social inequalities are functional for society. The response shows knowledge and understanding which has either range or 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.</p>	40	<p>In terms of knowledge candidates are likely apply material based on functionalist and/or New Right approaches.</p> <p>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"> • Davis and Moore’s functionalist theory of stratification • Parson’s value consensus theory • Murray’s New Right approach, e.g. the underclass deserve their position. • Saunders’ argument that class stratification is universal and desirable. • Rastogi’s human capital theory • Murdock the universality of gender differences • Schlafly’s anti-feminist view of gender roles • The host-immigrant model of ethnic inequalities (Patterson). • Disengagement theory of old age (Cummings and Henry)

<p>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: 5–8 marks 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. <i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point.</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><i>At the bottom of the level, there may be sociological knowledge when evaluating the view even where no arguments are presented for the view.</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 view 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 view.</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 view 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 view and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological application.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 13–16 marks Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the view that social inequalities are functional for society. Responses will include a 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 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. <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 The candidate shows 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, theories and/or concepts. The candidate may reach a 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 one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p> <p>Level 2: 5–8 marks</p>	<p>In evaluation candidates might consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxist approaches, i.e. that inequalities are based on exploitation and social injustice and benefit capitalists rather than disadvantaged social groups. Inequalities give rise to conflict and resistance rather than consensus/smooth working. • Weberian approaches, i.e. that privileged groups use sources of advantage to improve their wealth, power and status e.g. through social closure. • 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 do not benefit from social inequalities as they are often excluded from higher positions or even trapped in a black underclass (e.g. Rex and Tomlinson). • Evidence concerning economic inequalities e.g. distribution of wealth and income/poverty showing that these are not fair or functional. • Evidence of dysfunctions of inequality (e.g. Wilkinson and Pickett on social class, • Postmodernist approaches arguing that seeing inequalities/differences as either functional or dysfunctional is simply a metanarrative (Lyotard) or arguing that inequalities are much less significant in postmodern societies (e.g. Pakulski & Waters on social class, Featherstone and Hepworth on age). <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>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. <i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point</i></p> <p>Level 1: 1–4 marks 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. <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 2023 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.