



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
 Highlight	Q5 highlight the social group
	Anecdotal/ common sense/ asociological point

	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</p> <p>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="255 229 277 245">*</p> <p data-bbox="360 229 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="360 432 871 496">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 4–5 marks</p> <p data-bbox="360 501 1043 799">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="360 836 1021 970"><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="360 1007 595 1038">Level 3: 3 marks</p> <p data-bbox="360 1043 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="1200 229 2018 325">AO1: Knowledge and Understanding Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by secondary quantitative data.</p> <p data-bbox="1200 362 2080 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="1200 633 2080 767">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="1200 804 2047 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="1200 1007 2080 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="1200 1310 2047 1410">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="255 229 277 245">*</p> <p data-bbox="360 229 1021 325">Outline ways in which discrimination can affect the opportunities of different social groups in work and employment.</p> <p data-bbox="360 363 873 427">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 10–12 marks</p> <p data-bbox="360 434 1021 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="360 938 1021 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="360 1110 627 1142">Level 3: 7–9 marks</p> <p data-bbox="360 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="1200 229 2080 564">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="1200 603 2040 737">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="1200 775 1547 807">Social class discrimination</p> <ul data-bbox="1200 813 2074 1420" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1200 813 2074 906">• 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). <li data-bbox="1200 912 2074 1005">• 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. <li data-bbox="1200 1011 2074 1177">• 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) <li data-bbox="1200 1184 2074 1276">• Concept of social reproduction (e.g. Bowles and Gintis on myth of meritocracy, Willis on why working class kids get working class jobs). <li data-bbox="1200 1283 2074 1420">• 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 data-bbox="362 229 1043 293">Evaluate different sociological explanations of age inequalities.</p> <p data-bbox="362 331 873 395">AO1: Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 13–16 marks</p> <p data-bbox="362 402 1043 769">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 data-bbox="362 807 1021 935"><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="362 973 645 1005">Level 3: 9–12 marks</p> <p data-bbox="362 1011 1043 1378">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 data-bbox="1202 229 2080 357">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 data-bbox="1202 395 1904 427">Candidates might consider the following explanations.</p> <p data-bbox="1202 466 2080 667">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 data-bbox="1202 705 2080 1040">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 data-bbox="1202 1078 2080 1378">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 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 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