



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

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. 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. 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/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/company/ocr](https://www.linkedin.com/company/ocr)

 [/ocrexams](https://www.youtube.com/ocrexams)



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.