

# **Sociology**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G672**: Topics in socialisation, culture and identity

## **Mark Scheme for June 2012**

---

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, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2012















Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**Annotations**

Used in the detailed Mark Scheme (to include abbreviations and subject-specific conventions)

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	Unclear/confused/inaccurate
	Application/Interpretation
	Basic point/Undeveloped/superficial
	Development of point
	Example
	Evaluation/Analysis
	Juxtaposition
	Knowledge and understanding
	Limited
	Inaccurate/irrelevant
	Repetition
	Unsubstantiated/implicit
	Very good
	Partial relevance/Partial explanation

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations should focus on the functions of the family <b>in society</b>. Evidence related to functions for the individual should be explained in terms of the function served for society</li> <li>• Functions drawn from the functionalist perspective including primary socialisation, gender role socialisation, stabilisation of adult personalities, geographical mobility, education, economic, reproductive, sexual</li> <li>• Critical views on functions of the family drawn from Marxist and feminist perspectives including reproduction of capitalism, free domestic labour, consumerism, reinforcement of capitalist/patriarchal ideology, subjugation of women, reserve army of labour</li> <li>• Reference to evidence from feminism, functionalism, Marxism, New Right, Parsons, Murdock, Chester, Dennis &amp; Erdos, Ansley, Barrett &amp; McIntosh, Benston, Zaretsky</li> <li>• Explanations may also refer to social policy and the role of the family in supporting the state, the changing nature of family life in response to wider social changes including the development of new family types such as Neo-Conventional family</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point.</li> </ul>	17	<p>Features may be more implicit and presented within the context of an explanation or evidence.</p> <p>Reference to functions of the family 'in society', may be more implicit below level 4.</p>
	(b)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive and depends on the approach taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as new man, confluent love, egalitarian families, lagged adaptation, crisis in masculinity, complicit masculinity, superdads, individualisation, risk society, diversity and choice, pick and mix, blurred boundaries, co-parenting, fathering, feminisation of labour market, changing households, neo-conventional family, sandwich generation, hegemonic masculinity, traditional nuclear family, domestic division of labour, emotion work, triple shift, patriarchy, dark side of family life, dysfunctional, exploitation, oppression, reproduction of labour power, dual systems, invisible work, dual burden</li> </ul>	33	<p>There are a variety of approaches to this question. For example, candidates may choose to construct their response around a discussion of whether roles have become more equal or not. Candidates may discuss different sociological perspectives in turn. Another approach may analyse particular aspects of roles in family life such as money management, decision-making, childcare, domestic labour etc.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies such as Stacey, Beck &amp; Beck-Gernsheim, Rapoport, Allan &amp; Crow, Roseneil &amp; Budgeon, Pakulski &amp; Waters, Grundy &amp; Henretta, Oakley, Dennis &amp; Erdos, Chester, Saunders, Ansley, Barrett &amp; McIntosh, Benston, Zaretsky, Parsons, Murdock, Edgell, Duncombe &amp; Marsden, Hakim, Giddens, Pahl, Gershuny, Willmott &amp; Young, Warin, Beck, Pahl, Dobash &amp; Dobash, Delphy &amp; Leonard, DeVault, Warner, Garrod</li> <li>• Theories: Marxism, Marxist feminism, radical feminism, critical views from radical psychiatry, liberal feminist views, postmodern views about diversity and choice, functionalism, New Right views on changing roles as damaging</li> <li>• Impact of social policy e.g. paternity leave</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation (depending on approach taken);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts: use of some of the concepts cited above and evaluation of concepts</li> <li>• Studies: use of some of the studies cited above and evaluation of studies</li> <li>• Theories: use of some of the theories cited above and evaluation of theories</li> <li>• Assessment of the role of government policy in supporting traditional forms of family life or in supporting change, diversity and choice</li> <li>• Impact of family diversity</li> <li>• Reference to diverse ways of examining roles including emotional factors, decision-making, household chores, non-decision making</li> <li>• Assessment of ideological strength of notions of traditional family life and related roles</li> <li>• Differences related to class, ethnicity, sexuality etc</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing attitudes and values regarding marriage, cohabitation, single parent families, single-hood</li> <li>• Changing expectations of marriage</li> <li>• Increase in cohabitation</li> <li>• Increase in divorce acting as a deterrent</li> <li>• Cost – average wedding £20,000; influence of culture of celebrity weddings/media making marriage seem prohibitively expensive</li> <li>• Concepts such as single-hood, secularisation, confluent love, individualism</li> <li>• Reference to evidence from Social Trends, feminism, postmodernism, New Right, Allan &amp; Crow, Giddens</li> <li>• Explanations may refer to increasing choice and diversity, changing role of women in society, feminisation of labour force</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point</li> </ul>	17	Reference to Divorce lacks relevance unless used in the context of its role as a deterrent.
	(b)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as pick and mix, blurred boundaries, cultural, class and sexual diversity, co-parenting, civil partnership, individualisation, consumer culture, feminisation of labour market, diversity and choice, families of choice, confluent love</li> <li>• Studies such as Rapoport, Eversley &amp; Bonnerjea, Allan &amp; Crow, Roseneil &amp; Budgeon, Brannen, Grundy &amp; Henretta, Smart, Berthoud &amp; Beishon, Foster, Oakley, Weeks, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, Stacey</li> <li>• Theories: postmodernism, supported by liberal feminism on emerging family forms and diversity</li> <li>• Reference to the range of diverse types of family life including single parent families, beanpole families, re-constituted families, same-sex families</li> <li>• Role of government policy in supporting diversity, New Labour views, current government views</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul>	33	Evidence supporting or refuting the view that families are increasingly diverse may be more implicitly related to the question below level 4. Evaluation that discusses diversity as good vs bad is less relevant.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>In evaluation (depending on approach taken);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as golden age, moral decline, neo-conventional family, patriarchy, ideology, hegemony</li> <li>• Studies such as Dennis &amp; Erdos, Chester, Somerville, Ansley, Barrett &amp; McIntosh, Benston, Delphy &amp; Leonard</li> <li>• Theories: functionalism on naturalness of nuclear family, New Right views on nuclear family as a core family type, Marxist and radical feminism on persistence of traditional family forms</li> <li>• Role of government policy in supporting traditional forms of family life, functionalism and New Right as critical of impact of diversity</li> <li>• Ideological strength of notions of traditional family life and values</li> <li>• Persistence of nuclear family, re-marriage rates indicating strength of traditional family forms</li> <li>• Differences related to ethnicity, social class and sexuality</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		
3	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key concepts such as mind body dualism, biological normality</li> <li>• Reference to relevant definitions of health and illness</li> <li>• Emphasis of model on diagnosis, treatment and cure including the classification of diseases into different types e.g. diseases of the circulatory system</li> <li>• Scientific approach involving objectivity</li> <li>• Approach taken by most official health practitioners and practiced within NHS</li> <li>• Reliance on identification and classification of health and illness by medical professionals</li> <li>• Health of society reliant on medical knowledge and resources</li> <li>• Reference to evidence such as Taylor &amp; Field, Sheeran</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point.</li> </ul>	17	Features may be more implicit and presented within the context of an explanation or evidence.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as marginalisation, material deprivation, poverty, environmental conditions, social capital, culture of inequality</li> <li>• Studies such as Nettleton, Browne &amp; Bottrill, Blackburn, Martin et al, Carstairs &amp; Morris, Lobstein, Paterson, Wrigley, Townsend, Shaw et al, Doyal &amp; Pennell, Clapp, Black Report, Wanless Report, Acheson Report, the Health Divide, Le Grand, Shaw et al, Davey Smith et al, Wilkinson</li> <li>• Theories: structural/material explanations</li> <li>• Reference to health statistics/ health issues such as morbidity, mortality, mental health, access to health care</li> <li>• Factors including employment patterns, housing, income</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such absolute improvements in health, consumerism, cultural meanings, consumption, lifestyle, risk, diversity, individualism, learned helplessness, feminisation of poverty, cultural deprivation, labelling, validity of data, social construction, biological difference, variations over time and space, the social process of becoming ill, socialisation, racism, sexism, ageism</li> <li>• Studies: Wadsworth, Illsley, Carr-Hill, Scambler, Connelly &amp; Crown, Annandale &amp; Field, Saunders, Wilkinson, Waldron, MacIntyre, Macfarlane, Seligman, Perren et al, Popay &amp; Bartley, Graham, Arber &amp; Thomas, Amin, Bowler, Karlsen &amp; Nazroo</li> <li>• Theories: social selection, cultural, artefact, feminist views, postmodern views, biological explanations</li> <li>• Evaluation of problems related to measuring health, illness, health inequalities, mental health; subjective measures, objective measures</li> <li>• Reference to differences related to gender, age, ethnicity and social class and the interplay between them</li> <li>• Evidence that suggest there is little difference in diseases suffered by different social groups e.g. Whitehead, Mares</li> </ul>	33	



Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		
4	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to Parson's analysis of the sick role including elements such as health professionals role in definition and diagnosis, expectations, rights, obligations, exemption from normal activities</li> <li>• Authority of health professionals including their achieved status and rewards</li> <li>• Medical professionals as competent, trained, knowledgeable, adhering to strict code of ethics, regulated by professional bodies</li> <li>• Emphasis on restoration of health</li> <li>• Reference to concepts such as universalism, affective neutrality, altruism, official gatekeepers</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point</li> </ul>	17	Features may be more implicit and presented within the context of an explanation or evidence.
	(b)	<p>There are a number of approaches to this question. For example, candidates may focus on explanations related to particular social groups or may choose to discuss general sociological explanations and evaluate with reference to the different approaches/differential experience of mental illness by social group. The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as labelling, stigma, social construction, social control, over-representation, inequality, sexism, racism, marginalisation, feminisation of poverty, material disadvantage, patriarchy, social control, social deprivation</li> <li>• Studies Scheff, Szasz, Goffman, Rosenhan, Laing, Barrett &amp; Roberts, Rogers et al, Rogers &amp; Pilgrim, Stansfeld et al, Ross et al, Taylor &amp; Field, Gomm, Fryer, McLoone, Reading &amp; Reynolds, Lawrence, Brown et al, Blaxter, Tyrer, Barrett &amp; Roberts, Nazroo, Koffman et al, Foucault</li> <li>• Theories: Interactionist, Marxist, artefact, cultural, biological/genetic views, structuralist explanations, postmodern views, social causation,</li> </ul>	33	

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>social labelling, feminist views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to explanations related to gender, age, ethnicity and social class</li> <li>• Factors including employment patterns, labour conditions in the home, neighbourhood, income, poverty, diet</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation (depending on approach taken):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as individualism, empowerment, evaluation of concepts used</li> <li>• Studies: Gove and Miles' criticisms of labelling theory, evaluation of studies used</li> <li>• Theories: evaluation of explanations used, assessment of relative strength of relevant theories, biomedical views</li> <li>• Reference to differences related to gender, age, ethnicity, age and social class and the interplay between them</li> <li>• Reference to the way in which definitions and treatments change over time</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		
5	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to factors such as membership, organisational structure, scale, relationship to wider society, demand on members, attitude to others</li> <li>• Reference to evidence such as Durkheim, Davie, Geetz, Bruce, Hamilton, Aldridge, Self &amp; Starbuck, Martin</li> <li>• Inclusive/ exclusive definitions</li> <li>• Concepts such as 'believing without belonging', 'belonging without believing', vicarious religion, privatisation, identity, individualism, spiritual shopping, consumerism, social construction, reliability, validity</li> </ul>	17	

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations concerning issues of private/public belief, practice and belief, attendance figures, complexities involved in discerning discrete religious identity, problems with statistics, methodological problems, postmodern views</li> <li>• Reference to particular forms of religion and related difficulties in measuring belief</li> <li>• Reference to recent data such as Census 2001 and related problems</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point.</li> </ul>		
(b)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as protestant ethic, spirit of capitalism, Calvinism, theodicy, salvation anxiety, social change, social action, charismatic leadership, liberation theology, praxis</li> <li>• Research from Weber, Marshall, Beckford supported by Maduro, Nelson, McGuire</li> <li>• Theories: Weberian views, supported by neo-Marxism</li> <li>• Rise of religious movements that challenge the status quo and promote social change such as some NAMS</li> <li>• Rise of fundamentalism as revolutionary</li> <li>• Dimensions of ethnicity, gender, class, age etc as challenging the status quo</li> <li>• Contemporary examples in support</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as ie spiritual shopper, religious fundamentalism, secularisation, religious pluralism, conflict, 'opium of the people', social control, ideological role, religious fundamentalism, patriarchal oppression, socialisation, collective conscience, consensus, stability, socialisation, social order, social solidarity, social integration, organic analogy, civil religion</li> <li>• Research from Parsons, Malinowski, Durkheim, O'Dea, Hamilton, Marx, Hook, Leach, Aldridge, Parkin, Beckford, Sombart, Kautsky</li> </ul>	33	

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theories: functionalism, Marxism, post-modern views, feminist views</li> <li>• Examples of religious conservatism</li> <li>• Dimensions of ethnicity, gender, class, age etc – religion maintaining consensus among disadvantaged groups</li> <li>• Evaluation of religion and its role in social change</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		
6	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denominations seen as having developed from churches or sects</li> <li>• Issues related to membership such as composition in terms of class, gender, ethnicity, age etc, whether inclusive or exclusive membership</li> <li>• Differences related to organisational structure e.g. denominations tend to have a hierarchy of paid officials whereas sects do not.</li> <li>• Scale – issues related to size and scope e.g. denominations tend to be national or international whereas sects do not.</li> <li>• Relationship to wider society; denominations seen to be world-accommodating while sects are often world-rejecting</li> <li>• Relationship with the State; denominations do not identify with the State whereas Church of England does</li> <li>• Demands on members; denominations require less commitment than sects</li> <li>• Attitude to other religions; denominations do not tend to claim to have a monopoly on the truth whereas some other religious institutions and movements do, denominations are tolerant of other religious organisations</li> <li>• Denominations tend to be quite conservative in terms of norms and values while some sects are seen as more radical</li> <li>• Reference to Weber, Glock, Troeltsch, Niebuhr, Aldridge, Wilson, Barker, Wallis, Drane, Heelas, Brierley, Bruce</li> <li>• Differences related to religious organisations such as churches, sects, cults, NRMs, NAMs</li> </ul>	17	

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to specific examples such as Methodists, Baptists, Pentecostals</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point.</li> </ul>		
(b)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as marginalisation, relative deprivation, identity, resistance, status, social closure, renewed vigour, accommodation, oppression, racism, empowerment, symbolic exclusion, othering, discrimination, liberation theology</li> <li>• Research from Weber, Beckford, Mitchell, Jacobson, Samad, Akhtar, Ahmed, Barker, Maduro, Modood, Bird, Pryce, Chryssides, Kepel</li> <li>• Theories: Marxism, neo-Marxism, Weberian views</li> <li>• Reference to data on patterns and trends of religiosity related to ethnicity e.g. ONS, 2001 Census, Christian Research</li> <li>• Reference to differential appeal of particular religious organisations e.g. NRMs tend to appeal more to marginalised groups, appeal of Pentecostalism</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as cultural defence, cultural transition, apostasy, patriarchy, sexism, feminisation of religion, ageism, blurred boundaries, individualism, social solidarity, social order, social integration, identity, shared norms and values, socialisation, hybridity, spiritual shopping, consumerism, secularisation</li> <li>• Studies such as Chryssides, Bruce, Davie, De Beauvoir, El Sadaawi, Miller &amp; Hoffman, Brierley, Glock, Glendinning &amp; Bruce, Voas, Voas &amp; Crockett, Mitchell, Parsons, Malinowski, Durkheim, Wilson</li> <li>• Theories: functionalism, Marxism, feminism, postmodern views</li> <li>• Impact of secularisation</li> <li>• Interplay between social class, ethnicity, gender and age</li> <li>• Under-researched nature of some aspects of the debate</li> </ul>	33	

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		
7	(a)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as girl power, bedroom culture, social control, oppression, ladette, normative femininity, passive femininity, assertive femininity, invisibility</li> <li>• Reference to evidence from McRobbie &amp; Garber, Blackman, Smart, Lincoln, Hollands, feminism</li> <li>• Reference to examples such as New Wave Girls, Riot Girls, Gang Girls, Faith Girls, The Survivors, The Rebels</li> <li>• Explanations such as oppression, resistance, social control, socialisation, patriarchy, emancipation</li> <li>• Issues of ethnicity and social class</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point.</li> </ul>	17	Features may be more implicit and presented within the context of an explanation or evidence.
	(b)	<p>The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts/issues such as status frustration, transitional phase, anomie, opportunity structures, focal concerns of masculinity, values, norms</li> <li>• Studies such as Abrams, Eisenstadt, Durkheim, Merton, Cloward &amp; Ohlin, Miller, A.Cohen</li> <li>• Theories: functionalism</li> <li>• Reference to patterns and trends, statistical data on youth deviance</li> <li>• Reference to functional role of deviance</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts; dysfunctional, delinquent subcultures, social exclusion, opposition, resistance, exaggeration, marginalisation, labelling, institutional racism, discrimination, crisis in masculinity, patriarchy, ladettes, peer pressure, edgework, racism, sexism, folk devils,</li> </ul>	33	There are a number of ways to achieve wide-ranging and detailed knowledge and understanding. It is possible to reach level 4 using general Functionalist theory accurately applied to youth deviance if this is wide ranging and detailed. Similarly, another approach could use general Functionalist theory applied to deviance plus at least one Functionalist subcultural study discussed in range and detail e.g. Miller's Six Focal Concerns in depth

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
		scapegoating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies; CCCS, Becker, S.Cohen, Messerschmidt, Muncie, Smart, Campbell, Alexander, Sewell, Cicourel</li> <li>• Theories; Marxist views, feminism, interactionism, postmodern views</li> <li>• Differences in youth deviance in terms of gender, ethnicity and social class and the interplay between them</li> <li>• Conformity of 'ordinary' youth</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues including a critique of official statistics</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		
8	(a)	The following list is indicative of possible factors/evidence that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as fragmentation, diversity, choice, fluidity, pick and mix, 'scene', blurred boundaries, individualism, consumerism, edgework</li> <li>• Reference to club cultures, rave culture, neo-tribes</li> <li>• Influence of consumption on youth style; supermarket of style</li> <li>• Influence of the media</li> <li>• Impact of globalisation including its influence on the creation of hybrid subcultures</li> <li>• Reference to Thornton, Polemus, Maffesoli, Redhead, MIPC, Bennett, Muggleton, Lyng</li> <li>• Any other reasonable point.</li> </ul>	17	Features may be more implicit and presented within the context of an explanation or evidence. Answers should relate specifically to postmodern society rather than general features of youth subcultures e.g. spectacular subcultures or resistance would not be credited
	(b)	The following list is indicative of possible factors that candidates may refer to but is not prescriptive or exhaustive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts/issues such as racism, resistance, hidden curriculum, labelling, racialised expectations, social identity, ethnocentric curriculum, cultural navigation, white mask, hybridity</li> <li>• Studies by Modood, Gillborn &amp; Youdell, Mac an Ghail, Sewell, Shain, Mirza, Wright et al, Coard, Johal, Connolly, Archer</li> <li>• Theories: Marxist views, some feminist views e.g. black feminists, interactionism</li> </ul>	33	

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence related to ethnicity and factors such as subculture, achievement, extracurricular opportunities, teacher/pupil relationships, attendance, truancy, expulsion, bullying etc.</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> </ul> <p>In evaluation (depending on approach):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts such as cultural capital, speech codes, reproduction, resistance, peer pressure, gender stereotypes, crisis in masculinity, school subcultures, labelling, ladettes, hybridity, diversity and choice, blurred boundaries, multiculturalism, assimilation</li> <li>• Studies such as Willis, Bourdieu, Bernstein, Lees, Hatcher, Aggleton, Power et al, Sullivan, Archer, Reay, Spender, Sharpe, Jackson</li> <li>• Theories: postmodern views on diversity, choice &amp; individualism, interactionism, feminism, functionalist views</li> <li>• Assessment of ethnicity as the greatest influence as opposed to other possible factors such as social class</li> <li>• Statistical evidence on social class as the greatest influence on achievement</li> <li>• Differences related to gender, ethnicity, social class and the interplay between them</li> <li>• Reference to differential socialisation</li> <li>• Discussion of wider social factors vs factors inside school</li> <li>• Reference to social policy e.g. strategies to standardise provision such as the National Curriculum</li> <li>• Candidates may refer to methodological issues</li> <li>• Any other reasonable response</li> </ul>		



## APPENDIX 1

## Part (a) Questions (17 marks)

## AO1 Knowledge and Understanding

## Level 4

**13-17** Candidates show a very good knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** contemporary evidence/examples. Responses will contain wide ranging **and** detailed knowledge and understanding. Sociological evidence will be accurate and explicit. At the top of the band there will be sociological evidence outlined in depth for both factors. At the bottom of the band this may be uneven and provided in depth for only one factor or explanations may be less developed.

The quality of written communication will be very good, presenting appropriate material in a logical, accurate and coherent manner, with very few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## Level 3

**9-12** Candidates show good knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** contemporary evidence/examples. Responses will contain wide ranging **or** detailed and narrow knowledge and understanding. There will be some use of sociological evidence but it will be underdeveloped. At the bottom of the band evidence will be narrower and less informed.

The quality of written communication will be good, presenting appropriate material in a logical, accurate and coherent manner, with few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## Level 2

**5-8** Candidates show a basic knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** contemporary evidence/examples. Knowledge and understanding is partial / confused / undeveloped. At the top of the band evidence may be more generalised. At the bottom of the band sociological ideas may be marginally related. One factor fully explained can reach the top of this band.

The quality of written communication will be basic, presenting some sociological material with limited coherence and some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## Level 1

**1-4** Candidates show a limited knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** evidence/examples. There will be a lack of sociological evidence, relying heavily on non-sociological material or material of little relevance. There may be reference to only one factor.

The quality of written communication will be limited, presenting some sociological material with limited coherence and many errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**0** No appropriate sociological knowledge or understanding.

**Part (b) Questions (33 marks)****AO1 Knowledge and Understanding (10 marks)****Level 4**

**8-10** Candidates show a very good knowledge and understanding of appropriate sociological theories **and/or** concepts; contemporary evidence/examples may also be included. Sociological evidence will be accurate and explicit. Responses will contain wide ranging **and** detailed knowledge and understanding. At the bottom of the band this may be less detailed, narrower or uneven.

The quality of written communication will be very good, presenting appropriate material in a logical, accurate and coherent manner, with very few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Level 3**

**5-7** Candidates show a good knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** contemporary evidence/examples. Responses will contain wide ranging **or** detailed and narrow knowledge and understanding. There will be some use of sociological evidence but it will be underdeveloped. Expect to see a narrower, less informed response at the bottom of the band.

The quality of written communication will be good, presenting appropriate material in a logical, accurate and coherent manner, with few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Level 2**

**3-4** Candidates show a basic knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** contemporary evidence/examples. Whilst the view may be quite well illustrated, knowledge and understanding is partial / confused / undeveloped.

The quality of written communication will be basic, presenting some sociological material with limited coherence and some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Level 1**

**1-2** Candidates show a limited knowledge and understanding of sociological theories **and/or** concepts **and/or** evidence/examples. There will be a lack of sociological evidence, relying heavily on non-sociological material.

The quality of written communication will be limited, presenting some sociological material with limited coherence and many errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**0** No appropriate sociological knowledge or understanding.

**AO2a Interpretation and Application (13 marks)****Level 4**

**10-13** Candidates show a very good ability to interpret sociological evidence and apply it to the discussion. Expect to see reasonably accurate interpretation of patterns **and/or** trends **and/or** research data applied to the debate. At the top of the band evidence will contain a high level of detail, depth and/or breadth. At the bottom of the band the evidence selected will be less wide ranging or less developed and relevance to the question may be less explicit in parts.

**Level 3**

**7-9** Candidates show a good ability to interpret appropriate sociological evidence and apply it to the discussion. Evidence will be relevant, but may be more implicit. Expect to see some interpretation of patterns **and/or** trends **and/or** research data applied to the debate. At this level there may be more unsubstantiated evidence and/or the evidence selected will be narrow.

**Level 2**

**4-6** Candidates show a basic ability to interpret sociological evidence and apply it to the discussion. Evidence will be only partially relevant to the question. Evidence may be superficial and/or contain inaccuracies. More than one dimension to the debate will be applied, for or against the views.

**Level 1**

**1-3** Candidates show a limited ability to interpret sociological evidence and apply it to the discussion. Evidence will have limited relevance. At least one form of data will be applied for or against the view.

**0** No appropriate interpretation and application.

**AO2b Analysis and Evaluation (10 marks)****Level 4**

**8-10** Candidates show a very good ability to analyse and evaluate sociological evidence, using available arguments and alternative explanations. Evaluation will be sustained and there may be an evaluative tone to the discussion. Expect to see some explicit evaluation of sociological evidence addressing the debate. There may also be some evaluation of methods. At the bottom of the band analysis and evaluation may be less developed and/or focus significantly more on one side of the view at the expense of the other.

**Level 3**

**5-7** Candidates show a good ability to analyse and evaluate sociological evidence. There will be some relevant evaluation but it will be underdeveloped. Responses may contain some juxtaposition but it is likely that sociological evidence presented will be questioned on some level. Expect to see a narrower range of evaluation at a more superficial level. There may be some lack of balance evident. At the bottom of the band some of the evaluation may not fully address the question.

**Level 2**

**3-4** Candidates show a basic ability to analyse **and/or** evaluate sociological evidence. Evaluation will be partially relevant or narrow in focus or evaluation will be implicit through only juxtaposition. Discursive points may be asserted without explanation. Evaluation may be undeveloped and/or less relevant. Answers here will be more superficial and/or inaccurate and are likely to concentrate on one side entirely at the expense of the other.

**Level 1**

- 1-2** Candidates show a limited ability to analyse **and/or** evaluate sociological evidence. Evaluation will be minimal with one or two largely implicit points and/or mainly irrelevant.
- 0** No appropriate evaluation.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

