

2004 Sociology

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR MARKERS

All questions in the papers provide scope for candidates to demonstrate sociological knowledge, understanding and skills at different levels.

Section A is specific in the type of information required and more detailed marking guidelines are given for this paper.

Sections B, C and D are more open in terms of the range of answers candidates can produce. This leaves scope for candidates to achieve strong responses to the questions. Advice on what constitutes strong responses to specific questions is given in the specific marking guidelines with suggestions for allocating marks. However, in general strong responses would also be characterised by:

- consistent use of appropriate sociological terms and language
- elaboration of responses that go beyond that which is required in the question set. For example, by making more points and good exemplification
- ideas expressed with a high degree of clarity
- coherence demonstrated by linking relevant concepts/ideas appropriately.

The guidelines illustrate the kinds of responses that are judged to be acceptable. However, given the range and scope of sociological theory and research the guidelines are not exhaustive and markers may accept alternative responses which they judge to be acceptable.

SECTION A

Question A1

Candidate can be awarded up to **7 marks**.

In this question candidates are asked to describe, so for candidates who describe 3 features accurately using technical phrases such as 'agency' or 'interpretation', 'social actor', etc. then they should be given **2 marks** for each feature described. If answers tend to be single words or short phrases then a maximum of **1 mark** for each feature should be given.

Features could include, for example:

- Social interaction of groups and individuals
- Interested in social processes
- Notion of the social actor and social roles
- Meaning and interpretation is important
- Individuals and groups are still important
- Social action is created not given.

1 mark for an example of its application. To gain mark, candidate needs to say how it is applied and not just identify the area.

Answers could include, for example:

- The labelling of pupils in classrooms
- The labelling of individuals as criminals.

Question A2

2 marks for an explanation of why consensus and conflict perspectives are structural perspectives. Single word answers are not acceptable.

Answers could include, for example:

- Look at society as a whole
- See society in terms of a system
- Look at the way in which society is organised at a macro level
- Look at society as a system of institutions.

Candidates can be awarded up to **4 marks** for this part of the question. Candidates are required to explain two differences between conflict and consensus – each difference must include two points. If candidate simply identifies differences then award **1 mark**. If candidate makes a clear distinction between each perspective award **2 marks**. Evaluative comments should be awarded higher marks. For example, when candidate phrases answers in a way that draws contrasts.

Differences between the two perspectives include:

- Consensus stresses harmony, integration and stability, whereas conflict stresses conflict, struggle and change
- Consensus theorists stress value consensus, whereas conflict stresses values imposed by powerful groups

- Consensus theorists tend to see the structure of society being made up of social institutions, whereas conflict theorists see the structure as infrastructure and superstructure
- Consensus theorists stress co-operation between and interdependence of social institutions, whereas although conflict theorists acknowledge interdependence of social institutions, they do not see relations as harmonious
- Consensus theorists see functional unity between different institutions and roles in society, whereas conflict theorists see conflict and contradictions
- Consensus theorists explain everything in terms of the function it performs with emphasis on stability and integration, whereas conflict theorists explain some things in terms of their causes and development
- Consensus theories are based on variable-sum notions of power, whereas conflict theories are based on zero-sum notions.

Question A3

Candidates can be awarded up to **6 marks** with **2 marks** allocated to **each** difference. Each difference must include 2 points. If candidate simply identifies differences then award **1 mark**. If candidate makes a clear distinction between each perspective award **2 marks**.

- Structural perspectives see society as shaping the individual, whereas social action perspectives see individuals shaping society
- Structural perspectives see society as more than the sum of its parts, whereas social perspectives see society as comprising its members
- Structural perspectives are interested in trends, structures and social forces, whereas social action perspectives concentrate on interactions and processes
- Social action perspectives give more weight to the role of human agency, whereas structural perspectives emphasise the role of social structures
- Social action perspectives tend to use methods of research that generate qualitative data, whereas structural perspectives tend to use methods of research that generate quantitative data
- Structural perspectives start with the whole and work towards the parts, whereas social action theorists start with the parts and work towards the whole.

Question A4

Up to **8 marks** can be awarded to this question. **2 marks** per stage for explanation, but only up to a maximum of **2 marks** in total if names only are given. Stages do not need to be explained in sequence.

Answers could include, for example:

- Hypothesis: a particular idea that the sociologist wants to explore set out as a statement or series of statements or predictions which he/she then tests by carrying out research
- Operationalisation: deciding how to put the research into practice including 4 sub-stages – defining concepts – choose a sample – choose a method – decide on specific measurements
- Fieldwork: the researcher conducts the research using the methods identified
- Processing of results: the researcher analyses the data gathered and presents his/her findings in a report, journal and perhaps a seminar.

Question A5

Up to **6 marks** can be awarded for this question. Candidates can be awarded a total of **4 marks** if they make at least four points that include 2 elaborated differences. For example, if a candidate explains that common sense explanations are based on opinion, whereas sociological explanations are grounded in theory and research, then this would count as 2 points and 1 difference.

Answers could include, for example:

Common sense explanations include the following:

- Based on opinion
- May be individualistic or naturalistic
- Lacks objectivity
- Carries notions of being factual and hard-headed
- Non-sociological.

Sociological knowledge includes the following aspects:

- Based on particular theories that have been tested through research
- Attempts to be objective
- Attempts to be value free or acknowledges role of values in formulating theories
- Challenges taken for granted assumption.

Candidates can be awarded **2 marks** if the example given illustrates both sides of the argument. If candidates only give one side of the argument then they should be given **1 mark** depending on the clarity of the example.

Examples could include:

- People marry because they love each other vs. people marry because it is a social expectation
- People are unemployed because they are lazy and don't want to work vs. the structure of employment has changed
- People are poor because they do not budget properly vs. people are poor because of low wages and low benefits.
- People commit suicide because they are unhappy vs. rates of suicide are socially distributed and can be attributed to social factors such as unemployment, religion, urbanisation, etc.

Question A6

Up to **6 marks** can be awarded. **2 marks** for describing a qualitative method. **1 mark** for each advantage and each disadvantage. Marking at the top of range will depend on clarity of description. Those who use explanation and exemplification should be awarded higher marks. One-word/short phrase answers should be given lower marks.

Participant Observation – The researcher becomes a participant in the group/situation that he/she wishes to observe.

Advantages:

- Gives a realistic picture
- Can look at processes and interactions in an in-depth way.

Disadvantages:

- High cost in terms of researcher time
- High cost in terms of researcher input
- 'Hawthorne effect'. The real presence of the sociologist may change the behaviour
- Can only do this with small group
- Situation may be dangerous
- 'Getting in', 'staying in' and 'getting out' can be problematic
- Difficult to record observations when researcher is also a participant.

Unstructured Interview – The researcher has a number of broad topic/general areas to be covered with the interviewee.

Advantages:

- Researcher and respondent meet face to face
- Repeat question if something is not understood
- People can answer questions even if they cannot read or write
- Respondent allowed to elaborate on areas
- Open questions permit varied response in terms of depth and emphasis
- Interviewer is allowed to clarify and explore particular points.

Disadvantages:

- Can be high cost because of researcher time
- Can be time consuming for researcher and respondent
- Can be difficult to quantify results.

Non-participant observation – the researcher observes the behaviour of others.

Advantages:

- Researcher does not influence the behaviour of people being observed
- Researcher can observe how people actually behave.

Disadvantages:

- Researcher has to interpret behaviour that is being observed – has to take this at face value
- Difficult to quantify
- No way of checking details or exploring issues further
- Time consuming
- High cost.

Personal Documents – Using existing data such as diaries, letters or personal accounts.

Advantages:

- Good source for in-depth account/case studies
- May provide social comment on the society within which person lived.

Disadvantages:

- They may be biased
- Difficult to check details if individual no longer alive
- Authenticity may be difficult to establish
- Does not tell you what is missed out.

Question A7

Up to **6 marks** can be awarded. In this question candidates are asked to describe two main features of official statistics and two advantages and two disadvantages. Candidates must describe to gain **2 marks** for features and **1 mark** for each advantage and disadvantage. If candidate gives one word answers then no more than half marks should be awarded. **Markers should note some advantages/disadvantages may be expressed as features and vice-versa and that this is acceptable.**

Answers could include, for example:

Official Statistics

- Gathered by official bodies, eg police, health trusts, etc
- Used to show trends
- Used as a basis for planning, policy, etc

Advantages:

- Good for quantitative studies – how many crimes have been reported in any one year
- Can save researcher lot to time
- May give good general trend for particular behaviour.

Disadvantages:

- May be biased because of way collected or reason they have been collected
- May be difficult to do comparison on longitudinal studies because different criteria may be used when gathering statistics, eg class criteria
- All statistics still require interpretation
- People may lie in official statistics, eg 1991 census because of the Poll Tax.

SECTION B

Question B1

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Lists are not exhaustive and markers should award marks if other valid theories are being used in an appropriate manner. The suggested marking guidelines are as follows:

Introduction	2
Theories	12
Studies	8
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks, candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Introduction

The marks given will depend on how the candidate expresses these ideas. For example, for straight definitions of inequality, stratification or class stratification the candidate should be awarded lower marks. Higher marks should be awarded to those who draw a distinction between inequality in general and class stratification in particular. Up to **2 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion.

As a form of introduction and discussion of general features of inequality and class stratification, candidates might include:

- definitions of inequality
- definitions of stratification
- definitions of class stratification.

Theories

In answering this question candidates must discuss at least 2 theories. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Even if theories are similar, candidates should be able to demonstrate how one theory may have built upon another, eg neo-Marxism and Marxism. Up to **12 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion.

Theories could include:

- Functionalist
- Marxist
- Weberian
- Neo-Marxist
- Neo-Weberian
- Structuration
- Feminist.

Studies

Up to **8 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author/name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- comparison is made between perspectives. For example, which ones are strong on particular aspects, eg Marxism is good at looking at production, whereas Weberian perspectives are often seen as being closer to people's experience
- where strong conclusions are made about the question. For example, have they said why theories remain important or do they think they don't help
- differences between inequality and class stratification
- stratification as a form of structured inequality, persists across generations.

SECTION C

Question C1

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Lists are not exhaustive and markers should award marks if other valid theories are being used in an appropriate manner. The suggested marking guidelines are as follows:

Changes	8
Theories	8
Studies	6
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Changes

Candidates are asked to describe changes and well thought out answers should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range. Up to **8 marks** should be awarded to this part of the discussion.

Changes to the education system and the study of education might include:

- changes in the school leaving age
- changes in the curriculum
- expansion of education provision, eg comprehensivisation
- changes in who is educated, eg from privileged to universal
- parental choice in terms of schools
- introduction of fees and abolition of maintenance grants for higher education
- changes in issues of control, eg school boards and governors
- issues such as gender and ethnicity are now being studied, whereas traditional studies often focused on class-based inequalities
- issues of training vs. education, academia vs. vocationalism
- shifts in educational policy, eg educational priority areas.

Theories

In answering this question candidates must discuss at least 2 theories. Up to **8 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Even if theories are similar, candidates should be able to demonstrate how one may have built upon another, eg neo-Marxism and Marxism.

Theories might include:

- Functionalist
- Marxist
- Neo-Marxist
- Interactionist
- Liberal
- Feminist.

Studies

Up to **6 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author/name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and/or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate makes some comparison of how different perspectives have helped us understand the main characteristics of the educational system and the issue of the extent to which it can be described as meritocratic
- cogency of the argument that relates the theories and studies to the features, changes and other areas of society. In particular, it should be clear that different theories would explain the issue of meritocracy in particular ways
- socialisation – including formal, informal, secondary and anticipatory
- providing society with a skilled workforce.

Question C2

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Lists are not exhaustive and markers should award marks if other valid theories are being used in an appropriate manner. The suggested marking guidelines are as follows:

Changes	8
Theories	8
Studies	6
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Changes

Candidates are asked to describe changes and well thought out answers should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range. Up to **8 marks** should be awarded to this part of the discussion.

Changes could include:

- is importance of work increasing or decreasing?
- changes in the nature of work, eg technology, computers, home working, less heavy industry in the West
- leisure time – which groups?
- More complex relationship between producers and consumers
- Occupational structure
- Gender balance changing
- Transfer of production of goods/services to developing countries
- Unemployment/underemployment
- Utilisation of cheap immigrant labour in the West.

Theories

In answering this question candidates must discuss at least 2 theories. Up to **8 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Even if theories are similar, candidates should be able to demonstrate how one may have built upon another, eg neo-Marxism and Marxism.

Theories might include:

- Marxist
- Neo-Marxist
- Weberian
- Neo-Weberian
- Structuration
- Feminist
- Functionalist.

Studies

Up to **6 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author/name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and/or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate gives an evaluation of whether work is still important or to what extent it has changed. For example, a candidate may say it has changed because of more women, technology, or increase in leisure, but demise is not imminent

- candidate discusses different aspects of change, eg by drawing on theorists who argue change means demise or deskilling, and those who believe reskilling will ensure the survival of work
- necessary to society
- important part of social life
- mental and physical activity, but also social and economic
- defining work – does it have to be paid, eg DIY, housework.

Question C3

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Lists are not exhaustive and markers should award marks if other valid theories are being used in an appropriate manner. The suggested marking guidelines are as follows:

Introduction	2
Theories	12
Studies	8
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg for full marks candidates must discuss at least two theories. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Introduction

Up to **2 marks** can be awarded for this section.

These could include:

- definition of crime and deviance.

Theories

In answering this question candidates must discuss at least 2 contrasting theories. Up to **12 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Even if theories are similar, candidates should be able to demonstrate how one may have built upon another, eg Marxism and New Left Realism.

Where candidates use two similar theories no more than 8 marks can be awarded in total, unless the contrasts between these theories are adequately drawn out.

Theories could include:

- Interactionist
- Functionalist
- Marxist
- Left Realist
- Feminist
- Neo-Marxist
- Right Realist.

Studies

Up to **8 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author/name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and/or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate draws strong contrasts between theories, eg looking at the deviant, at agents of control, structure of society, etc
- candidate discusses the implications of each in terms of solutions to crime and deviance, eg interactionism would look at agents of control, Marxism at ending capitalism
- social consideration of deviance
- cultural and historical relativity of crime and deviance.

SECTION D

Question D1

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Lists are not exhaustive and markers should award marks if other valid theories are being used in an appropriate manner. The suggested marking guidelines are as follows:

Changes	8
Theories	8
Studies	6
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Changes

Candidates are asked to describe changes and well thought out answers should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range. Up to **8 marks** should be awarded to this part of the discussion.

Answers may include, for example:

- in the UK change of family from unit of production to unit of consumption
- change from extended to nuclear to reconstituted/single-parent/others
- marriage
- family size
- study of family changed from purpose it serves to role of women within the family
- needs of labour market have changed place of women within family
- growth of single occupancy households.

Theories

The candidate is required to discuss 2 or more contrasting theories. Up to **8 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Even if theories are similar, candidates should be able to demonstrate how one may have built upon another, eg neo-Marxism and Marxism.

Theories might include:

- Functionalist
- Marxist
- Feminist.

Studies

Up to **6 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author and name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and/or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for two or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describe more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate demonstrates the use of contrasting theories and the way they differ, eg looking at serving the needs of society (functionalist), or the needs of men (feminist)
- candidate discusses the implications of each, eg freeing women from labour, ending capitalism
- takes many forms, eg nuclear, extended, reconstituted, lone parent
- experiences within the family differ – for some, positive, for others painful and harmful
- seen as one of the main social institutions
- notion of the family life cycle where an individual may be part of extended family, then nuclear, then reconstituted
- the functionalist perspective has influenced studies of the family.

Question D2

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Lists are not exhaustive and marker should award marks if other valid theories are being used in an appropriate manner. The suggested marking guideline is as follows:

Features	6
Theories	10
Studies	6
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given overleaf.

Features

Up to **6 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion.

These could include:

- relative and absolute nature of poverty
- social distribution of poverty
- some groups affected more than others, eg the elderly and the unemployed
- children and women particularly affected by poverty
- effects include malnourishment, undernourishment, morbidity and self-esteem
- mortality
- powerlessness
- lack of income, unemployment destitution.

Theories

In answering this question candidates must discuss at least 2 contrasting theories. Up to **10 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks.

Theories might include:

- Individualistic

- Marxist
- Conflict
- New Right
- Sub-cultural
- Functionalist
- Feminist

If candidate uses similar theories they should only be awarded up to **6 marks**

Studies

Up to **6 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author and name of study
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and/or author is given but no explanation then, no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate discusses the ways in which different theories would advocate different solutions to poverty, eg individuals helping themselves, change to distribution of wealth, etc
- candidate points out that definitions and measurement of poverty carries political implications. For example, in the UK measurement of relative poverty is greater than absolute poverty
- differences between absolute and relative poverty
- poverty is socially distributed.

Question D3

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Its main focus is to evaluate two contrasting explanations of health and to be able to show how each differs. The suggested guidelines are as follows:

Introduction	2
Theories	12
Studies	8
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Introduction

Up to **2 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion.

This could include:

- difficulty in defining health
- is health and illness medical or social?
- mortality and morbidity rates would suggest health and health care are socially distributed
- inequalities in health care also suggest social distribution of care and treatment.

Theories

In answering this question candidates must discuss at least two theories. Up to **12 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Even if theories are similar, candidates should be able to demonstrate how one may have built upon another, eg Marxist and conflict.

Theories could include:

- Interactionist
- Marxist
- Conflict
- Feminist
- Functionalist.

Studies

Up to **8 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author/name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support/refute the theory/argument.

If a study and /or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate these aspects. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate includes comments that health and medicine is not simply about biology, but can be understood from a sociological perspective
- candidate includes comments that give some indication of her/his preference in terms of sociological explanation, based on the relative merits of each theory.

Question D4

This is worth **30 marks** and therefore is difficult. Its main focus is to evaluate 2 contrasting explanations of the mass media and to be able to show how each differs from the other. The suggested marking guideline is as follows:

Aspect	6
Theories	10
Studies	6
Further Evaluation	8

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *theories* refers to the plural and therefore for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. **No marks can be taken from further evaluation for description.** Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Aspect

Up to **6 marks** should be given to this part of the question. Well thought-out answers should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range.

Answers might include one of the following aspects and points:

Bias

- some believe media are biased towards certain groups
- this bias evident from news reporting
- also, bias from newspapers or programmes supporting particular views
- bias may also involve over and under representation of certain groups, such as white males, women and so on.

Influence/Attitude formation

- debate on extent to which media influence audience
- particular concerns include advertising, violence, and susceptibility of children.

Ownership

- ownership of the media important as this may lead to particular viewpoints being propagated
- danger of monopoly of media institutions
- difficulty in knowing who owns what.

Theories

The candidate is required to discuss two contrasting theories. Up to **10 marks** should be given to this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- name of a theorist associated with the theory
- at least two key features
- at least one strength
- at least one weakness.

Candidates who highlight all of the above points and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks

Theories could include:

- Pluralist
- Marxist (manipulative model)
- Neo-Marxist (hegemonic model)
- Feminist
- Post-modernist
- Sub-cultural.

Studies

Up to **6 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies to support their discussion and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following:

- author/name of study/date
- main point of study
- findings
- if they support /refute the theory/argument.

If a study and/or author is given but no explanation, then no more than **1 mark** can be awarded to each study with a maximum of **2 marks** for 2 or more studies.

If an explanation is given without reference to a study/author, then high marks should still be awarded depending on the depth and relevance of the explanation.

Further Evaluation

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **8 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate such further evaluation. These comments could be throughout the answer and/or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates; links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidate uses contrasting theories to review the way they see the consumer, eg recipient as active, recipient as passive

- candidate comments on the implications of theories discussed, eg media need to be controlled, or no control as people are rational and will make their own choices
- influence of mass media – education or indoctrination?
- purposes of media – to inform or make money?
- do media reflect or set societal values?

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]