

**GCSE**

**Sociology**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Unit **B673**: Applying Sociological Research Techniques

**Mark Scheme for June 2015**

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 2015

## Annotations

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

| Annotation  | Meaning   |
|---|---|
|    | Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response. |
|    | Sociological Concept  |
|    | Relevant point made. Also denotes 1 mark, apart from in questions 6b and 13   |
|    | Implicit answer. Can be used with BOD or NBOD   |
|    | If writing, idea or answer is unclear and/or confused   |
|    | To be used in question 6b or 13 to show the development of a point  |
|    | To show a large amount of irrelevant information  |
|    | To show an evaluation point in question 13  |
|    | To show benefit of doubt has been awarded   |
|    | To show where no benefit of doubt has been awarded  |
|  | To show where answer has included application to the study of crime, or the investigation – question 13   |
|  | To show where an answer has included irrelevant information   |
|  | To show that information has been looked at when there is no other annotation on the answer. Not to be used on zero mark answers  |
|  | To show a level one answer on questions 6b & 13. To be placed at the end of the answer.   |
|  | To show a level two answer on questions 6b & 13. To be placed at the end of the answer.   |
|  | To show a level three answer on questions 6b & 13. To be placed at the end of the answer.   |

| Question |     | Answer   | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|--|------|---|
| 1        |     | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of <b>one</b> of the aims.</p> <p>eg. (<b>one</b> from)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what causes people to commit crime</li> <li>• how prisoners feel about being in prison</li> <li>• why prisoners continue to commit crime after they are released</li> </ul>   | 1    | The aim identified should be the same as on the pre-release. Credit can be given if there are minor changes / omissions but re-phrasing of the hypothesis cannot be credited. |
| 2        |     | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of questionnaire</p> <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of: semi-structured interviews</p>  | 2    | <p>Credit self-completion questionnaire</p> <p>Credit only semi-structured interviews</p>   |
| 3        | (a) | <p><b>One mark</b> for a partial description of a pilot study, which relates in some way to research done before the study but the answer lacks a clear understanding. This might be lifted from Investigation 1.</p> <p>Eg. A study of 3-5 people done before she carried out the research.</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for a clear description which shows understanding of a small study done before the main study and used to test for possible errors or problems which could arise in the main research such as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• testing for badly phrased questions which can be changed</li> <li>• find out about possible response rate to see if the research needs to be changed or abandoned</li> <li>• respondents refusal to answer questions as intrusive or misunderstood inadequate choice on pre-coded questions</li> </ul> | 2    |   |

| Question |     | Answer  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|------|---|
|          |     | <p>Eg. A small study carried out before the research to find out if there are any questions that respondents do not understand so they can be changed.</p> <p>Eg. A small study carried out before the research to test for validity</p> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p>  |      |   |
| 4        | (a) | <p><b>One mark</b> for identification of one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• same views about education in prison</li> <li>• same view about prisons not being effective / don't work</li> </ul> <p><b>One additional mark</b> for a clear reference to investigation 1 which shows agreement</p> <p>eg. (A) there is not the money to provide education / (B) not enough money put into education in prison</p> <p>eg. (A) prison does not work / (B) prisons don't seem to stop crime</p>  | 2    | <p>Implicit comparison between person A and person B can be credited with 2 marks if there is direct reference to the investigation.</p> <p>There must be direct reference to the investigation for 2 marks to be awarded.</p> <p>A clear and accurate reference back to the source (for person A or B or both) can be credited with the additional mark.</p> |
| 4        | (b) | <p><b>One mark</b> for identification of one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• different views about concern about victims by prisoners</li> <li>• different views about the ability of prisoners to get jobs</li> <li>• different feelings about prisoners generally</li> </ul> <p><b>One additional mark</b> for a clear reference to investigation 1 which shows disagreement</p> <p>eg. (A) prisoners don't really care about how people have suffered / (B) many prisoners do care and understand how they upset their victims.</p> <p>eg. (A) If they tried harder, they could get jobs when they leave prison /</p> | 2    | <p>Implicit comparison between person A and person B can be credited with 2 marks if there is direct reference to the investigation.</p> <p>There must be direct reference to the investigation for 2 marks to be awarded.</p>  |

| Question |     | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|-----|--|------|----------|
|          |     | <p>(B) they can't get jobs when they leave<br/>           eg. (A) has a negative view of prisoners (no responsibility / teach each other criminality)<br/>           (B) feels sorry for prisoners (feels sad / they have had a poor upbringing)</p> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p>   |      |          |
| 5        | (a) | <p><b>One mark</b> for a partial description of secondary sources which relates in some way to the researcher collecting data which already exists but the answer lacks a clear understanding or gives a correct example of secondary sources</p> <p>eg. Not done by the researcher<br/>           eg. Information from the internet / TV programmes/ books etc</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for a clear description which shows understanding of secondary sources as data which already exists and has not been collected directly by the researcher.</p> <p>A weak description can be given 2 marks if a clear example is given to support it.<br/>           eg. Done by someone else<br/>           eg. Got from the internet</p> <p>Any other reasonable response</p> | 2    |          |
| 5        | (b) | <b>57%</b>   | 1    |          |
| 5        | (c) | <p><b>One mark</b> for <b>one</b> correct conclusion identified</p> <p>Answers might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people given community sentences are least likely to</li> </ul>   | 2    |          |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <p>re-offend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people with a prison sentence of less than 12 months are most likely to re-offend</li> <li>• people given longer prison sentences / sentences of 1-4 years are more likely to re-offend than those given community sentences</li> <li>• people given longer prison sentences / sentences of 1-4 years are less likely to re-offend than those given shorter prison sentences</li> <li>• people given community sentences are less likely than those given prison sentences to re-offend</li> <li>• people convicted of crimes often re-offend</li> <li>• neither prison or community sentences stop people from re-offending</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p> <p><b>One additional mark</b> for each conclusion supported by specific statistics from the table<br/>Eg. people given community sentences are least likely to re-offend as only 34% re-offended but 38% / 57% of prisoners re-offended.</p> <p><b>One mark</b> for accurate identification of statistics which imply different re-offending rates but there is no clear conclusion made<br/>Eg. 57% of some prisoners re-offended but only 34% of those given community sentences re-offended.</p> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p> |      |          |

| Question |     | Answer   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|-----|--|------|--|
| 5        | (d) | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of a disadvantage of using statistics / official statistics.</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for the correct identification of two disadvantages of using statistics / official statistics.</p> <p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• statistics / numbers do not have reasons or explanations</li> <li>• the government can change / withhold data</li> <li>• the government presents information which is biased / makes it look better</li> <li>• not everyone is included in the statistics</li> <li>• statistics may not include the exact information the researcher wants</li> <li>• statistics may lack validity</li> <li>• Source 1 has been adapted (see guidance)</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p> <p><b>One additional mark</b> for each disadvantage described in relation to the source (prisons and criminals) and not simply a disadvantage of statistics / official statistics generally.</p> <p>eg. the government change / hide numbers of prisoners because they will look good / bad if the prison numbers are seen to be high / low</p> <p>eg. the numbers in the table do not tell us what the prisoners think of prison</p> <p>eg. the number of prisoners in the table may not be accurate as not all criminals have been caught</p> <p>eg. the table says 34% of people given community service re-offend but does not tell us about the community service – those who did not re-offend may have had a longer / different community service.</p> | 4    | <p>A brief reference to prisons or criminals cannot be credited with the additional mark.</p> <p>Out of date is not credited.</p> <p>The same id cannot be credited twice. E.g. “statistics are not valid because.....”</p> <p>Adapted can be credited as either an id or an explanation, however if credited as an explanation it must relate specifically to the source e.g. “adapted official statistics” or “adapted from the Ministry of Justice.”</p> <p>For an additional mark the response must be related to crime, or a clear reference back to the source.</p> <p>‘Non-reporting of crimes’ can only be credited if it relates specifically to reoffending rates.</p> |



| Question |     | Answer   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|-----|--|------|--|
| 6        | (a) | <b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of; case studies  | 1    |  |
| 6        | (b) | <p><b>Level 3: 5 – 6 marks</b><br/>At this level candidates demonstrate good evaluation and understanding of both parts of the source as related to the issue of prisons. There will be clear identification and explanation of two or more evaluation points linked to the issue of prisons and with reference to both programmes (A and B)</p> <p><b>Level 2: 3 – 4 marks</b><br/>At this level candidates apply basic evaluation of the source as a useful means of finding out about prisons. At this level the answers are likely to focus on only one side of the debate or only one part of the source, or general advantages / disadvantages of the source not related to the issue of prisons</p> | 6    | <p>It is likely that responses will focus mainly on disadvantages of the source.</p> <p>No credit can be given for a response which says 2012 is out of date.</p> <p>Credit can be given for answers which relate to representation.</p> <p>Credit can be given for a response which focuses on researching prisons in general, or if related specifically to Investigation 1.</p> <p>For <b>6 marks</b>, answers will be more developed. There will be clear understanding of a wider range of factors, related to the issue of prisons. Both advantages and disadvantages will be discussed. Reference to both parts of the source, A and B will be made.</p> <p>For <b>5 marks</b>, answers will have some development. There will be clear understanding of a range of factors, related to the issue of prisons. More than one advantage or disadvantage will be discussed. Reference to both parts of the source, A and B will be made.</p> <p>For <b>4 marks</b>, candidates will identify more than one advantage or disadvantage which may be developed. However one may not be related specifically to the source or issue or only one part, A or B will be referred to. For 4 marks there must be specific reference to studying prisons or crime.</p> |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|---|------|--|
|          | <p><b>Level 1: 1 – 2 marks</b><br/>At this level candidates show limited understanding and knowledge of the source and how it can be applied to the issue of prisons.</p> <p>Possible answers might include:</p> <p><b>Part A</b><br/>Possible disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• programme in 2006 so out of date and less valid</li> <li>• The programme is about Danish prisons, which may not represent prisons in the UK or other countries.</li> <li>• only one prison so less representative</li> <li>• prison for violent / serious crimes</li> <li>• information in the programme only one person's interpretation</li> </ul> |      | <p>For <b>3 marks</b> candidates must identify and explain one clear and accurate advantage or disadvantage, which may be developed, related to the source or issue<br/><b>or</b><br/>more than one general advantage or disadvantage of the source.</p> <p>eg. A is a report on a prison in Denmark. This is useful as it could help to prove that prisons can work as only one third re-offend<br/><b>or</b><br/>eg. A and B are from the media. They are not useful as they may be exaggerated for entertainment.</p> <p>Responses which are accurate but descriptive, with no attempt to evaluate cannot be credited above level 1.</p> <p>For <b>2 marks</b> there will be some attempt to address the question although this may be brief or implicit or general<br/>eg. A is from 2006 and things may have changed since then.</p> <p>For <b>1 mark</b>, answers may make some brief references to one or more of the programmes and which are descriptive<br/>eg. B is a TV programme which tells us about lifers</p> <p>There is no attempt to relate to the issue.</p> |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• from the media which may be edited by the BBC</li> <li>• from the media which may be exaggerated for entertainment</li> <li>• represents the view of the journalist and may be biased</li> <li>• bias by the Danish authorities who have provided information which only shows the success of their system</li> <li>• could be researcher bias in editing / selecting the prisoner's comments</li> <li>• case studies are not reliable</li> </ul> <p>Possible advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• qualitative / detailed data</li> <li>• from BBC Newsnight– a respected programme</li> <li>• showed prison as helping inmates rather than just punishment</li> </ul> <p><b>Part B</b></p> <p>Possible disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• only one prison</li> <li>• only 8 prisoners case studies so not representative</li> <li>• prison for violent / serious crimes</li> <li>• from channel 4 – less respected than the BBC</li> <li>• information in the programme only one person's interpretation</li> <li>• only showed prisoners who felt positive about prison</li> <li>• from the media which may be edited</li> <li>• from the media which may be exaggerated for entertainment</li> <li>• represents the view of the journalist and may be biased</li> <li>• could be researcher bias in editing / selecting the prisoner's comments</li> <li>• case studies are not reliable</li> </ul> |      |          |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
|          | <p>Possible advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• programme in 2012 so up to date</li> <li>• qualitative / detailed data</li> <li>• shows that prisoners do get educated in prison</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response</p>  |      |          |
| 7        | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of <b>one</b> of the reasons.</p> <p>eg. (<b>one</b> from)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• young black male</li> <li>• brought up in Birmingham</li> <li>• some friends in gangs</li> <li>• knowledge of research methods</li> </ul>  | 1    |          |
| 8        | <p><b>One mark</b> for a partial example.<br/>eg. the identification of a statement (with no reference to the topic).<br/><b>or</b> a question related to the topic of crime<br/><b>or</b> an aim related to the topic of crime</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for a clear example.<br/>eg. a statement / claim, related to the topic of crime.</p> <p>Possible answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• only boys join gangs</li> <li>• criminals are becoming more violent</li> <li>• criminals enjoy committing crime</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response</p> | 2    |          |

| Question |     | Answer  | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|-----|---|------|--|
| 9        |     | <p><b>One mark</b> for a partial description<br/>eg. it is right / true / accurate / trustworthy</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for a clear description which show understanding of valid data as information or evidence from research which is accurate or truthful</p> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p>  | 2    | <p>Responses which refer to 'data' as accurate or truthful can be credited with only one mark</p> <p>For 2 marks the response must show understanding of data e.g. information or evidence or refer to data from research/sociological study/investigation.</p>  |
| 10       | (a) | <p><b>One mark</b> for a partial description of observation schedule<br/>eg. a list the researcher ticks<br/>eg. things the researcher is looking for</p> <p>Two marks for a clear description of observation schedule<br/>eg. A form or coding sheet filled out by the researcher during an observation.<br/>It records pre-planned behaviours or events which the researcher sees during the observation.</p>                                   | 2    | <p>Credit cannot be given for responses which only refer to:<br/>Time / timing of the observation<br/>Deciding when and who to observe</p> <p>Only credit 'planning' the observation if it is linked to behaviours being observed.</p>   |
| 10       | (b) | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of:<br/>Overt</p>   | 1    |  |
| 10       | (c) | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of:<br/>Covert</p>  | 1    | Credit responses which state undercover  |
| 11       | (a) | <p><b>One mark</b> for one partial explanation of an advantage of participant observation. This might be brief, unclear or undeveloped or there may be an explanation of an advantage in general and not related to studying gangs.</p> <p>Possible answers might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>gains more in depth / detailed / qualitative information</li> <li>taking part leads to a better understanding of</li> </ul> | 4    | <p>A brief reference to gangs cannot be credited with the additional mark</p> <p>Credit the additional mark if the answer relates specifically to investigation two.</p> <p>A response which refers to there being no change of respondent behaviour can only be credited if there is specific reference to covert research.</p> |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
|          | <p>behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• those being studied can't lie</li> <li>• more valid</li> <li>• see behaviour as it happens</li> <li>• see people in their natural surroundings</li> <li>• if covert, people will not change their behaviour</li> <li>• primary, 'first hand' data</li> </ul> <p><b>Two marks</b> for one clear explanation that relates to gangs or Investigation 2<br/>Possible answers might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gains more detailed information about why people join gangs</li> <li>• gains a better understanding about how gang members feel when they are violent or under attack</li> <li>• by taking part the observer might gain a better understanding of the buzz / excitement felt by the gang</li> <li>• watching the gang members means they can't exaggerate or hide their criminal / violent activities like in a questionnaire / interview</li> <li>• if covert, the gang will act naturally and any violent / criminal acts will not be reduced as no fear of being caught</li> <li>• Find out information the researcher would not have thought of asking such as having a different 'language'</li> </ul> <p><b>Two marks</b> maximum for each advantage.</p> |      |          |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|---|------|--|
| 11 (b)   | <p><b>One mark</b> for one partial description of a disadvantage of participant observation. This might be brief, unclear or undeveloped or there may be a description of a disadvantage in general and not related to studying gangs.</p> <p>Possible answers might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• difficulty of getting into a group</li> <li>• difficulty of staying in the group</li> <li>• if covert, there are ethical issues (deception)</li> <li>• very time consuming</li> <li>• observers have to give up their own life / leisure time</li> <li>• very expensive</li> <li>• data gained is only one person's view</li> <li>• interpretation may be biased</li> <li>• lack of validity</li> <li>• difficulty of recording data</li> <li>• if covert there are possible dangers if found out</li> <li>• taking part means a researcher doing things he /she may not want to</li> <li>• the researcher may become part of the group rather than a researcher</li> <li>• If overt the group may act differently because of being watched</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for one clear description of a disadvantage that relates to gangs or Investigation 2</p> <p>Possible answers might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• difficulty of getting into a group- James Patrick met the gang member through his job but not everyone can do this</li> </ul> | 4    | <p>A brief reference to gangs cannot be credited with the additional mark</p> <p>If the disadvantage relates specifically to overt or covert observation, this must be specified for credit to be given.</p> |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|--|------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• being part of a gang could be dangerous – James Patrick had to flee Glasgow to be safe</li> <li>• the researcher in method 3 was young / black / male but an older or female researcher could not become part of a young, male gang</li> <li>• the researcher may not be able to join in with all people in the group – in method 3 the younger and older members of the gang wouldn't accept him</li> <li>• ethical issues if covert – the researchers found out about illegal behaviour which the gang members may not have chosen to reveal or researcher having to take part in illegal activities</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response</p> <p><b>Two</b> marks maximum for each advantage.</p>    |      |  |
| 12       | <p><b>One mark</b> for the correct identification of one way interviews would be useful.</p> <p><b>Two marks</b> for the correct identification of two ways interviews would be useful.</p> <p><b>Three marks</b> for the correct identification of three ways interviews would be useful.</p> <p>Possible answers might include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can ask exactly what you want</li> <li>• Can produce statistical results (numbers / quantitative) if structured</li> <li>• All respondents asked the same questions – can compare answers</li> <li>• Can make generalisations (patterns / trends)</li> <li>• Can ask a large sample/collect large amount of data</li> <li>• Can use a representative sample</li> </ul> | 6    | <p>Answers which identify advantages of interviews through comparison with other methods can be credited eg.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they are better than questionnaires because gang members will be more keen to talk than to read or write</li> <li>• they are better than participant observation because they avoid ethical issues such as having to take part in criminal activities</li> </ul> <p>Credit cannot be given for the same point being repeated e.g. 'interviews are useful to find out about criminal activities' 'interviews are useful to find out about how they got into the gang.'</p> <p>'interviews are useful to find out how girls feel about the gang'</p> <p>Or</p> <p>'interviews are useful to find out how younger members feel about the gang.'</p> |



| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quicker and cheaper than observation</li> <li>• Can get quantitative data if structured</li> <li>• Can get qualitative data if unstructured</li> <li>• If structured, more reliable than other methods</li> <li>• Less likely to be unethical than other methods (people can refuse to take part)</li> <li>• More valid as people are less likely to lie if face to face</li> <li>• More valid as detailed information is gained if unstructured</li> <li>• More valid as respondents can talk about whatever they choose if unstructured</li> <li>• Semi-structured interviews can provide both quantitative and qualitative data</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response.</p> <p>Three marks maximum</p> <p><b>One additional mark</b> for each way which is related to studying gang behaviour or Investigation 2</p> <p>eg. From the interview results, statistics on the age / ethnicity / gender of the gangs can be gained</p> <p>eg. A large sample of gang members from different gangs across different cities could be used.</p> <p>eg. can find out specific information by asking gang members their age/ ethnic group/ crimes and compare answers with a different gang</p> |      |          |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|--|------|---|
| 13       | <p><b>Level 3 [9-12 marks]</b></p> <p>Candidates reveal a good knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of the samples and sampling techniques and can apply this knowledge and examples to the question.</p> <p>Candidates analyse and evaluate the debate in a good way. A wide range of evidence from the methods/sources and wider knowledge is used to critically support substantiated arguments and conclusions in relation to the issue. Meaning is clear.</p> <p>Typically answers will contain a range of sociological ideas and language throughout.</p> <p>Complex ideas will be expressed clearly and fluently using a style of writing appropriate to the subject matter. There may be a few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p> <p>Lower in the level, candidates will respond with developed if not fully balanced arguments evaluating the samples and techniques of sampling used.</p> <p>At the top, candidates will have evaluated a wide range of the samples in depth and consider a range of issues in detail.</p> <p>There will be a more balanced evaluation, considering the advantages and disadvantages in some detail. The response will relate closely to studying criminals. Also at the top candidates may make some suggestion (which may be implicit) as to how the samples and or sampling could have been improved.</p> | 12   | <p>For level 3, reference to some part of both investigations must be made</p> <p>For level 3 there must be at least one advantage and one disadvantage of some of the samples / techniques discussed.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must have identified as least one advantage and disadvantage <b>within</b> at least one of the samples.</p> <p>Responses which provide a general account of the advantages or disadvantages of sampling techniques, without reference to the investigation, can only be credited in level 1.</p> |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <p><b>Level 2 [5-8 marks]</b></p> <p>Candidates reveal a basic knowledge of the advantages / disadvantages of the samples and sampling techniques which is used to analyse and evaluate in a basic way. Relevant information and evidence is presented and meaning is generally clear.</p> <p>Typically answers may contain sociological ideas and may use sociological language.</p> <p>There will be some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar, but these are unlikely to be intrusive or obscure meaning.</p> <p>At the bottom of the level, typical responses will identify and provide some explanation of the advantages or disadvantages of the samples and / or sampling techniques. The range of methods/sources may be narrow and the arguments one-sided.</p> <p>At the top of the level the answer may use a wider range of sources but arguments will not be developed or there may be fewer methods/sources used but explained in some detail. There may be the start of a debate and some (if limited) recognition of advantages of the sampling. There will be links made to studying criminals. Some use of sociological language will be made.</p> <p><b>Level 1 [1-4 marks]</b></p> <p>Candidates reveal a limited knowledge of the advantages / disadvantages of the sampling.</p> |      |          |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <p>Candidates apply limited knowledge and examples to the question.</p> <p>Information and evidence is presented with some lack of clarity and inaccuracy. Arguments and points are interpreted simply.</p> <p>There are likely to be some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar, some of which might be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p>At this level candidates are likely to produce a one-sided argument (most likely disadvantages). This will be based simply on some individual points about sampling. Here is likely to be reference to only one method/source or one investigation.</p> <p>Typical answers at the bottom may be restricted to one or two points about the samples. These are likely to be undeveloped and descriptive points about the samples identified with simple interpretation and little or no attempt to evaluate.</p> <p>Higher in this level there will be more points made and with some simple criticism of the samples, e.g sample size, showing some understanding of where there may be advantages / disadvantages.</p> <p>At this level there will be no or little use of sociological language.</p> <p>Responses which focus on the advantages or disadvantages of sampling generally and are not related to the investigations will be credited at this level</p> |      |          |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
|          | <p>Possible answers could include discussion of some of the following:</p> <p><b>Investigation 1</b></p> <p>Method 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample size dropped to 30</li> <li>• Snowball sampling – may have chosen the ‘best’ prisoners</li> <li>• Those who could not read will not have been chosen</li> <li>• Only one prison</li> <li>• Only in one area of the country</li> <li>• Only a male prison</li> <li>• Ethnic groups / age not identified</li> <li>• Types of criminals not specified</li> <li>• People who have committed crimes but not caught will not be included</li> <li>• Pilot study only 5 and not suitable people</li> <li>• 50 a reasonable sample</li> <li>• Snowball sampling may be the only way to do the research</li> <li>• Selecting a sample from prison fits with the aims</li> </ul> <p>Method 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample of only 2</li> <li>• Both work with offenders so not typical of the population</li> <li>• Different ages</li> <li>• Different genders</li> </ul> |      |          |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <p>Source 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample didn't include those sentenced to more than 4 years</li> <li>• Sample was re-offenders in only one year</li> <li>• Included only those who re-offended within 12 months</li> </ul> <p>Source 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample of only 2 – not representative of all documentaries</li> <li>• From different channels</li> <li>• Different kind of audience</li> <li>• Both are about only 1 prison</li> <li>• A Denmark – not representative of the UK</li> <li>• A violent criminals</li> <li>• B in Leicester – not representative</li> <li>• B a category B prison – only on lifers</li> <li>• Small number of case studies so not representative of all prisoners in the prison</li> </ul> <p><b>Investigation 2</b></p> <p>Source 3</p> <p><b>James Patrick</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one gang based in Glasgow – not representative</li> <li>• From only one area of Glasgow</li> </ul> <p><b>Dick Hobbs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very large sample of 230 – large amount of data and generalisations can be made</li> <li>• Only 7 did not take part so a high response rate</li> </ul> |      |          |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposive sampling so the 'right' people chosen</li> <li>• Respondents in sample fitted with the aims – to research high level drug dealers</li> <li>• No sampling frame available</li> <li>• No guarantee they had sentences of over 7 years</li> <li>• People knowledgeable about drug dealing given under 7 years were excluded</li> <li>• Some people with sentences of over 7 years were not high level drug dealers</li> <li>• Those not convicted would not be included in the sample</li> </ul> <p>Method 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gang was said to be typical of all gangs so a representative sample</li> <li>• Studying one group is usual in PO</li> <li>• Close contact with 20 – still large for PO</li> <li>• Male gang – needs a female gang to understand gang behaviour</li> <li>• Most gang members black – needs gangs of other ethnic groups</li> <li>• Did not talk to the girlfriends so lack of understanding</li> <li>• Did not spend time with all the age ranges</li> <li>• Gang only in Birmingham – does not represent all areas</li> <li>• Personal contacts with the gang may lead to biased information</li> <li>• Gang may not be typical – a subjective view by researcher</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response</p> |      |          |

**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 2015

