Section C: Deprivation

9   **Fig. 7A shows deprivation in Scotland in 1981, by Health Board, and Fig. 7B locates the Boards.   Fig. 8 shows the populations of each Health Board classified by one measure of deprivation.   Fig. 9 shows the cycle of deprivation as it appears on a government website.**

    (a)   **Using Figs 7A and 7B, name, and describe the location of, the Health Boards with the highest level of deprivation.   [2]**

            Glasgow, Lanarkshire, and Argyll and Clyde. Three adjacent Health Boards in central western Scotland (or similar).

    (b)   **Identify the Health Board with the lowest level of deprivation in Fig. 7A and compare it with what is shown in Fig. 8.   Comment on your findings to justify the mapping.   [4]**

            The lowest level of deprivation in Fig. 7A was in Grampian. In Fig. 8, however, three Health Boards (Borders, Dumfries and Galloway, and Highland) show no 'deprived 6/7'population, whereas Grampian shows approx. 5% 'deprived 6/7'. The two figures therefore appear contradictory. The mapping in Fig. 7A must take into account Grampian's large 'affluent 1/2' population, approx. 38%, more than in any other Health Board, in showing Grampian as the least deprived population <u>overall</u>, despite its small deprived population.

    (c)   **A decision has been made to update the information given in Figs 7A, 7B and 8 using data from the 2011 Census.   Why might this be difficult to achieve?**

            Candidates may recognise a number of different reasons why updating the information may prove difficult. These may include issues such as the comparability, or lack of comparability, of Health Board areas following name and/or boundary changes, and of categories of census data over time. It may be impossible to calculate the index of deprivation in the same manner as before, because of one or more such changes. There may be practical issues, for example of funding. Candidates may have knowledge of changes consequent on the establishment of the Scottish Parliament and new governance structures in Scotland, or of questions about the nature of the 2011 Census, but a full response can be made at the conceptual or theoretical level.   **[6]**

            L3 (5–6 marks)
            Detailed explanation of potential difficulties showing judgment.
            Wide and robust use of evidence from figures.

            L2 (3–4 marks)
            Partial explanation of two or more potential difficulties.
            Provides some evidence from the figures at the top end of this level.

            L1 (0–2 marks)
            Simple description of one or more difficulties, perhaps lacking explanation.
            Use of data support is inaccurate or lacking.

(d)   **In 1983 government funding of the Tayside Health Board was increased.**
       substantially. Suggest how far Figs 7A, 8 and 9 help to explain this
       decision.   **[8]**

Fig. 7A shows Tayside clearly as in the 4th quintile (so above average, quite
deprived, but not the worst) and as a physically extensive region in central
Scotland, with less deprived neighbours, notably Grampian.
Fig. 8 shows the disparities within the population of Tayside, including a
significant 'deprived 6/7' population, approx. 15%, so helps to indicate need in
a broad manner.
Fig. 9 is a simplistic representation of a cycle of deprivation which, although
general, does attempt to show the interconnectedness of factors resulting in
deprivation. 'Poor Health' is expressly mentioned, linked to environmental
factors. Fig. 9 is not specific to Tayside in any way but is applicable.
The figures are limited as background to this funding decision. They give no
specific information about health and disease in Tayside at the time, such as the
prevalence of smoking. There is nothing about what the funding was to
be used for by the Health Board. A spatial breakdown of deprivation within
Tayside would be useful to have, for example, in order to compare deprived areas
of a city, such as Dundee, with rural areas, which may be deprived in other ways.

L3 (6–8 marks)
Clear and detailed assessment of the usefulness of the three figures and their
limitations.
Extensive support for the assessment made.

L2 (3–5 marks)
Some assessment of the usefulness and/or limitations of at least two figures.
Provides support for some observations.

L1 (0–2 marks)
Limited ability to interpret the figures. May describe or provide unconnected
comments.
No attempt to evaluate.

                                                                                           [Total: 20]

10   (a)   Fig. 10 shows information about the homeless population of the USA in 2006.

Assess whether a typical profile of an American homeless person can be proposed from the evidence in Fig. 10.   [5]

The notion of how typical or untypical an element is involves analysis and judgement.   Media and policymakers, as two groups, commonly deal in such simplifications: others, including demographers and geographers tend to recognise complexity.   For example, although in each section of the figure, the highest bar (the most frequently occurring) shows single men, African American and substance abusers; there is the strong incidence of families with children, Caucasians and the disabled also. It is highly creditable to point out that there are no links made between the three categories, so it is unclear what percentage of single men are both African American and abuse substances, etc.   The untypical, such as youths or homeless persons of Asian origin, can be established with greater certainty.

L3 (4–5 marks)
Clear and detailed assessment of the homeless population in relation to the idea of a typical profile. Extensive and accurate data support for the assessment made.

L2 (2–3 marks)
Some assessment of the homeless population in relation to the idea of a typical profile. Provides data support for some of the observations made at the top end of this level.

L1 (0–1 marks)
Limited ability to interpret data about the homeless population, may simply describe. Use of data support is inaccurate or lacking.

(b)   'Deprivation is easier to recognise than it is to define.'

From your wider study of deprivation, to what extent do you agree with this assertion?   [10]

Candidates should consider both elements of the statement, in a reasonably balanced manner and come to their own supported position.

Recognising deprivation might include:
  • who recognises deprivation (e.g. national government and local government, officially; charities, the media, ordinary people)
  • dimensions of deprivation (e.g. individual, household, community; external traits and internal/hidden traits)
  • aspects of relative easiness and relative difficulty.
The definition of deprivation might include:
  • different definitions of deprivation (affected by time, culture, politics, etc.)
  • a critical appreciation of single criterion and multiple criteria measures.

High-achieving candidates may observe that deprivation is easier to define than to recognise and substantiate the counter-argument.

L3 (8–10 marks)
Detailed assessment of recognition and definition of deprivation, clearly based in candidate's wider study. Critical appraisal of both elements.

L2 (5–7 marks)
Some assessment of the assertion, perhaps focussed on one case or context and with limited attention to either the element of recognition or of definition. Some links to candidate's wider study.

L1 (0–4 marks)
Little or no assessment of recognising and defining deprivation. May be simply generally descriptive of one or more deprived contexts.

[Total: 15]

11   With reference to your own investigation of deprivation, discuss the strengths and limitations of the use of primary sources and secondary sources of information.

Begin by stating the question or hypothesis that you investigated.   [15]

Candidates should base their responses firmly in the results of their own investigation and quote evidence from that investigation to establish clearly the strengths and limitations of the primary and secondary sources used. Strengths of primary sources are likely to focus upon issues of reliability, which could be related to sampling techniques and sizes, accuracy of any equipment used and diligence in the collection process. Strengths of secondary sources are likely to focus on the reliability of published material. Limitations of primary sources are likely to focus on the difficulties involved in the data collection process, while limitations of secondary sources might consider how up-to-date the material is and the scale at which the material is available. Candidates should consider both strengths and weaknesses of both sources of information and provide some assessment of these strengths and weaknesses.

Possible strengths could include:
- a carefully and logically structured sampling framework with a good sample size that covered the area(s) chosen for study fully;
- the use of repeated readings to increase accuracy;
- the reliability of any equipment used and the diligence with which it was operated;
- the reliability of secondary sources used, which might include base maps at different scales, geology maps, hydrological and precipitation data from official sources.

Possible limitations could include:
- practical considerations, such as weather conditions, time limitations, accessibility and minimising risk;
- problems experienced with the equipment used;
- how up-to-date the secondary sources were;
- the scale at which secondary data were available.

L4 (13–15 marks)
Candidates cover a range of possible strengths and weaknesses of both primary and secondary sources. Discussions are detailed and show a clear understanding of the nature of

the strengths and weaknesses identified. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is clear. The whole answer is clearly built around the candidate's own investigation.

L3 (10–12 marks)
Candidates cover a range of possible strengths and weaknesses of both primary and secondary sources. Discussions are detailed and show an understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified, but may show an imbalance between primary and secondary sources or between strengths and weaknesses. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is present. The answer makes appropriate reference to the candidate's own investigation.

L2 (7–9 marks)
Candidates cover a narrow range of possible strengths and weaknesses of both primary and secondary sources. Discussions are sound and show some understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified, but show an imbalance between primary and secondary sources or between strengths and weaknesses. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is present, but lacks any development. The answer makes appropriate reference to the candidate's own investigation, but some points made are rather generalised.

L1 (0–6 marks)
Candidates cover a narrow range of possible strengths and weaknesses and may concentrate on either primary or secondary sources. Discussions lack detail but show some understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is likely to be absent. The answer makes little appropriate reference to the candidate's own investigation, but some points made are rather generalised.

12 **In your own investigation of deprivation, to what extent could the variations you found be explained?**

Begin by stating the question or hypothesis that you investigated. **[15]**

Candidates should base their responses firmly in the results of their own investigation and quote evidence from that investigation to establish clearly the strengths and limitations of the primary and secondary sources used. Strengths of primary sources are likely to focus upon issues of reliability, which could be related to sampling techniques and sizes, accuracy of any equipment used and diligence in the collection process. Strengths of secondary sources are likely to focus on the reliability of published material. Limitations of primary sources are likely to focus on the difficulties involved in the data collection process, while limitations of secondary sources might consider how up-to-date the material is and the scale at which the material is available. Candidates should consider both strengths and weaknesses of both sources of information and provide some assessment of these strengths and weaknesses.

Possible strengths could include:
- a carefully and logically structured sampling framework with a good sample size that covered the area(s) chosen for study fully;
- the use of repeated readings to increase accuracy;
- the reliability of any equipment used and the diligence with which it was operated;
- the reliability of secondary sources used, which might include base maps at different scales, geology maps, hydrological and precipitation data from official sources.

Possible limitations could include:
- practical considerations, such as weather conditions, time limitations, accessibility and minimising risk;
- problems experienced with the equipment used;
- how up-to-date the secondary sources were;
- the scale at which secondary data were available.

L4 (13–15 marks)
Candidates cover a range of possible strengths and weaknesses of both primary and secondary sources. Discussions are detailed and show a clear understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is clear. The whole answer is clearly built around the candidate's own investigation.

L3 (10–12 marks)
Candidates cover a range of possible strengths and weaknesses of both primary and secondary sources. Discussions are detailed and show an understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified, but may show an imbalance between primary and secondary sources or between strengths and weaknesses. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is present. The answer makes appropriate reference to the candidate's own investigation.

L2 (7–9 marks)
Candidates cover a narrow range of possible strengths and weaknesses of both primary and secondary sources. Discussions are sound and show some understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified, but show an imbalance between primary and secondary sources or between strengths and weaknesses. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is present, but lacks any development. The answer makes appropriate reference to the candidate's own investigation, but some points made are rather generalised.

L1 (0–6 marks)
Candidates cover a narrow range of possible strengths and weaknesses and may concentrate on either primary or secondary sources. Discussions lack detail but show some understanding of the nature of the strengths and weaknesses identified. An assessment of the importance of these strengths and weaknesses is likely to be absent. The answer makes little appropriate reference to the candidate's own investigation, but some points made are rather generalised.