

**A LEVEL**

**Examiners' report**

# **SOCIOLOGY**

**H580**

For first teaching in 2015

**H580/03 Autumn 2020 series**

## Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.



Reports for the Autumn 2020 series will provide a broad commentary about candidate performance, with the aim for them to be useful future teaching tools. As an exception for this series they will not contain any questions from the question paper nor examples of candidate answers.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

### Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

## Paper 3 series overview

Paper 3 is an option paper with a compulsory Section A, and then three options in Section B. The paper is demanding, with several different question styles, sources, and extended responses. Overall, the standard was not high in this series and the entry was very small.

Candidates who did well on this paper were able to showcase their knowledge and understanding and wrote in depth, utilising appropriate sociological evidence. Such candidates were also usually able to develop detailed evaluation points, and stay focused on the questions set. However, such responses were rare in this series.

There was often a lack of precise sociological knowledge, with many candidates unable to recall and apply appropriate sociological studies, even in Section B essays. Theoretical understanding was also often limited and confused. In Section A, few candidates used relevant contemporary examples, and many struggled to develop material in the sources beyond basic recycling.

<i>Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:</i>	<i>Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• selected and applied relevant sociological studies and concepts</li> <li>• responded to the questions set and focused their answers</li> <li>• included very clear and explicit evaluation where required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wrote more common-sense based/assertive points</li> <li>• struggled to focus on the precise questions set</li> <li>• demonstrated confusion between theories and studies used</li> <li>• lacked explicit and/or developed evaluation points in longer responses.</li> </ul>

## Section A overview - Globalisation and the digital social world

This section was generally completed to a reasonable standard.

### Question 1

Most candidates did not go further than the examples contained within the sources. Better responses referred to the source(s) to illustrate their points but then developed these further with evidence, including studies (such as Sutton et al) and/ or specific examples. However, very few candidates referred to recent 'events' such as the coronavirus pandemic or the Black Lives Matter protests as examples in their responses, when such examples would have been creditable.

Note: despite the slightly different wording on Question 1 compared to previous series ('With reference to both sources' rather than 'With reference to the source(s)'), candidates who just referred to one of the sources (most likely Source A) were still fully credited.

### Questions 2 and 3

Both questions were generally done well. Some candidates struggled to focus on the precise question. In Question 2 the focus should have been on the impact on 'identity', whereas many were referring more to relationships. Similarly, in Question 3, the focus should have been on 'relationships'. Some candidates just focused on positive and negative impacts in a more general way.

Some candidates are not including any/ enough evaluation – two points of evaluation are suggested for Question 2, and three points of evaluation for Question 3.

#### ***Key point call out***

Questions that have the command terms "to what extent" (Q2) and "evaluate" (Q3) require students to show the skills of evaluation. Some students in these questions are not including any/ enough evaluation – two points of evaluation are suggested for Question 2, and three points of evaluation for Question 3.

## Section B overview - Crime and Deviance

The standard of responses for this option topic was generally low.

### Question 4



The focus on green crime as a 'growing issue' caused some problems. Examples were credited in the same way as sociological studies, but weaker responses tended to list types of green crime, which did not gain much credit.

### Question 5

Evaluation often took the form of juxtaposition, merely presenting other explanations, such as left realist, Marxist or interactionist views, without making any attempt to show why such views would challenge the view in the question.

### Question 6

Some responses struggled to include explicit evaluation, due to the nature of this question. However, if they directly contrasted competing explanations, they were credited in the way that most benefitted them. However, many weaker responses lacked depth of knowledge on explanations, with chivalry and labelling appearing the most, but often being written in a vague way and lacking substantiation.

	<b>Misconception</b>	<p>Almost all the responses to this question confused Right Realism with the New Right, using Murray and ideas on the underclass as their main knowledge points. While these were credited this time, it should be noted by centres that the New Right and Right Realism are distinct theories and should not be taught as interchangeable. Very few candidates used the ideas of Wilson, Wilson &amp; Kelling or Hirschi.</p>
	<b>OCR support</b>	<p>Page 16 of the <a href="#">suggested studies guide</a> lists the separate studies of Right Realism (Wilson, Wilson &amp; Kelling, Wilson &amp; Herrnstein) and the New Right (Murray, Murray and Herrnstein). Hirschi (also listed) can be seen as a Right Realist.</p>

## Section B overview - Education

The standard of responses for this option topic was also quite low.

### Question 7

Some candidates struggled to focus on attainment, and discussed issues such as subject choice or the hidden curriculum. Points must make some link back to attainment to be creditable.


### Question 8

It was surprising that very few candidates seemed to know any studies on labelling, and most could not make any link to Interactionism. Some focused on studies relating to ethnicity or gender, and some used studies which were not actually about labelling though claimed that they were – such as Willis.

Evaluation often took the form of juxtaposition, merely presenting other explanations such as cultural or material deprivation, without making any attempt to show why such views would challenge the view in the question.

### Question 9

Most candidates recognised the ideas of Durkheim, Parsons and Davis & Moore as being the most relevant, with some also applying New Right ideas and/ or linking to policies relating to vocationalism. However, the link to work was often not well developed, and the precision and accuracy with which these ideas were presented varied. Evaluation was often through juxtaposition, without direct evaluative links being made.

	<b>Misconception</b>	Some candidates included very dated material, such as 1970s and 80s feminist studies explaining female underachievement (e.g. Spender), with no apparent awareness that females no longer underachieve. The relevance of teaching such material must be called into question.
---	----------------------	---

## Section B overview - Religion, belief and faith

There were very few responses for this topic. Questions were generally done well, though issues of detail and focus, and problems with juxtaposition were also seen in this topic.

### Question 10

Good comparisons between the US and UK were seen.

### Question 11

Feminist views were sometimes discussed interchangeably with views on gender and religiosity, which are not necessarily the same thing. Evaluation had a tendency to be via juxtaposition.

### Question 12

Most focused well on this debate, though weaker responses changed the focus to whether religion was good or bad, instead of the secularisation debate.


## Key teaching and learning points – comments on improving performance

Use past papers to encourage students to focus on the precise wording of the question. This would also help students decode questions and understand the command terms and when they need to evaluate.

Make sure that in the 'Globalisation and digital social world' topic, issues of identity, relationships and inequality are differentiated and considered separately.

Encourage students to be clear on the different theoretical views within each aspect of their topics, and to have some names to go with each view.

Highlight the difference between juxtaposition and direct evaluation. Merely presenting alternative views, even with the addition of the word 'however' before them is not good evaluation. Students need to practise picking out the differences between different theories, and showing how each would challenge the others.

	<b>AfL</b>	Practise developing direct evaluation skills in a debate style format; one student or group presents a view and others, designated to different theories, must directly challenge and argue with them.
---	------------	--

## Guidance on using this paper as a mock

Consider the wording in Question 1 – this could be amended for use with students so the Question 1 could say, as it will in all future exams, 'With reference to the source(s)'.

This paper could be used as a full mock exam for students or could be split into sections to practise with the candidates after they have completed a section of the course. For example, Section A of this paper could be used after teaching the Globalisation and Digital Social World.

This paper would also be useful to use as a full mock at the end of the two year course since it will help to highlight the key issues and assessment skills of question focus, theoretical confusion and evaluation.

---

# Supporting you

---

## Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

## Supporting you through 2020-2021

Our priority is supporting you and your students this autumn and to support you as you prepare for summer 2021 exams. We'll update our [website information](#) regularly with resources, guidance and key information.

## Take a look at our support for:

- [Teachers](#)
- [Students](#)
- [Exams officers](#)
- [Assessment specialists](#)

## Keep up-to-date

We are sending a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

## OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. All our courses for the academic year 2020-2021 are being delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

## Signed up for Exambuilder?

**ExamBuilder** is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals and Functional Skills qualifications. See the full list of available qualifications in the [sign up form](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.



## Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our Customer Support Centre.

General qualifications

**01223 553998**

**general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk**

Vocational qualifications

**02476 851509**

**vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk**

For more information visit

 [ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/](https://ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/)

 [ocr.org.uk](https://ocr.org.uk)

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

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

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

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

## We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this



OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2020 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.