

**GCE**

**Sociology**

**H580/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities**

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021**

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2021

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Knowledge and understanding point Q3 and 4: strength of the method
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way / detailed Q1 Interpretation/drawing conclusion from the data
	Underdeveloped: partially explained, but requiring more depth
	Q1 – 4: To indicate data taken from the source to support the point On other questions: explicit application to the question (optional)
	Critical evaluation point Q3 and Q4 for weakness of the method
	Juxtaposition of alternative theories/ideas without direct/ explicit evaluation
	Unsubstantiated/ undeveloped/ implicit / accurate without explanation/ substantiation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense/inaccurate
	Irrelevant material/ not clearly focused on question set
	Repetition
	Q5 highlight the social group
	Anecdotal/ common sense/ asociological point
	Q1 – 4: lip service to the source

## MARK SCHEME

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Summarise <b>two</b> patterns or trends in the data shown in <b>Source A</b>.</p> <p><b>AO2: Application</b>  <b>Level 4: 4 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability by clearly and accurately summarising <b>two</b> patterns or trends shown in Source A. At this level, both will be supported by data from the source.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 3 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to summarise two patterns or trends shown in Source A. Data should be accurately interpreted but may be less clearly expressed. At this level answers will typically summarise two patterns or trends but may only support one of them with data from the source.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 2 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to interpret the data. Data should be accurately interpreted, may be less clearly expressed. Candidates will typically either outline just one pattern or trend supported with data or two patterns with neither supported by data.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 mark</b>  The candidate shows a limited ability to interpret data, for example by outlining just one pattern or trend without supporting data or alternatively accurately citing one or more pieces of data without showing how it is part of a pattern or trend</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No ability to interpret data shown, e.g. the candidate misunderstands the data or interprets it entirely inaccurately.</p>	4	<p>Candidates should identify two patterns or trends in the source which are supported by the data.</p> <p>Where candidates summarise more than two patterns or trends marks should be credited for the two best developed points.</p> <p>Examples of trends which might be summarised would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hourly rates of pay have increased between 2013 and 2017 for most ethnic groups with the largest increase for Indians (£1.85 per hour) and Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, Black and other minorities all seeing some increase overall in hourly pay.</li> <li>• One group which has seen their hourly pay fall between 2013 and 2107 is the Mixed group where their pay fell from £11.57 to £10.85 between 2013 and 2015. Since then it has increased to £11.26 in 2017 but this remains a lower rate than what they received in 2013.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of patterns which might be summarised would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indians consistently enjoy the highest hourly rate of pay at £11.29 in 2013 rising to £13.14 in 2017 while the Pakistani/ Bangladeshi group has consistently the lowest rate of pay at £8.27 in 2013 and £9.52 in 2017. The gap between the hourly rate of Indians and Pakistanis/ Bangladeshis has therefore widened between 2013 and 2017.</li> <li>• In 2017 the hourly rate of whites (£11.34) was higher than all the ethnic minorities except Indians. Pakistani/ Bangladeshis had the lowest hourly rate at £9.52, while Indians earned more than all other ethnic groups (including whites) at £13.14.</li> </ul>

					Any other reasonable pattern or trend should be credited, so long as it is supported by the data in the source. However, candidates need to summarise data in some way to reveal a pattern or trend rather than merely reading off statistics from the table.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to <b>Source B</b>, explain <b>two</b> ethical issues which sociologists studying young offenders in a Young Offenders Institution would need to consider in their research.</p> <p><b>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</b>  <b>2 marks</b>  The candidate shows a clear understanding of two ethical issues which sociologists studying young people in a Young Offenders Institution would need to consider in their research.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b>  The candidate clearly explains one issue or shows a partial understanding of two issues.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p> <p><b>AO2: Application</b>  <b>Level 4: 4 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply evidence with a clear ability to support both ways using material from Source B.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 3 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to apply evidence from Source B, for example by showing a clear ability to support one issue and some evidence to support a second, this is likely to be lip service.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 2 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to apply evidence from Source B, for example by using evidence to clearly support one of the issues cited or showing some ability to support two issues with lip service.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 mark</b></p>	6	<p>Examples of ethical issues which candidates might consider would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed consent - Gaining permission from the authorities to undertake the research in the first place would be part of the process of obtaining informed consent. The source states that “the researchers had to obtain permission from the management of the YOI. They eventually convinced them of the value of the project after some negotiation.” The offender themselves were also told they could withdraw from the study at any time.</li> <li>• Avoidance of harm - The Source states that “All of the prisoners had negative life experiences and some had a range of problems such as mental health issues and learning difficulties.” This would mean that the researchers would need to be extremely sensitive in how they dealt with the participants in the survey to avoid upsetting them or exacerbating mental health problems.</li> <li>• Avoidance of harm - The researchers felt some guilt and unease about leaving the YOI, not knowing what would happen to the young offenders after their departure. This suggests that they had some ethical concerns about upsetting the offenders they had worked with by leaving the prison and perhaps never seeing them again.</li> <li>• Confidentiality - The source states that while the participants were assured of confidentiality during the research, the researchers warned those involved that if they informed them of something that would put others in danger, they would have to inform the authorities.” There might therefore be some difficult ethical choices over whether to maintain confidentiality or inform the authorities, for example if one of the participants suggested they might be planning to harm someone else.</li> </ul>

		<p>The candidate shows a limited ability to apply evidence from Source B to support at least one issue. Typically reference made to the source is likely to be lip service only and refer to only one issue.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant application of material from the Source.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Avoidance of deception – The researchers tried to be honest with the participants, for example they explained exactly how long they would be working with them.</li></ul> <p>Any other reasonable response should be credited.</p> <p>To gain application marks candidates should consider specific examples of ethical issues which were raised in this piece of research rather than just discussing ethical issues in general.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to <b>Source A</b>, explain <b>one</b> strength and <b>one</b> weakness of using official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay.</p> <p><b>AO2: Application</b>  <b>Level 4: 4 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply data from <b>Source A</b> in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to both the strength and the weakness identified.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 3 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to apply data from <b>Source A</b> in answering the question. There is an attempt to apply the source material in relation to both the identified strength and the weakness but it is likely to be clearer in relation to one than the other.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 2 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to apply data from <b>Source A</b> in answering the question. There is a clear application of source material in relation to either the strength or the weakness or showing some ability to support two issues with lip service.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 mark</b>  The candidate shows a limited ability to apply data from <b>Source A</b> in answering the question. Typically reference made to the data is likely to be lip service and refer to either a strength or a weakness.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No relevant application of data.</p> <p><b>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</b></p>	10	<p>To gain marks for application candidates must make reference to the data in Source A. Candidates who simply evaluate official statistics in general may score marks for evaluation but not for application.</p> <p>Possible strengths might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References to positivist theory and the use of such data to identify patterns and trends such as the extent to which ethnic differences in pay are increasing/ decreasing.</li> <li>• The objective nature of such statistics as they are collected as part of a government sponsored survey.</li> <li>• The ability to quantify the extent of inequality. Using such data allows us to see the precise extent of the pay gap between ethnic groups and the extent to which it is changing.</li> <li>• The representativeness of such data as it is likely to be based on a large and nationally representative sample.</li> <li>• The reliability of the research. Government surveys are usually carried out every year using similar methods and produce consistent findings suggesting it is reliable.</li> <li>• The research is valid as it accurately measures what it aims to. It is likely to provide accurate data on the earnings of different ethnic groups which allows for valid comparisons to be made.</li> </ul> <p>Possible weaknesses might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References to interpretivist theory, e.g. this type of data fails to understand subjective aspects of ethnic differences in pay, for example the meanings and interpretations attached to their level of pay by members of different ethnic groups.</li> <li>• The data from the survey is purely quantitative and qualitative data, for example on workers experiences of inequalities in pay would offer a richer and more detailed understanding of the issue.</li> </ul>



	<p><b>Level 4: 5–6 marks</b> The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate of the use of official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay considering both a strength and a weakness. Both points should be clearly developed and supported by methodological concept(s) and/or theory. At the bottom of the level, one is likely to be less developed.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 4 marks</b> The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate the use of official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay by considering both a strength and a weakness, one of which will be supported by methodological concept(s) and or theory. The development of the evaluation is likely to be uneven in terms of coverage of the two points with one idea likely to be underdeveloped.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 2–3 marks</b> The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate using official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay i.e. a less developed evaluation of both an advantage and a disadvantage. Methodological concept(s) may be undeveloped or implicit. OR the candidate may consider only a strength or a weakness offering a clear and developed evaluation supported by methodological concept(s) and or theory.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 mark</b> The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate using official statistics to study ethnic differences in pay. Candidates will typically present a less developed evaluation of either a strength or a weakness.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The data from the survey is purely descriptive of the extent of the ethnic pay gap and does not offer an explanation of it or why it may be decreasing.</li> <li>• Issues of validity, for example does this data fully represent individuals earnings as it may not cover earnings not disclosed to tax authorities e.g. pay from informal work or self-employment.</li> <li>• Validity of ethnic categories – The data is classified according to official government categories which may not be particularly useful, for example Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are categorised as one group and Black-Caribbean's and not distinguished from Black Africans nor are White British distinguished from other white groups.</li> <li>• Issues of representativeness. We do not know the size of the sample or how the data was collected so it may not be nationally representative. The survey presumably only covers employees so may not reflect the earnings of other groups such as the self-employed or the unemployed.</li> </ul> <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded.</p>
--	---	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p data-bbox="255 212 282 231">*</p> <p data-bbox="360 212 1093 308">Using <b>Source B</b> and your wider sociological knowledge explain and evaluate the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution.</p> <p data-bbox="360 379 875 443"><b>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</b> <b>Level 4: 4–5 marks</b></p> <p data-bbox="360 448 1093 715">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. The response will use a wide range of accurate methodological theory and concepts. There is a well–developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p data-bbox="360 751 1066 847"><i>There will typically be four well-developed methodological concepts or theories, or three well-developed with theory towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p data-bbox="360 887 595 919"><b>Level 3: 3 marks</b></p> <p data-bbox="360 924 1106 1257">The candidate shows a good understanding of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in this context. Knowledge will have either range or depth. There will be some understanding of methodological concepts and/or theories but these may not be fully developed. Responses are generally clear and accurate, though may contain some errors. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most–part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p data-bbox="360 1294 1039 1358"><i>There will typically be 2 developed or three underdeveloped methodological concepts or theory.</i></p>	25	<p data-bbox="1261 212 2085 443"><b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b> Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by qualitative methods. Discussion of the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability in relation to the relevant qualitative methods is also expected. This should relate to consideration of the context of the research i.e. researching young people in a Young Offenders Institution.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 483 2069 611">The response may also relate the selection or choice of methods to the research aim. Candidates should be rewarded for appropriate application of theoretical perspectives to their discussion e.g. interpretivism and positivism.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 651 2096 1090"><b>AO2: Application</b> Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge and understanding of the use of qualitative methods and how these might be applied to the study of young offenders in a Young Offenders Institution. Candidates are expected to apply material drawn from the Source in answering the question. For example, they might point to evidence that the mixture of qualitative data allowed the researchers to gain a deeper and more detailed understanding of the lives of the young offenders and their reasons for offending. The best candidates are likely to consider the unique difficulties of researching in a Young Offenders Institution and apply this to their discussion of the methods employed.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 1129 2074 1329"><b>AO3: Analysis and Evaluation</b> Candidates should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative methods, especially in relation to the concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability, and relate this to the context of the question, researching young people in a Young Offenders Institution.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 1361 1989 1393">In terms of positive evaluation candidates might include:</p>

		<p><b>Level 2: 2 marks</b> The candidate shows a basic understanding of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in this context. The response lacks range and depth and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate, and contain errors; however, the candidate does establish the basic meaning of structured interviews. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, implicit, inaccurate or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure.</p> <p><i>Typically there will be one developed methodological concept or theory or two underdeveloped, concepts and theory may be implicit.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 mark</b> The candidate shows a limited understanding of the use of qualitative methods. The response lacks range and detail and may show considerable inaccuracy and/or lack of clarity. The candidate may simply describe an aspect of the method and/or research methods in general. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p><i>Typically there will be one underdeveloped idea or one or more undeveloped ideas without methodological concepts and theory.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretivism – using qualitative methods allows a richer/deeper understanding of subjects’ social worlds giving a more valid insight into their social reality/meanings e.g. young offenders were able to talk about their experiences in their own words in a relatively informal manner.</li> <li>• Validity – using qualitative methods is likely to produce more valid responses because the researchers built rapport with their subjects and sought to establish empathy with them.</li> <li>• Reducing distance/barriers between the researchers and the researched – by making it clear they were not prison staff by using first names and adopting an informal style of research the researchers brought themselves down to the level of their subjects allowing for greater rapport.</li> <li>• The study was successful in giving a voice to a group of young people who might normally be misunderstood or marginalised. This was probably only possible using this type of methodology, e.g. some offenders may have struggled to complete a questionnaire because of literacy problems and many would have been reluctant to open up in a formal interview.</li> <li>• Ethics - The methods used in the study were ethically sensitive, for example respecting confidentiality and trying to minimise any risks of harm to the subjects.</li> <li>• Representativeness – although subjects were not selected using a random sampling method and were only drawn from one institution, the insights from them might be generalisable to other young offenders assuming that what the researchers observed was typical of other offenders and other institutions.</li> <li>• Practical issues – Although the research took some weeks to complete it was relatively small scale so would have not been too costly in terms of time and money. The constraints of the institutional setting and the nature of the subjects also meant that the methods adopted were probably more practical than possible alternatives.</li> <li>• Candidates may also consider why the researchers did not consider alternative methods e.g. questionnaires or</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

	<p><b>AO2: Application</b>  <b>Level 4: 4–5 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution in an explicit way. At the top of the level application will be wide ranging. The material is related to the question.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 3 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (young people in a Young Offenders Institution) in a mostly explicit way. Some of the material may be more implicitly related to the question.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 2 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (young people in a Young Offenders Institution). Explicit application is likely to be very narrow. The material is related to the question occasionally and mainly implicitly.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 mark</b>  The candidate shows a limited ability to relate the use of qualitative methods to the context of the research in Source B (young people in a Young Offenders Institution). The material is only implicitly related to the question and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No relevant sociological application.</p>	<p>structured interviews and point to the idea that these would be less likely to elicit positive responses from the young offenders or provide the kind of detailed insight being sought by the researchers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value for policy making – Research on young offenders might help to give an insight into reasons for their offending and how they might be turned away from offending.</li> <li>• Triangulation – Using a variety of methods would allow researchers to triangulate and compare data drawn from one method such as interviews with another such as observation.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of critical points candidates might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positivist theory – Would have preference for objective/statistical methods. The study could be seen as too subject to bias and based on personal interpretations of the researchers.</li> <li>• Representativeness – The sample was very small (18 offenders in 1 institution eventually reduced to 14) and was based on volunteers who might not be typical of all inmates.</li> <li>• Generalisability – Findings would not be generalisable to all young offenders as the research was based on just one YOI which might not be typical.</li> <li>• Reliability – The study was very dependent on the personalities of the researchers and the way they interacted with their subjects. This would be difficult to replicate and a similar study carried out by other researchers might produce very different results.</li> <li>• Validity – We cannot be sure of whether the researchers gained a truthful picture of their subjects. The nature of the institution and the fact that the young people were offenders might mean that they held back a lot of information from the researchers or were not entirely truthful about some issues.</li> <li>• Time and cost – Although not as costly as large scale surveys, the study was quite time consuming and subjects might only have started to open up to the researchers in the later stages of the study.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

		<p><b>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</b>  <b>Level 4: 12–15 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. Responses will include a wide range of explicit and relevant evaluative points and may make some comparison with other methodologies. There will be a discussion of qualitative methods in relation to the purpose of the research. The evaluation will be sustained, balanced and the discussion will be related to using qualitative data in this research context. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed. The candidate may reach a critical and reasoned conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be four well-developed evaluative points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p><b>Level 3: 8–11 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. Responses will include a wide range or depth of explicit and relevant evaluative points and may make some comparison with other methodologies. Responses will raise a few clear points of evaluation but may leave these only partially developed. The evaluation is not necessarily balanced. At the top of the level points start to be developed. The candidate may reach a critical but brief conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be three developed evaluative points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of data – This type of study would produce a whole range of qualitative data which would be complex and time consuming to analyse. Conclusions drawn from the data would also be dependent on the choices made about which data to select or emphasise meaning a risk of bias from the researchers.</li> <li>• Ethical issues – although the research was ethically sensitive it was clear that some of the young offenders were upset when the offenders departed and this was an ethical issue that the researchers themselves were concerned about.</li> </ul> <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><b>Level 2: 4–7 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the use of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. Responses are likely to offer a few generalised, evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument or listing strengths and weaknesses. If present, different methodological approaches are likely to be juxtaposed simply and/or implicitly. At the bottom of the level there should be at least two evaluative points. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1: 1–3 marks</b>  The candidate shows a limited ability to evaluate and analyse the usefulness of qualitative methods to research young people in a Young Offenders Institution. Responses should include at least one point of evaluation, however, this is likely to be minimal, unbalanced, assertive one-sided or tangential to the main issue. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or assertion.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p data-bbox="255 204 300 236">*</p> <p data-bbox="360 209 1077 272">Outline ways in which gender can influence a person's life chances.</p> <p data-bbox="360 309 875 373"><b>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</b> <b>Level 4: 10–12 marks</b></p> <p data-bbox="360 378 1104 745">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of ways in which gender can influence a person's life chances. The response demonstrates a wide range and depth of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts the material is generally accurate. There will be reference to at least two areas of social life (e.g. education and income). At the bottom of the level evidence may be slightly less developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p data-bbox="360 783 1061 884"><i>There will typically be four well-developed knowledge points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p data-bbox="360 920 629 952"><b>Level 3: 7–9 marks</b></p> <p data-bbox="360 957 1088 1324">The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of ways in which gender can influence a person's life chances. The response shows knowledge and understanding which will demonstrate either depth or a wide range. There will be a range of sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts but they may not be fully developed. Responses are generally clear and accurate, though may contain some errors. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p data-bbox="360 1329 1099 1425"><i>There will typically be three developed knowledge points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be one developed and one</i></p>	20	<p data-bbox="1261 209 2101 475">Candidates should show an understanding of the concepts of gender and life chances. Better answers may also consider how gender intersects with other inequalities (e.g. social class or ethnicity) to create disadvantages in life chances. Such knowledge should be rewarded but is not a prerequisite for a top level answer. There are a wide range of possible ways to respond to this question and candidates are only expected to explore some of these.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 512 2056 576">Most candidates are likely to focus on ways on which women have poorer life chances than men, such as:</p> <ul data-bbox="1261 580 2101 1433" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1261 580 2101 815">• Life chances in work and employment e.g. men more likely to be in paid work, men more likely to gain higher level jobs/become senior managers or directors, risks of losing job through pregnancy, effect of childcare and domestic responsibilities on women's chances of working full-time or seeking promotion. Candidate may reference a wide range of sources e.g. ONS, EHRC, Fawcett Society, UK Feminista.</li> <li data-bbox="1261 820 2101 1054">• Life chances in terms achieving high incomes and wealth e.g. gender pay gap, higher chances of women suffering poverty, more women on minimum wage, higher proportion of very wealthy people are male, women more likely to head lone parent families with greater chances of poverty. Again a wide range of sources could be applied e.g. Low Pay Commission, Fawcett Society, DWP.</li> <li data-bbox="1261 1059 2101 1262">• Some candidates may also offer more theoretical or conceptual answers, for example referencing the impact of the dual labour market (Barron and Norris), vertical and horizontal segregation or women's position in the reserve army of Labour (Breugel). Such responses should be focused on how gender affects women's life chances.</li> <li data-bbox="1261 1267 2101 1331">• Chances of upward mobility e.g. studies such as Li and Devine, Savage.</li> <li data-bbox="1261 1335 2101 1433">• Women's responsibilities in relation to family life and childcare and how these impact on life chances in other areas, candidates may consider concepts such as dual</li> </ul>

		<p><i>underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p> <p><b>Level 2: 4–6 marks</b> The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of at least one way in which gender can influence a person's life chances. The response lacks depth and range. Knowledge and understanding of sociological evidence, theories and concepts may be partial, inaccurate, confused, implicit and/or undeveloped. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by some limited evidence.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1: 1–3 marks</b> The candidate shows limited knowledge and understanding of ways way in which gender can influence a person's life chances. The response may be narrow and undeveloped, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity. The candidate may simply describe an aspect of gender inequality without linking it to life chances. The information is limited and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or a vague representation.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p>		<p>burden, triple shift and the unequal domestic division of labour, cite statistical evidence from sources such as the BSAS and/or more theoretical approaches e.g. Delphy and Leonard.</p> <p>Some candidates may also consider how men's life chances are affected by their gender, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Males more likely to be criminalised and labelled as deviant, candidates may reference Home Office crime statistics, concept of crisis in masculinity (e.g. Mac an Ghail), studies of gangs (e.g. Harding).</li> <li>• Educational achievement – Candidates may cite data on exam results and HE entry (e.g. DfE statistics), statistics on school exclusions and levels of literacy (National Literacy Trust). May also reference studies on school subcultures (e.g. Willis, Mac an Ghail) and boys attitudes to education (Francis).</li> <li>• Health chances and mortality – Longer life expectancy of females (Department of Health, ONS), higher risks of heart disease and certain cancers for men (ONS), higher suicide rate for males (ONS), higher chances of drug and alcohol problems for males (ONS).</li> <li>• Workplace inequalities – higher chances of industrial accidents and deaths for males (HSE), longer working hours for men (ONS), least desirable and most dangerous jobs done mainly by men (Benatar).</li> <li>• Family life – men having less chance of time with families because of long working hours (EOC), fathers less likely to gain custody of children following divorce, men have less parental rights e.g. in relation to leave from work than women.</li> </ul> <p>Although there is little material in textbooks, some candidates may consider the life chances of trans people or those who reject binary gender categories and how this may impact on life chances e.g. in relation to work, education, family life or other areas.</p>
--	--	---	--	---



		<p>No relevant knowledge or understanding.</p> <p><b>A02: Application</b>  <b>Level 4: 7–8 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply sociological knowledge. A wide range of material is explicitly and consistently related to the question.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 5–6 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to apply sociological knowledge. A range of material is explicitly related to the question but this may not be consistently applied.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 3–4 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to apply sociological knowledge. The material is related to the question occasionally and mainly implicitly.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1–2 marks</b>  The candidate shows a limited ability to apply sociological knowledge. The material is only implicitly related to the question and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No relevant sociological application.</p>		<p>Any other reasonable responses should be rewarded, though candidates should focus material on the question (the influence of gender on life chances) and support points with evidence.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p data-bbox="255 209 277 225">*</p> <p data-bbox="360 209 1037 272">Assess Weber's view that inequalities in society are explained by differences in class, status and party.</p> <p data-bbox="360 309 871 373"><b>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</b> <b>Level 4: 13–16 marks</b></p> <p data-bbox="360 379 1093 743">The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of Weber's concepts of class, status and party and how they explain inequalities in society. The response demonstrates knowledge of a wide range of sociological material in depth, including clear understanding of sociological concepts and theory; the material is generally accurate. At the bottom of the level material may be slightly less developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p data-bbox="360 783 1059 879"><i>There will typically be four well-developed knowledge points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p data-bbox="360 919 640 951"><b>Level 3: 9–12 marks</b></p> <p data-bbox="360 957 1084 1324">The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of Weber's concepts of class, status and party and how they explain inequalities in society. The response shows knowledge and understanding with range or depth. There will be some understanding of sociological evidence, theory and/or concepts but they may not be fully developed. Responses are generally clear and accurate, though may contain some errors. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p data-bbox="360 1364 1097 1423"><i>There will typically be three developed knowledge points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the</i></p>	40	<p data-bbox="1261 209 2092 440">Candidates should show an understanding of Weber's concepts of class, status and party. Good candidates may also consider related concepts such as market situation, life chances, social closure and power (though this is not essential for a good answer). Better answers may refer to more recent theories or studies of inequalities in British society today which have been influenced by Weber.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 480 2085 576">Candidates may also consider how Weberian theories could be applied to understanding different types of social inequalities, i.e. social class, gender, ethnicity and/or age.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 616 2029 679">To achieve full marks, candidates must explicitly refer to all three concepts of class, status and party.</p> <p data-bbox="1261 719 2085 783">Candidates might consider the following in support of Weberian theories:</p> <ul data-bbox="1261 790 2098 1398" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of social class – based on market situation, four class model, possible comparison with Marxist theory, influence on later occupational/multi class models e.g. Hope-Goldthorpe scale, NS-SEC classification. Relevance of concept of middle class to UK society e.g. growth of service economy/non-manual employment. Relevance of division between wealthy upper class and petit bourgeoisie e.g. survival/growth of small businesses and self-employed in UK.</li> <li>• Concept of life chances in relation to social class – Candidates may cite a wide range of evidence on social class and its influence on life chances linking it to Weber's original concept. May also link Weberian theory to social mobility research (e.g. Goldthorpe's use of multi-class model based on market situation of occupational groups). Some candidates may also discuss the extent to which social groups operate closure in order to defend their own privileges or opportunities.</li> </ul>

	<p><i>bottom of the level there may be one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth)</i></p> <p><b>Level 2: 5–8 marks</b>                  The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of Weberian concepts. The response lacks range and depth, and may occasionally be unclear or inaccurate, and contain errors. Knowledge and understanding of concepts may be partial, inaccurate and undeveloped or omitted. There may be reliance on anecdotal examples. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed knowledge point.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1: 1–4 marks</b>                  The candidate shows a limited knowledge and understanding of Weberian concepts. The response lacks range and depth, and shows considerable inaccuracy and lack of clarity; the candidate may simply describe an aspect of inequality in general. There is likely to be a tendency towards common sense knowledge. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or a vague representation.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b>                  No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of status – Importance of status divisions cutting across class divisions, candidates may refer to examples of gender, ethnicity or age creating status distinctions separate from social class. Parkin’s concept of negatively privileged status groups.</li> <li>• Concept of party/power – Evidence that power may be separate from class position/ economic wealth e.g. role of political parties, pressure groups, trade unions, new social movements. Emergence of new political identities separate from social class (e.g. Beck).</li> <li>• Candidates may also consider how Weberian concepts have been used in understanding gender inequalities (e.g. Barron and Norris, dual labour market theory), ethnic inequalities (e.g. social closure and discrimination against minorities, Rex and Tomlinson and underclass theory), and age inequalities (Parkin, old age as a negatively privileged status or Turner’s exchange theory)</li> <li>• Some candidates may also refer to cross-cultural material e.g. how status plays a significant role in caste type systems e.g. India, in ‘race’ based systems e.g. apartheid/ segregation in Southern USA, or in gerontocracies and societies practising senicide.</li> </ul> <p>In critical evaluation candidates could apply a variety of theoretical approaches including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marxist theory (e.g. Westergaard and Resler) – Weberian theory obscures fundamental importance of social class and economic inequalities by focusing on other aspects. Over-emphasises the role of social groups pursuing their own interests rather than of capitalism in creating social inequalities.</li> <li>• Feminist theories (e.g. Abbott and Wallace) – Weberian theory gives insufficient attention to issues of gender e.g. Goldthorpe’s mobility research only based on men. Concept of life chances originally mainly applied to social class rather than gender.</li> <li>• Functionalism – Weberian concepts tend to imply that social inequalities are designed to benefit privileged social groups</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	<p><b>AO2: Application</b>  <b>Level 4: 7–8 marks</b>  The candidate shows an excellent ability to apply sociological knowledge and evidence both for and against the view. The material is explicitly and consistently related to the question.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 5–6 marks</b>  The candidate shows a good ability to apply sociological knowledge and evidence to the question. Some material is explicitly related to the view.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 3–4 marks</b>  The candidate shows a basic ability to apply sociological knowledge to the question. The material is related to the view occasionally.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1–2 marks</b>  Candidates show a limited ability to apply sociological knowledge to the question. The material is only implicitly related to the view and mainly irrelevant or of marginal relevance.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  No relevant sociological application.</p> <p><b>AO3: Analysis and evaluation</b>  <b>Level 4: 13–16 marks</b>  Candidates show an excellent ability to evaluate and analyse Weber’s concepts of class, status and party and how they explain inequalities in society. Responses will include a wide range of sustained and explicit evaluative arguments with depth. There will be a discussion of different theoretical approaches. At the top of the level answers will reach a conclusion. At the bottom of the level the evaluation may be slightly less developed.</p>	<p>while functionalists (e.g. Davies and Moore) argue they are functional and beneficial to society as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functionalism/New Right – Social inequalities can be seen to be derived from natural/biological differences rather than socially constructed differences such as class/status/party.</li> <li>• Postmodernism – Theories of social class including Weber’s are now out of date as society has become increasingly individualised with stratification based on cultural rather than economic differences (Pakulsi and Waters, Beck).</li> <li>• Candidates may also offer critical evaluation of specific applications of Weberian theory by modern sociologists. For example, dual labour market theory criticised by radical feminists for blaming gender inequality on the working of the labour market (class/market situation) rather than on patriarchy, Rex and Tomlinson’s underclass theory exaggerates the importance of racial divisions (based on status) between different groups and workers and ignores the extent to which all workers are equally exploited by capitalism, social action approaches deriving from Weber e.g. of age inequality can be criticised for adopting too micro sociological an approach and ignoring the importance of structural features creating social inequalities.</li> </ul> <p>This is a very broad question so candidates should not be expected to consider every form of social inequality. Answers which show an understanding of the key concepts and apply them in a relevant way should be rewarded.</p>
--	---	---

		<p><i>There will typically be four well-developed evaluative points, or three well-developed points and one underdeveloped point towards the bottom of the level.</i></p> <p><b>Level 3: 9–12 marks</b> Candidates show a good ability to evaluate and analyse the view. Responses will demonstrate range or depth of evaluation. At the top of the level there will be some discussion of different sociological evidence, theories and/or concepts. The candidate may reach a brief conclusion.</p> <p><i>There will typically be three developed evaluative points or a wider range of underdeveloped points. Towards the bottom of the level there may be one developed and one underdeveloped point (showing some range and some depth).</i></p> <p><b>Level 2: 5–8 marks</b> Candidates show a basic ability to evaluate and analyse the view. The response lacks range and depth. Responses are likely to offer a few generalised, evaluative points with little supporting evidence or argument. If present, different sociological evidence is likely to be juxtaposed simply and implicitly. If present, the conclusion is likely to be summative.</p> <p><i>There will typically be two underdeveloped / unsubstantiated points or one developed evaluative point.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1: 1–4 marks</b> Candidates show a limited ability to evaluate and the view. Evaluation is implicit, minimal, assertive or tangential to the main issue. There is unlikely to be a conclusion.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p><i>There will typically be one or two undeveloped/ unsubstantiated points or assertion.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant sociological evaluation or analysis</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**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