



GCE

Sociology

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS **H180**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2017 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

The report also includes:

- An invitation to get involved in Cambridge Assessment's research into **how current reforms are affecting schools and colleges**
- Links to important documents such as **grade boundaries**
- A reminder of our **post-results services** including Enquiries About Results
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme
- A link to our handy Teacher Guide on **Supporting the move to linear assessment** to support you with the ongoing transition

Understanding how current reforms are affecting schools and colleges

Researchers at Cambridge Assessment¹ are undertaking a research study to better understand how the current reforms to AS and A levels are affecting schools and colleges.

If you are a Head of Department (including deputy and acting Heads), then we would be very grateful if you would take part in this research by completing their survey. If you have already completed the survey this spring/summer then you do not need to complete it again.

The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes and all responses will be anonymous.

To take part, please click on this link: <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/KP96LWB>

Enquiry About Results

If any of your students' results are not as expected and University places are reliant on them, you may wish to consider one of our Enquiry About Results services. For full information about the options available visit: <http://ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on [Interchange](#). For more information on the publication of grade boundaries please see the [OCR website](#).

Enquiry About Results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our Enquiry About Results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are reliant on the results you are making an enquiry about you may wish to consider the priority 2 service which has an earlier deadline to ensure your enquires are processed in time for university applications.

Further support from OCR



Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance. It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/getting-started-with-active-results>

¹ Cambridge Assessment is a not-for-profit non-teaching department of the University of Cambridge, and the parent organisation of OCR, Cambridge International Examinations and Cambridge English Assessment



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session. <https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Sociology (H180)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H180/01 Socialisation, culture and identity	6
H180/02 Researching and understanding social inequalities	10

H180/01 Socialisation, culture and identity

General Comments:

This is the second examination of the new Sociology specification, and overall the standard of responses was good. There was a wide range of responses, suggesting that the paper differentiated effectively. The vast majority of candidates attempted to answer all questions of the paper and managed to time their responses well. There were very few rubric errors and candidates seem, overall, well prepared knowing the assessment objectives of each question. It was apparent that some candidates did not evaluate in the questions which specifically asked for evaluation; that is, question 4 on Section A and the 20 mark questions on Section B. Do remind candidates of the importance of addressing all three assessment objectives, particularly when the question asks to 'Assess this view...' or to 'Briefly evaluate...'. In Section A, there were clear differences between candidates in the use of sources; some candidates made no reference to the source and consequently did not achieve AO2 marks for application. There is further discussion regarding use of sources in the individual questions (questions 2 and 3) below. In section B, the Families and relationships option was the most popular, followed closely by Youth subcultures. Few centres chose the Media option.

With every question, in order to achieve marks in the highest mark band, candidates need to include a range of sociological evidence and to discuss these with some depth. A large number of responses, particularly for the 12 and 20 mark questions in Section A and Section B did not include the required range and depth of sociological evidence. 'Evidence' can include studies, theories, concepts and contemporary examples, although it should be noted that responses which rely heavily of contemporary examples will not score very highly as, on their own, contemporary examples are not good sociology.

On the whole there was a clear difference between the high and low achieving candidates. At the top end, there was a range of sociological evidence contained in answers to all of the questions. Such responses included relevant and detailed explanations including sociological studies, concepts and theories where appropriate. The lower achieving candidates were often unable to provide sociological knowledge and understanding and their answers became very anecdotal and common sense like. Encourage candidates to back up their answers with sociological evidence; be it concepts, studies, relevant contemporary examples or theory. For example, in answers to question (3), candidates who discussed how individuals are socialised into upper class identities by referencing high culture or the 'old boys network' scored more highly than those that talked about partaking in sports such as rugby or polo.

In terms of assessment objectives, Knowledge and Understanding (AO1) remains the strongest area; good candidates were able to offer a whole range of sociological knowledge, mainly in the form of concepts and studies, but sometimes making relevant use of contemporary examples and theory. Application (AO2) seemed to have improved from last year with many candidates signposting their use of the source with phrases such as, 'In Source A...'. Whilst this is good practice it should be noted that there is a difference in the mark scheme between simply referencing the source (e.g. lip service) and doing something with it (i.e. taking elements from the source and applying them to specific pieces of sociology). AO3 skills of Analysis and Evaluation were moderately successful. It is worth mentioning that when candidates are prepared for this examination, it should be made explicit that question 4 and question 8/12/16 all have AO3 marks with the latter having more AO3 marks than any other skill area. Therefore candidates should be encouraged to evaluate more than what they would write for their AO1 knowledge marks.

Comments on individual questions:**Question 1**

The majority of candidates were able to offer a core definition of the term 'subculture'. Most referred to a 'culture within a culture or a minority group in a majority culture'. Candidates were awarded 2 marks for an accurate definition. The other two marks were awarded for development of the definition, for example by discussing an example of a subculture such as Hebdige's punks and the norms and values of resistance. Most candidates were able to score at least 3 marks on this question and the vast majority of candidates had a good knowledge of this concept. However, not all candidates were able to develop the concept to score full marks. Centres should encourage candidates to write a definition then develop it with examples to show how it links to the concept.

Question 2

The vast majority of candidates understood what two cultural characteristics of working class identity were. The source material allowed students to potentially gain straightforward marks by referring to leisure time at the pub and poor education as working class characteristics. Do remind candidates that there are two marks available for stating two examples of norms and then four marks available for application to the source. To further develop application marks, centres should encourage candidates to be very explicit with applying the source material and developing the characteristics further. For example, 'leisure time at the pub' could be developed with a larger discussion on the role of popular culture. In addition further development could be gained through contrasting to upper/middle class characteristics, or using a study or concept to ensure top marks.

Question 3

Most candidates had a good understanding of what was meant by socialising into upper class identities. That said, a minority of candidates did slip into purely middle class identities. There were 8 marks available for this question: 4 marks for Knowledge and Understanding (AO1) and 4 marks for Application (AO2). In this question, the application marks were awarded for reference to the source and wider knowledge. The best answers offered a range of knowledge and understanding of socialising into upper class identities and to reach Level 4 both the source and wider knowledge needed to be referred to. Those that achieved top marks used the source and brought in studies to support their points such as Scott and Bourdieu. Most common ways were family, education and peers with concepts of social closure and old boy network. It was common for students not to refer to the source explicitly which limited the marks that could be achieved – there were quite a few 3, 2 or 4, 2 mark answers.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to offer some sociological knowledge to support the view that social class is no longer an important part of an individual's identity. Those that scored full marks used Postmodernists such as Pakulski and Waters as well as the work of Savage or Skeggs. Marxism was most usually offered for evaluation with candidates occasionally opting for other identities as being more important than social class. It is worth noting that when alternative explanations are given there can be a danger for candidates to drift into juxtaposition: this is implicit evaluation and is when an alternative viewpoint is given without any direct link to the question. This should be avoided as it does not score as highly as explicit evaluation. Generally students knew postmodernist views but the development of these views varied. Some candidates spent a lot more time on why social class is important, using Marxist studies, and were less successful in supporting the view in the question. Some candidates forgot to evaluate completely. Candidates must be reminded that this 12 mark question is a "mini essay" with all three assessment objectives being tested.

Question 5

The majority of candidates were able to define and explain the concept of reconstituted families. Those that scored full marks typically defined the term and developed it with current trends or

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

statistics regarding the reconstituted family. This was then furthered by making an extra point regarding the link between diversity and reconstituted families. Some candidates missed out on gaining the full two marks for the core definition as they didn't mention the children aspect of the reconstituted family. Candidates should be reminded that any definition needs to be developed with at least two extra development points or examples in order to get full marks.

Question 6

Most candidates were able to identify two reasons for trends in divorce. This question was answered very well with the decline in divorce due to individualisation (Beck and Beck-Gersheim) and changes such as the Divorce Reform Act being the most common. Candidates signposted their answers very well with two clear paragraphs and this was a nice technique to use. Candidates must include sociological knowledge and not their own ideas about why divorce rate have changed.

Question 7

The majority of candidates interpreted this question within the Functionalist literature and so a range of answers were seen using Murdock and Parsons. This was further reinforced with the New Right with some exceptional candidates using Feminist views as to why the nuclear family has persisted in terms of furthering patriarchy. Do use the sample assessment material and practice papers to help inform students not to provide evaluation (A03) as there are no marks available. Some candidates were not able to achieve full marks as they had spent too much time being critical.

Question 8

This question was generally very well answered and most candidates showed a good knowledge and understanding of the debate in the question. Strong responses were able to back up their arguments with a range of sociological evidence, using for example Dobash and Dobash and Ansley to discuss domestic violence. Too often candidates had a tendency to drift into non-dark side issues such as housework and debates about the symmetrical family and this was not credited. Evaluation was often in the form of the Functionalist and New Right views. It must be stressed that AO3 is the biggest skill in this essay question and therefore essays are expected to evaluate and be critical more than anything else. Some of the best candidates created debate through little criticisms throughout their essay as well as offering counterviews.

Question 9

There was a mixed response to this question with some candidates getting confused in their definitions of 'youth culture' and 'subcultures'. Whilst subcultures were accepted as an example of youth culture, the required definition and most common correct answer was: the norms and values associated with being young. The best answer contained further examples backed up by evidence such as Parsons and youth being a bridge between childhood and adulthood. Candidates should be reminded that any definition needs to be developed with at least two extra development points or examples in order to get full marks.

Question 10

This was generally a well answered question by the majority of candidates who referred to two patterns or trends of youth deviance related to ethnicity. Most candidates opted for Black/Asian youth and stop and search, custodial sentences and relative deprivation as reasons for deviance/crime acts. At times some candidates didn't seem to fully understand the 'patterns and trends' aspect of the question and descended into listing anecdotal evidence regarding certain minority ethnic groups. Candidates signposted their answers very well with two clear paragraphs and this was a nice technique to use.

Question 11

This was a very well answered question with most candidates viewing this as a 'theory' question regarding the formation of youth culture and subcultures. Typically candidates would discuss Functionalist, neo-Marxist and Feminist viewpoints in great detail with good conceptual language

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

and a range of studies. At times there were still some candidates evaluating, often using post-modernism as a critique. It should be noted that evaluation is not credited in this question and candidates should not spend time doing so. The level of detail remained the differentiator between level 3 and level 4 responses, with candidates purely listing studies and explaining them in a sentence unable to reach level 4 because they lacked the significant depth of knowledge.

Question 12

The majority of candidates struggled to fully satisfy all three Assessment Objectives on this question and would often focus on one Assessment Objective at the expense of the other. Therefore candidates would either focus on the labelling aspect of the question by using studies such as Becker and Cicourel, or would focus on counter-arguments such as why working class males were over represented due to having deviant values. In this question, it was apparent that candidates had a tendency to juxtapose some of their evaluation. We would encourage centres to develop techniques that ensure candidates stay focused on the question such as using the words of the question in their answer.

Question 13

There were some strong answers to this question which explained the concept of a moral panic. Most candidates referred to the media and aspects of deviancy amplification. There were usually explicit references to Stan Cohen and the mods and rockers. Typically candidates could get the two marks of a core definition and a further two marks by using an example to back up their point. However, there were fewer candidates producing a further example or point to get the fifth mark. Candidates should be reminded that any definition needs to be developed with at least two extra development points or examples in order to get full marks.

Question 14

There was a very mixed response to this question. Whilst most candidates clearly understood what stereotypical media representations of the working class meant, candidates sometimes struggled to pinpoint the exact sociological evidence to back up their assertions. The best answers focussed on Dodd and Dodd and representations from television shows such as Eastenders as well as the work of Devereaux and the deserving poor. However, too often, examples of shows were listed without sociological concepts or studies to reinforce specific points and therefore gained less marks. Candidates signposted their answers very well with two clear paragraphs and this was a nice technique to use

Question 15

The vast majority of candidates had a good understanding of representations of gender in the media but there was a high proportion who didn't state how they were changing. Some candidates focused on negative representations instead of changing representations. Many included little evidence of media based points such as the new man with no examples of how this is represented within the media. Some candidates wasted time on evaluation and arguing that representations have not changed. The few candidates who were successful typically used studies by Gauntlett, Gill and Mayers and highlighted very specific examples of how representations have changed such as changing attitudes.

Question 16

Most candidates were able to locate this question within the media models literature and almost always began with a description of the hypodermic syringe model. This was then built upon with the work of Packard and examples from Bandura et al's work with the Bobo doll experiment. This was then evaluated using different indirect models such as the 'two step flow model'. It is worth reminding candidates that evaluation marks can be gained from direct criticism as well as offering counter-arguments. Do also remind candidates that AO3 makes up half the marks on this question so they should spend more time evaluating than they do explaining the view in the question.

H180/02 Researching and understanding social inequalities

General Comments:

This was the second assessment of this paper for the new AS Level specification. Centres had had a year to analyse and reflect on the report from 2016 when preparing their candidates. In general, most candidates managed to answer all the questions in the time allowed and many did Section B answers first so that the smaller methodological questions were written later on. There were very few non responses and almost all candidates made some attempt at all questions.

In terms of AO1 Knowledge and Understanding skills, Section A concepts and theories seemed to be more confidently used than in Section B. For example, candidates handled validity, interpretivism and other methodological knowledge reasonably confidently; reliability does continue to be used incorrectly by many though. In Section B, there was less evidence of thorough learning of theories and studies that could be used as supporting evidence in questions 5 and 6. For example some candidates referred to Feminism as if it were one theory and there was a lack of empirical studies and statistics about work and employment.

AO2 Application appears to be the weakest of the three skills, especially in the sense of really engaging with the context of the research in the two sources rather than just paying lip service to it. Many clearly able candidates also struggled to interpret the data in question 1.

There was some improvement in AO3 Analysis and Evaluation skills from last year in terms of providing a balance of the different viewpoints in Question 4 and 6. That said a minority of candidates continue to look only at strengths or weaknesses. This was particularly apparent in Question 6 as many answers spent hardly any time arguing and supporting the view that women have now achieved equality.

Comments on individual questions:

Question 1

This question differentiated candidates well. A significant group of candidates didn't read the source carefully and therefore made simple errors in their answers which often meant they were unable to gain any marks. The following were common errors:

- Assuming that the survey was done only on women rather than on adults.
- Assuming that the figures represented proportions of women working rather than percentages of respondents agreeing women should work.
- Reading figures as numbers rather than percentages.
- Making comparisons rather than identifying changes, e.g. comparing attitudes towards mothers with children under school age with those who have started school.
- Comparing figures for 1989 where there is a child under school age with figures for 2012 for when the youngest child has started school.
- Failing to specify whether the change identified applied to women with a child under or over school age.

Most candidates who did not make these basic errors were able to identify two changes and, in most cases, were able to develop their answers with statistics drawn from the table – this enabled them to gain full marks. However, when candidates missed out a percentage sign (%) and simply cited numbers, they were unable to achieve all 4 marks.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

The question asked candidates for two changes yet a minority of candidates wrote about three or more changes. There were also candidates who did not clearly understand what was meant by a change and thus did not include a reference to time or use words like ‘increase’, ‘decrease’ or ‘double’. To achieve full marks on this question, which many candidates did, it was necessary to identify two changes and then give precise statistics to support those two changes. There was a small minority of candidates who spent time unnecessarily giving reasons for the changes shown and this meant that they wrote quite lengthy answers, leaving themselves short of time towards the end of the paper. It was very helpful when candidates did write two separate paragraphs headed ‘The first change is...’ and ‘The second change is...’.

Do ensure that candidates are constantly practising the interpretation of quantitative data during their course – there are plenty of tables, charts and similar quantitative data that can be found related to every area of the specification. Candidates also need to learn the meaning of key terms like trend or change so that they are aware of the time element. Awareness of the units in which the data is expressed (are they percentages, millions, thousands etc.) is also key to correct interpretation – a good guide for this type of question is Title? Units? Time?

Question 2

Most candidates showed some understanding of this question with some very good answers seen. The best answers showed good understanding of sociological concepts such as validity, reliability, verstehen, rapport and tended to link the use of quotations to an interpretivist approach. The best answers tended to focus on two or three reasons but explained and developed their points well relating the concepts to the question.

The best answers also applied the source material well, often using the quotations supplied in the source to explain how a sociologist might use them in various ways including:

- To show the exact words of the respondents, gaining a true understanding and give validity.
- So other sociologists could check the research using Giazitoglu’s primary data and possibly use it as secondary material in their research creating reliability.
- So researchers could achieve verstehen, for example by conveying the kind of language, dialect etc. used by respondents.
- So the researcher could compare responses of different respondents on a specific issue e.g. comparing Phil and Adam’s aspirations.

Weaker responses tended to be less developed and/or less conceptual and/or didn’t apply specific examples drawn from the source. There were many examples of candidates not developing their points but simply stating something. For example writing ‘The direct quotes tell us what the working class men really think’ but then not taking this further by saying something such as ‘This makes the research more valid because it gives the researcher a true understanding of the men’s experiences of social mobility...’. The mark scheme differentiates between ‘developed’ (Level 3) and ‘underdeveloped’ (Level 2) so this further step is crucial to gaining the higher marks. It is also important to note that to be awarded the top level marks the answer has to have explicit concepts which are used accurately. Many able candidates did not do this depriving themselves of the top range of marks. Some candidates also discussed possible criticisms of using quotations in this way but gained no credit as this was not asked for by the question.

Question 3

This question saw only a minority of candidates showing detailed sociological knowledge of sampling techniques. Although the question asked candidates to explain how sociologists might select a representative sample, many candidates chose to interpret this as why they might. As the question said ‘in order to carry out a survey of social attitudes’ this was marked as a legitimate response where candidates related their answer to carrying out a survey of social

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

attitudes. A significant number of candidates had little idea of what is meant by a 'representative sample' and there were many examples of candidates giving lists of the different types of sampling methods and simply describing how they are done. In many cases, there was no awareness of the lack of representativeness in snowball or opportunity samples.

Weaker answers tended to either miss the point of the question (for example just discussing social surveys or quantitative methods more generally) or they simply talked about representativeness in rather general terms (for example the need for the sample to represent the target population in terms of class, gender, ethnicity, age, location or other social factors). Some candidates focused on the importance of sample size, though not always fully explaining why this might affect representativeness although better answers were rewarded for AO2 where they referred to the size of the sample in the 2012 survey. Some candidates persisted in the error apparent in question 1 of assuming that the survey had only been aimed at women.

Higher quality answers tended to show some understanding of possible sampling methods, typically describing one or more techniques such as random, systematic, stratified, or quota sampling although sometimes candidates did not fully understand these. Some candidates also discussed methods which would be inappropriate for large scale attitude surveys such as snowball, volunteer or purposive sampling.

The best answers were able to consider issues such as identifying a target population, establishing a sampling frame, explaining why techniques such as stratified sampling would be particularly likely to produce representative samples, considering the importance of sample size and focusing on the fact that the survey was on social attitudes so would need to represent the full range of social attitudes in British society. Better answers were conceptual, showing an understanding of concepts such as representativeness, generalisability, sampling frame, randomisation, stratifying a sample etc. To achieve the higher levels, candidates are required to show a range of knowledge and for the points to be developed. A developed paragraph would need to include the point, some methodological theory, at least one methodological concept and a link to the source. It does not have to be a very lengthy paragraph in order to achieve this. It is worth reminding candidates that the top levels require 'range *and* depth' and the next level down requires 'range *or* depth' and so on. A teaching tip is to encourage candidates to highlight or underline the key words in this type of question so that they realise the three elements that need to be addressed i.e. RESEARCH ELEMENT (in this case a representative sample) SOURCE (Giazitzoglu) and CONTEXT (in this case survey of social attitudes).

Question 4

This question had the highest number of excellent responses and in turn, the highest number of full mark answers. The majority of candidates knew the strengths and weaknesses of the two methods in the question, presumably having been well trained in evaluating all the research methods they were required to study during their AS. There was also widespread knowledge and understanding of methodological theories such as positivism and interpretivism, with many candidates linking these well to their evaluative points.

The best answers typically focused on the combination of methods showing how insights of one method might complement those of the other - most candidates did make some attempt to do this however simply. Such answers often alluded to concepts such as triangulation, methodological pluralism and ethnography. These good answers tended to focus on a reasonably wide but not excessive range of evaluation points typically identifying at least two strengths and two weaknesses to the methodology allowing them to fully develop their explanation of each evaluation point. In order to attain the top marks (Level 4) in AO3, candidates needed to write a range of developed points (for example 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses) as well as using a range of key methodological concepts such as validity, reliability, representativeness, verstehen, researcher bias etc. as well as applying theoretical approaches. A range of concepts and reference to theory was also necessary for top Level 3 marks in AO1. The number of candidates achieving Level 4 for AO3 was restricted because a

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

significant number either did not develop their points sufficiently with concepts / theories or did not discuss either the source or the context.

Really good answers were also able to make use of the source material, not just by effectively quoting from the source but also by using the material to illustrate specific points. For example, how the author used his shared background with the respondents to develop *verstehen* and engage in more effective interaction with the respondents but also how his close relationship with the 'Changers' might have affected his objectivity and reduced the reliability of the study. Very good responses went even further and recognised the context of the research rather than just focusing on the methods: for example, considering the topic of social mobility and the practical and ethical problems of researching what might be a quite sensitive subject for some of the subjects. Some candidates didn't really engage with the context of the question and simply paid lip service to it. As a result they couldn't achieve the higher level marks.

There were some common weaknesses among the weaker candidates. Some wrote long-winded introductions about all the different types of interviews and observations; some simply described the research process and/or the research results; some wrote quite lengthy conclusions reiterating what they had said in the main body of the essay - this gained no credit and was not an effective use of valuable examination time. Another common weakness was to not develop points, as outlined above, for example writing 'This makes the research more valid' without then going on to say why it makes it more valid and showing how this worked in the source research. Finally, some candidates had a tendency to throw in several concepts within the same sentence, almost hedging their bets to make sure that one of them hit the target. An example of this would be 'Participant observation made Giazitzoglu's research more valid and reliable.' As a result it is not clear whether the candidate fully understands the point being made.

Question 5

The marks for this question are all AO1 so candidates must demonstrate their knowledge and understanding via the use of various forms of concrete, often empirical data - whether it is sociological studies, concepts, theoretical viewpoints, statistics, surveys and so on. Contemporary examples are also acceptable but if these are the only form of evidence used to support the two ways, then the candidate cannot achieve higher than Level 2. Candidates are assessed on their ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of evidence about the form of social inequality specified in the question – many found this difficult to do and were very vague and generalised in attempts to do this. For example, saying people in working class jobs earn a lot less than people in middle class jobs, rather than quoting actual statistics or a study which showed inequalities in other things such as job security or perks.

Some candidates were aware of inequalities in relation to life chances or social mobility but this was often expressed very simply, for example in terms of the upper classes going to private schools and getting the top jobs. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and read 'social class inequalities' as 'social inequalities' and proceeded to demonstrate gender or ethnic inequalities (without linking these to class in any way). There was a tendency among some to pay no attention to the 'work and employment' element of the question with social class inequalities in education or media discussed instead.

Many candidates structured their answers in two paragraphs headed 'The first way in which...' and 'The second way in which...' which was a nice technique to use. Whilst this question was in general not as well answered as others, better answers were seen and an occasional really good answer produced clearly identifying two aspects of social class inequality which were then explicitly linked to work and employment. These candidates then went on to discuss at least two pieces of evidence relating to patterns or trends in each. Some very good candidates were able to discuss specific statistics or patterns revealed in studies in relation to areas such as social mobility, income inequality or levels of unemployment. For example some candidates quoted government statistics on income distribution to show how the gap between those on high and low incomes was widening. Quite a few candidates drew on material relating to education but

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

sometimes did not relate this to work and employment but better candidates made a clear link, for example relating Scott's work on social capital and the 'old boy network' to social closure and recruitment into top level jobs. In order to attain the high levels in this question, a candidate needed to give breadth and depth to their answers whereas lower levels will only have breadth or depth.

As a final interesting note in relation to this question, very few candidates took the option to describe trends rather than patterns in work, possibly showing that the term itself is not understood, or perhaps the element of time implied in it.

Question 6

This question led to a wide range of differentiated outcomes. In general, candidates seemed to have more knowledge of arguments against the view rather than for the view. In fact, many candidates seemed to turn the question around and start by arguing that women had not achieved equality and then added a few arguments in favour of the view at the end. There were a number of candidates who wrote very well argued answers with extensive evidence of women being unequal to men but who then didn't include any argument for the view and as result, could not achieve full marks because of the lack of balance in their answer.

The way this question is assessed is to award the AO1 marks for evidence to support the view that women have now achieved equality with men in the UK; thus, any theories, studies, statistics, laws etc. that show this to be the case are credited. The better answers used examples of the legal rights that women have gained, some Liberal Feminist studies like Sharpe or Wilkinson, Postmodernist theories, or possibly Hakim and preference theory. A few candidates drew on other topics they had studied and used evidence on youth subcultures (e.g. on ladettes and Holland's work on girls' participation in Newcastle nightlife) mass media (e.g. changing representations of women and the greater prominence of women as leads in film and TV drama) or family (e.g. the rise of the symmetrical family, demographic trends such a lower birth rates and rights in relation to marriage and divorce). Brief contemporary examples can be utilised too but it is a debate that by its very nature needs a certain amount of hard evidence both for and against the view.

The AO2 marks are used to assess how well the evidence on both sides of the debate is linked to the question and it was evident that many Centres had effectively taught their students how to structure an essay on a two sided argument with supporting evidence on either side, with a rational conclusion drawn at the end. Candidates who did not know how to do this listed the different theories without saying which side they were on, or without linking them to each other. Some simple linking words such as 'however' or 'on the other hand' can make a very big difference and avoid the trap of just juxtaposing different ideas one after the other. Using a separate paragraph for each point also enhances the flow of the argument, as well as helping the candidates to see a plan for their essay so their use should be encouraged.

Most candidates were able to cite a better range of evidence in terms of counter-arguments but answers were differentiated according to how fully these points were developed. Some candidates opted for a theoretical approach, for example, drawing on radical and Marxist feminist approaches to criticise the idea that women had achieved equality. Others were more conceptual using concepts like vertical and horizontal segregation, glass ceiling, patriarchal terrorism and unpaid domestic labour. Yet again, some were more empirical, considering evidence about the 'pay gap', domestic violence or women's representation in senior positions. The very best answers typically combined all three approaches. To achieve high levels in AO3 for this question, candidates needed to make a range of accurate, developed points which contained theory, concepts or evidence.

As a final point, it's important that candidates remain focussed on the question being asked. Some candidates lost sight of the actual question and instead wrote an essay on why women are not equal rather than are women equal. There is of course evidence and theoretical

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

approaches that can overlap in these two questions but answering a different question will score lower marks. There was also some discussion of reasons why men are now not equal with women which was not relevant to the question unless very carefully worded.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2017

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

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 2017

