

GCE

Sociology

H180/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

2020 Mark Scheme (DRAFT)

This is a DRAFT mark scheme. It has not been used for marking as this paper did not receive any entries in the series it was scheduled for. It is therefore possible that not all valid approaches to a question may be captured in this version. You should give credit to such responses when marking learner's work.

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

1. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
KU	Knowledge and understanding: studies, theories, policies, methods
CON	Sociological evidence / concepts / theory
DEV	Developed point: fully explained in a relevant way
^	Underdeveloped: Partially explained, but requiring more depth
EG	Example
APP	Application / interpretation
EVAL	Evaluation
J	Juxtaposition of theories / ideas without direct evaluation / analysis
U	Unsubstantiated / undeveloped / implicit: accurate without explanation / support
?	Unclear / confused / lacks sense / not creditable
REP	Repetition
 	Irrelevant – not focused on question set

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Using data from Source A, describe two conclusions that could be drawn about the relationship between social class, gender and life expectancy.</p> <p>AO2 Application Level 4: 4 marks Excellent ability to interpret the data in Source A and can draw two conclusions which could be drawn about the relationship between social class, gender and life expectancy. Responses should include clear reference to the data.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks Good ability to interpret the data in Source A. Responses will describe two conclusions, although the description of the conclusions may be less clear.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks Basic ability to interpret the data in Source A. Responses will be partial, for example, either only one conclusion may be fully described with some precision or two conclusions may be described but the response is more confusing or lacking clarity.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Limited ability to interpret the data in Source A. Typically only one conclusion is described and/or conclusions are poorly expressed.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application.</p>	4	<p>Typical responses are likely to be similar to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life expectancy decreases as the level of a person's social class decreases. Among men the highest social class have a life expectancy of 82.5 years while men in the Routine Class/ Class 7 have a life expectancy of only 76.6 years, a difference of 5.9 years. Among women the difference is 4.5 years, i.e. 85.2 years compared to 80.8. Women have a longer life expectancy than men within each class. For example in Class 1 women can expect to live 2.7 years longer than men while in Class 7 women can expect to live 4.2 years longer than men. <p>Any other reasonable response should be rewarded but to achieve Level 3 or above the candidate should establish some kind of correlation between either social class or gender and life expectancy rather than simply reading off individual statistics.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>With reference to Source A, explain why official statistics on life expectancy might provide objective data on social class and gender differences.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display an excellent range of knowledge and understanding of why official statistics on life expectancy might be seen as providing objective data for sociologists about social class and gender differences. Responses will include sociological concepts in their explanations. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. Responses should display some breadth and depth of knowledge. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates will display good knowledge and understanding of why official statistics on life expectancy might be seen as providing objective data for sociologists about social class and gender differences. The response will be underdeveloped or the response may have breadth or depth. Some concepts may be implicit. 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>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates will display basic knowledge and understanding of why official statistics on life expectancy might be seen as providing objective data for sociologists about social class and gender differences. At the top of the band, responses will be accurate but narrow. At the bottom of the band, responses may be limited, partial and confused or all concepts will be implicit. The</p>	9	<p>Candidates should show some understanding of concept of objectivity.</p> <p>Responses may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official statistics are generally collected in standardised, systematic, scientific manner which ensures objectivity. Candidates may consider how the data in Item A was calculated e.g. using records of births and deaths. • Official statistics are objective because of the nature of the data collection. They are collected by government researchers/agencies (in this case by Office for National Statistics) but these are not directly controlled by the government and possibly subject to less bias than research conducted by private organisations. • The nature of the statistics is objective. Life expectancy data is not as open to bias or interpretation as other statistics e.g. dates of birth and death can usually be reliably established. • Quantitative/statistical data provides greater precision which can reveal exact extent of social class and gender differences. This can be seen as providing objectivity. Candidates may quote statistics to illustrate this. • Objective conclusions from being able to clearly compare variables i.e. gender/class. • Positivist sociologists see quantitative data as more objective and scientific as it provides precision and is less subject to biases and multiple interpretations associated with qualitative data. • The NS/SEC classification can be seen as an objective measure of social class as it is based on occupation, which is a widely adopted indicator of social class for sociological research. Candidates may refer to the social classes used in the table.

		<p>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>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>A02 Application Level 3: 3 marks Candidates will make clear and explicit reference to issues relating to objectivity of official statistics using material from Source A.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks Candidates will make partial reference to issues relating to objectivity of official statistics using some material from Source A but application will be narrow or under developed.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Candidates will make limited reference to issues relating to objectivity of official statistics with some reference to Source A. Typically reference made to the source may be lip service only.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of Source A.</p>		<p>Answers should focus on why official statistics on life expectancy might be seen as providing <u>objective</u> data for sociologists about social class and gender differences rather than on general advantages of official statistics e.g. cheap and easy to access.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to Source B, explain the problems of using opportunity sampling.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 7–8 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of the problems of using opportunity sampling. The response will be accurate and detailed and include a range of knowledge in the form of concepts and theories. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display good knowledge and understanding. There will be range OR depth. There will be some concepts/theory but typically it may be underdeveloped and superficial. 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>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display basic knowledge and understanding, which will be lacking range and depth (e.g. basic understanding of opportunity sampling). Typically answers will be undeveloped, unsubstantiated, partial and confused. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display limited knowledge and understanding. Typically, there may only be vague representations of topic area (e.g. sampling in general) and a tendency towards common sense, or a very</p>	12	<p>Candidates should show an understanding of what is meant by opportunity sampling.</p> <p>Responses may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity sampling is a non-random sampling technique therefore the researcher can influence who is selected e.g. the couples who Twamley recruited may have disproportionately had certain characteristics which made it more likely that she would come across them and recruit them. • For a sample to be representative there needs to be a sampling frame covering the population to be studied and every individual needs to have an equal chance of being selected to ensure that a good range of different characteristics are represented, this is not the case with opportunity sampling. • Candidates may refer to the specific sources from which Twamley obtained her sample i.e. the local university, a dance class, chance meetings and explain why informants drawn from these sources might not necessarily be representative of her target population. • Candidates may refer to aspects of the sample which might make it unrepresentative, for example the couples were all middle class and Hindu. • Opportunity sampling may not guarantee the sample that the researcher is looking for, e.g. may not produce enough respondents with the desired characteristics (Twamley's English sample was only 12, less than from India. suggesting she may have struggled to find enough suitable respondents). • Opportunity sampling is a non-random technique so more chance of the researcher being biased or affecting who gets selected in some way.

		<p>narrow response. 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>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2 Application Level 4: 4 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to apply Source B and their wider sociological knowledge to this question, focusing specifically on the use of opportunity sampling. Candidates should make explicit reference to Source B.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks Candidates display good ability to apply Source B and their wider sociological knowledge to the question. There should be some reference the specific context.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks Candidates display basic ability to apply Source B and/or their wider sociological knowledge to the question.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Candidates display limited ability to apply Source B and/or their wider sociological knowledge to the question, typically application to the context is only by lip service.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity sampling can be quite time consuming as the researcher may have to spend some time tracking down suitable respondents. <p>Better answers are likely to make use of sociological concepts and technical terminology.</p> <p>Candidates should be rewarded for application when they use evidence from the source to support their points.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge explain and evaluate the use of semi-structured interviews to investigate gender roles among young heterosexual couples.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and understanding Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews to investigate gender roles among young heterosexual couples. There will be explicit and frequent use of sociological concepts and theory. To achieve top of the level theory is needed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates will display good knowledge and understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews to investigate gender roles among young heterosexual couples. There will be some use of sociological concepts/theory but it may be underdeveloped. 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>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates show a basic knowledge and understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews to investigate gender roles among young heterosexual couples. The response may be partial and confused without a core understanding of semi-structured interviews. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited</p>	20	<p>The best responses will make use of relevant sociological theories and concepts, for example referring to concepts such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positivism • Interpretivism • Validity • Reliability • Representativeness • Generalisability • Qualitative/quantitative data • Objectivity/bias • Ethics <p>In application candidates should link points to the context of the source material to support evaluation points.</p> <p>In positive evaluation responses may include the following positive points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured interviews allow collection of standardised data from all respondents as well as allowing more in-depth individualised questioning. Possibly combine qualitative and quantitative data. • The method was flexible allowing Twamley to explore different hypotheses and follow up findings later in the interview or in subsequent interviews. • By interviewing respondents in depth and on several occasions Twamley was more likely to have established rapport and verstehen with respondents producing more valid responses. Particularly important as subject matter was intimate relationships. • Twamley seemed to want to understand the roles and relationships of the respondents as they saw them and method seemed to allow this. Candidates may link to interpretivist theory.

		<p>evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2 Application Level 3: 5–6 marks Excellent application skills. Candidates will relate the use of semi-structured interviews to the context of the research in Source B in a consistent and explicit way.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Good application skills. Candidates will relate the use of semi-structured interviews to the context of the research in Source B but it may not be consistently and/or explicitly relevant or may only pay lip service in linking to the context in some parts.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Basic ability to relate the use of semi-structured interviews to the context of the research in Source B. Responses are likely to be generalised or lip service only.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application</p> <p>AO3 Analysis and Evaluation Level 4: 7–8 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to analyse and evaluate the use of semi-structured interviews in this context. There will be a wide range of explicit evaluative points, which are accurate and developed, considering both strengths and weaknesses of the method.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may favourably compare semi-structured interviews with other methods e.g. questionnaires (which would be less likely to produce in depth data and not allow for rapport) or observational methods (which might be too intrusive and create problems with access). • Ethical considerations, e.g. respondents could presumably withdraw from interviews or refuse to answer specific questions, if Twamley gained rapport this would help respondents to feel more comfortable. • In this particular study interviewing couples together and then separately allowed the researcher to gain a more rounded and valid picture. • Snowball sampling enabled the interviews to proceed more effectively as the respondents were likely to be willing participants and have some trust in the researcher. <p>Possible criticisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability- Twamley's female gender and presumably white British ethnicity may have influenced how respondents interacted with her. This could affect reliability/create interviewer effect (as male or other ethnicity researcher might produce different results) • Validity - candidates may have been more or less truthful (because of who was doing the interviewing and how). • Issues of bias/subjectivity. Twamley's own values may have influenced what questions she asked in interviews and how she interpreted her data. • Issues relating to recording data e.g. should researcher take notes or digitally record conversation and practical problems with transcribing and analysing large amounts of qualitative data from such interviews e.g. decisions about what to include and what to leave out of the final report. • Interviews are a snapshot and only reflect one point in a couple's relationship.
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display a good ability to analyse and evaluate the use of semi-structured interviews in this context. There will be some explicit evaluative points, but these are likely to be underdeveloped or a narrower range of more developed points.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display a basic ability to analyse and evaluate the use of semi-structured interviews. There will be a lack of range of evaluative points and responses are likely to be partial, confused and undeveloped. Alternatively, the evaluation will be all one-sided, for example only focusing on the strengths of the method and not the weaknesses.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a limited ability to analyse and evaluate the use of semi-structured interviews. Typically, the response will be minimal relying on only one idea, assertive, and/or tangential to the question.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant analysis or evaluation.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulties of interpreting contradictory or unclear responses e.g. some respondents claimed to be in favour of equality but later on emphasised role of the man as breadwinner. • Possible ethical issues, e.g. sensitive questions, intrusion into personal areas of respondents' lives • Issues of representativeness e.g. sample size was only 30 and based on opportunity sample. • Although semi-structured interviews allow for collection of quantitative data, the small sample size would make precise quantitative analysis difficult or unrepresentative. • Issues of generalisability, small-scale research may only focus on specific groups e.g. middle class Hindu couples may not be generalizable to other groups. <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Outline two ways in which women are disadvantaged compared with men in the workplace.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and understanding Level 4: 8–10 marks Candidates display a wide-ranging and excellent knowledge and understanding of two ways in which women are disadvantaged compared with men in the workplace. There will be explicit and frequent use of sociological concepts and evidence. At the top of this level the candidate will use a wide range of relevant concepts and evidence in a detailed, accurate and explicit manner for both ways. At the bottom of the level the use of concepts will still be wide-ranging and detailed but will be underdeveloped for one way. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 3: 5–7 marks Candidates will display good knowledge and understanding of one or two ways in which women are disadvantaged compared with men in the workplace. Responses will be wide-ranging or detailed. There will be some use of sociological concepts/ evidence for each way. At the top of the level candidates will use relevant concepts in an explicit way but they may well be underdeveloped. At the bottom of the level concepts may be underdeveloped and some may be implicit. One way with depth and detail can reach the bottom of this level. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information</p>	10	<p>Responses may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in pay: may cover hourly rates (ONS, Fawcett Society), women more likely on minimum wage (Oxfam), the effect of time off for motherhood on subsequent wages (UK Feminista). • Vertical segregation of employment: less women as directors on FTSE 100 boards (Fawcett Society), more men in higher professional jobs, fewer women in management and senior positions (LFS, EHRC), female graduates more likely to work in lower skilled occupations than men. Candidates may also refer to evidence of a glass ceiling, glass elevator and/or concrete ceiling. • Horizontal segregation e.g. women dominate occupations in caring and leisure industries (ONS, EOC) but under-represented in industries such as construction, engineering, IT etc. • Effects of pregnancy on job prospects: women sacked or lose out on promotion or pay (UK Feminista), each year a mother is absent from work her wages will reduce by 5% (UK Feminista). • Women less likely than men to climb career ladder (Savage). • Extent of sexual harassment at work (Everyday Sexism Project/TUC, EHRC). • Some candidates may attempt to apply theoretical approaches to answering this question, these should be credited as long as they refer to ways in which women are disadvantaged in workplace rather than merely explaining disadvantages. Examples might include Bruegel on women as a reserve army of labour, Walby on public patriarchy and employment, Barron and Norris on the dual labour market.

		<p>presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display basic knowledge and understanding of at least one way in which women are disadvantaged compared with men in the workplace. Responses will be lacking range and depth. Typically responses will be undeveloped/ unsubstantiated/ partial/ confused. There may be an over-reliance on contemporary examples rather than concepts and studies. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a limited knowledge and understanding. At the top of the level, knowledge will be very narrow, but will have some coherence. Responses may be very generalised. At the bottom of the level, they will be very limited and may be confused in places. 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>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p>	<p>The best answers are likely to include supportive evidence such as statistics, surveys or studies of women’s disadvantage in the workplace. Answers which discuss gender inequalities in general without considering evidence which is not linked to the workplace, should not be placed above level 2.</p>
--	--	---	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Assess the usefulness of functionalist theories for understanding class inequalities in UK society today.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of functionalist theories and how they help to understand class inequalities in UK society today. There will be explicit and frequent use of concepts, studies relevant to the functionalist view. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated with some range and depth.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display a good knowledge of functionalist theories and how they help to understand class inequalities in UK society today. There will be a range of concepts and/or studies relevant to the view but treated in less depth than Level 3 or a narrower range treated in more depth. There is a line of reasoning present with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by range or depth of evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a basic knowledge and understanding of functionalist theories. Knowledge is likely to be undeveloped, partial or confused, lacking range and depth. Candidates may fail to focus on UK society today or may discuss one or more explanations of class inequalities with only some reference to functionalism. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is</p>	20	<p>In support of the view candidates may consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talcott Parsons, including importance of value consensus, universality of social stratification, equality of opportunity, achieved status, meritocracy. • Davis and Moore, including role of stratification in role allocation and performance, functional uniqueness, degree of dependence. • Durkheim, including mechanical solidarity, division of labour in society. • Some candidates may also use New Right approaches e.g. Murray or Saunders to support functionalist approaches. May consider underclass, dependency culture, meritocratic nature of inequality, how inequality is necessary to drive capitalism. <p>In criticising the view candidates may consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tumin's critique of Davis and Moore. • Marxist theory and it's rejection of the idea of inequality as functional, including concepts such as alienation, exploitation, appropriation of surplus value, class conflict, contradictions of capitalism. • Neo-Marxist theory and rejection of idea of value consensus e.g. Gramsci on hegemony, Althusser on ideological state apparatuses. • Evidence of the dysfunctional effects of social class inequality e.g. Wilkinson & Pickett. • Evidence against functionalist notions of meritocracy, equality of opportunity e.g. social class differences in life chances, relative inequalities in social mobility (Goldthorpe). Bowles and Gintis on the myth of meritocracy. • Candidates may also apply theories which are not in AS specification in evaluation, for example Weberian theory and postmodernist approaches.

		<p>supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2 Application Level 3: 4 marks Candidates apply evidence for and against functionalist theories in an excellent and explicit way.</p> <p>Level 2: 2–3 marks Candidates apply evidence for and against functionalist theories in a good and mainly explicit way.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Candidates apply evidence for and/or against the functionalist theories in a basic way. Responses are likely to contain evidence/concepts which relate in a general way to class equality/inequality but are not directly or explicitly related to functionalist theories.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application.</p> <p>AO3 Analysis and evaluation Level 4: 8–10 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to analyse and evaluate functionalist theories. There will be a range of explicit evaluative points both for and against which are accurate and developed.</p> <p>Level 3: 5–7 marks Candidates display a good ability to analyse and evaluate functionalist theories. There will be a range or</p>	<p>Any other relevant points on either side should be credited.</p> <p>For AO2 candidates should be rewarded where they apply evidence relating to social class inequalities in the UK today in support of or against functionalist theories. The best answers will consider contemporary evidence in their debate.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>depth of explicit evaluative points but these are likely to be underdeveloped.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display a basic ability to analyse and evaluate functionalist theories. There will be a lack of range and depth of evaluative points and responses are likely to be partial, confused and undeveloped or juxtaposed.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a limited ability to analyse and evaluate functionalist theories. Typically, the response will be minimal, assertive, and / or tangential to the question.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant analysis or evaluation.</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

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored