

GCE

Sociology

Unit **H180/02**: Researching and understanding social inequalities

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

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: Q 3 onwards: Partially explained, but requiring more depth
APP	Application/Interpretation. On Q1 Conclusion stated. On questions 2, 3 and 4: clear reference to source Q5 and 6 application of point shown.
L	Lip service: Q2, 3 and 4 only
EVAL	Evaluation Q 4 ONLY for weaknesses of the method Q 6 for any evaluative point
J	Q4 only : strength of the method Q6 only: Juxtaposition of theories/ideas without direct evaluation/analysis
U	Unsubstantiated/ undeveloped/ implicit: accurate without explanation/ support
?	Unclear/confused/lacks sense not creditable
IRRL	Irrelevant: not related to the topic area and/or non-sociological
REP	Repetition
⋮	Not clearly focused on question set: tangential – sociological but not directly relevant

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Describe two conclusions which could be drawn about the distribution of income in the UK from the data in Source A.</p> <p>AO2 Application Level 4: 4 marks Excellent ability to interpret the data in Source A and can draw two conclusions. Responses will make comparisons between different income groups and/or consider changes over time and include precise reference to the data.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks Good ability to interpret the data in Source A. Responses will draw two conclusions although the description of the findings may be less precise.</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 drawn with precise reference to the data or two conclusions may be drawn but without precise reference/ comparison of the data.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Limited ability to interpret the data in Source A. Typically only one conclusion is drawn without reference /comparisons of the data.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of Source A.</p>	4	<p>Responses may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income inequality has increased between 1972/73 to 2009/10 as the share of the top 10% has increased from 21% to 31% while that of the bottom 10% has decreased from 4% to 1%. • The share of income of the top 10% declined from 34% to 21% between 1938/9 and 1972/73 but has steadily increased again between 1972/73 and 2009/10 from 21% to 31%. • In 2009/10 incomes were very unequally distributed with the richest 10% having 31% of income and the poorest 10% having only 1%. • Income inequality in 2009/10 was a lot more unequal than in 1972/73. In 2009/10 there was a 30% point difference between the top 10% and the bottom 10%, whereas in 1972/73 there was a 17% point difference. • Any other accurate conclusion supported by the data.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Using Source B, explain why sociologists may feel it is important to build up a rapport with the people they are studying.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding Level 3: 5-6 marks Candidates display an excellent range of knowledge and understanding. Responses will include sociological concepts in their explanations. 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. The response may be underdeveloped or the response may be detailed but narrow. 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. 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. The information is 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>	9	Responses may include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred by interpretivists • Allows researcher to access respondents' meanings/gain greater depth in data • Creates trust with participants/reduces suspicion • Increases validity / truthfulness of responses. • Ethical reasons, eg less intimidating to respondents. • More equal/less hierarchical relationship between researcher and subjects. • Improves response/participation rates / representativeness of sample. • Any other relevant response. Sociological evidence may include: Interpretivism, Validity, Ethics, Representativeness, Generalisability, Verstehen, Empathy, Ethnographic , Qualitative

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>A02 Application Level 3: 3 marks Candidates will make clear and explicit reference to why sociologists may feel it is important to build up a rapport using material from Source B.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks Candidates will make partial reference to why sociologists may feel it is important to build up a rapport using some material from Source B but application will be narrow or underdeveloped.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Candidates will make limited reference to why sociologists may feel it is important to build up a rapport with some reference to Source B. Typically reference made to the source may be lip service only.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application of Source B.</p>		<p>In applying material from Source B candidates may refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some women refused to be interviewed; gaining rapport may help to reduce this. • Gosling states that disclosing information about herself helped to build trust and get better responses. • She states that she could relate to the women on the estate better because she came from a similar background. • Because the researcher had accessed her subjects via local community groups she was seen as more trustworthy. • Respondents were being interviewed about sensitive issues such as poverty so gaining rapport was necessary. • Gaining rapport assisted with the snowball sampling ensuring higher participation rates and a larger sample

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>With reference to Source A and your wider sociological knowledge, explain why quantitative data might be useful in studying the distribution of income in the UK.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Level 4: 7–8 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of why quantitative data might be useful in studying the distribution of income in the UK. The response will be accurate and detailed and include a range of knowledge in the form of concepts and/or theories. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured.</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 or detailed and narrow. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure.</p> <p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display basic knowledge and understanding which will be lacking range and depth. Typically answers will be undeveloped, unsubstantiated, partial and confused. The information has some relevance but is poorly structured.</p> <p>Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display limited knowledge and understanding. Typically, there may only be vague representations of topic area or very narrow response.</p>	12	<p>Candidates should show an understanding of quantitative data and should use the example in Item A. Answers may also make reference to other sources on distribution of income eg official statistics or surveys relating to individual or household incomes or poverty.</p> <p>Responses may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positivist preference for quantitative data/seen as more scientific. • Precision of measurement eg shows exact extent of income inequalities/how much they have changed. • Enable researchers to easily analyse patterns, trends or correlations. • Quantitative data may be able to track changes over time eg if it is collected annually. • Reliability of quantitative data such as official statistics as they are collected on a regular basis/consistent methodology. • Larger samples or national coverage enable greater representativeness. • Easy access/savings of time and cost in using secondary sources such as those shown. • Objective nature of statistical data. • Less ethical problems in using official statistics/secondary data • Any other reasonable points. <p>Sociological concepts may include: Positivist, Reliability, Representativeness, Generalisability , Value free, Objectivity , Social facts, Patterns, Trends, Correlations , Causal relationships, Ethics.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The information is very narrow or mostly lacking in relevance and communicated in an unstructured way.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>AO2 Application</p> <p>Level 4: 4 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to apply knowledge to the distribution of income in the UK in a consistent and explicit way.</p> <p>Level 3: 3 marks Candidates display good ability to apply knowledge to the distribution of income in the UK. There should be some explicit application to income distribution.</p> <p>Level 2: 2 marks Candidates display basic ability to apply knowledge to the distribution of income in the UK. Application to income distribution will be narrow.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 mark Candidates display limited ability. Application will be lip service only.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application.</p>		<p>In applying material from Item A and elsewhere candidates may highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Item A data is available since the 1930s allowing study of changes over time. • Item A or other data allows measurement more precisely of the extent of inequalities eg size of gap between top and bottom 10%. • Using Item A we can make comparisons eg between share of income taken by different income groups. • Easy availability of data, eg from ONS or government websites. • Representativeness and reliability of official statistics eg in relation to ONS data. • Any other logical and accurate interpretation of material from Item A or elsewhere.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge, explain and evaluate the use of semi-structured interviews for researching the lives of women in poorer neighbourhoods.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Level 3: 5-6 marks Candidates display an excellent and wide ranging knowledge and understanding. There will be a wide range and explicit use of sociological concepts / theory. At the top of the level responses will include theoretical issues. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured.</p> <p>Level 2: 3-4 marks Candidates will display good knowledge and understanding. The response may be underdeveloped or may be detailed and narrow. There will be some use of sociological concepts at the bottom of the level these may be implicit. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-2 marks Candidates show a basic knowledge and understanding of the use of semi-structured interviews. The response may be partial and confused. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p>	20	<p>Responses may include the following:</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding/justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured Interviews produce mainly qualitative data as they allow the researcher and respondent to go beyond the set interview schedule • However, also capable of producing quantitative data by inclusion of standardised questions. • Qualitative data higher in validity • Quantitative data higher in reliability. • Ethical advantages eg ability to gain informed consent, sensitivity to concerns of informants. • Theoretical issues eg address concerns of both positivists and interpretivists. • Practical advantages eg allow researchers to gain standardised data as well as to explore issues in more depth. <p>In evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical disadvantages eg time, cost, training of interviewers) • Ethical disadvantages (ensuring confidentiality, protection from harm) • Theoretical disadvantages (issues with validity, reliability or representativeness) • Sampling issues eg due to time taken to do interviews samples are likely to be small. <p>Examples of links to context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews explored at length women's personal understandings and experiences of social exclusion and urban regeneration fits in with interpretivist approach. • Gosling states interviews gave rich accounts of women's experiences. • Interviews allowed detailed and more open accounts of the women's lives to be reached suggesting validity.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2 Application</p> <p>Level 3: 5-6 marks Excellent application and wide ranging skills. Candidates will relate the method of semi-structured interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching the lives of women in poorer neighbourhoods) in a consistent and explicit way.</p> <p>Level 2: 3-4 marks Good application skills with some range. Candidates will relate the method of semi-structured interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching the lives of women in poorer neighbourhoods) but it may not be consistently and/or explicitly relevant.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-2 marks Basic ability to relate the method of semi-structured interviews to the context of the research in Source B (researching the lives of women in poorer neighbourhoods) with occasional reference to the context. At the bottom of the band responses are likely to be generalised or may only pay lip service in linking to the context in some parts.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application.</p> <p>AO3 Analysis and Evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 7-8 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to analyse and evaluate. There will be a range of explicit evaluative points which are accurate and developed, considering both strengths and weaknesses of the method. At the bottom of the level some points may be less developed.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method allowed Gosling to interview women with a range of experiences giving a more representative picture. • More informal interview method allowed her to achieve trust and rapport. • Interviews were built on initial research using other methods which provided framework for questions. • May be hard to produce quantitative data as women not all asked the same questions. • Possibility of bias/lack of validity as women in this situation may have distrusted the researcher/ some refused to be interviewed • Ethical difficulties of researching a sensitive issue such as poverty.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display a good ability to analyse and evaluate. 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. There will be a lack of range of evaluative points and/or 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. Typically, the response will be minimal/ assertive, and/or tangential to the question.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant analysis or evaluation.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Outline two ways in which social class may affect a person's life chances.</p> <p>Level 4: 8–10 marks Candidates display a wide-ranging and excellent knowledge and understanding of two ways in which social class may affect a person's life chances. There will be explicit and frequent use of sociological concepts and evidence and a clear understanding of the concept of life chances. 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 two ways in which social class may affect a person's life chances. 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 less developed and some 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>	10	<p>Possible areas / ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic (opportunities to achieve high levels of wealth and income, chances of social mobility, chances of poverty) • Lifestyle/cultural (social/cultural capital, access to high culture, leisure opportunities, housing, consumer goods) • Education (educational attainment, opportunities for private education, higher education) • Work (chances of unemployment/redundancy, opportunities for status/fulfilment/autonomy in work, other rewards from work) • Health (class differences in morbidity/ mortality / life expectancy) • Crime and deviance (chances of victimisation/ criminalisation) • Politics (opportunities to influence decision making/ achieve political power) <p>Possible theories/ concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxism • Weberian theory • New Right • Life chances • Market situation • Closure • Inequality of opportunity • Absolute and relative social mobility • Social reproduction • Economic/cultural/social capital • Material/ cultural deprivation • Health inequalities /health chances • Cycle of poverty • Social exclusion • Power • Workplace inequalities • Distribution of wealth and income

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display basic knowledge and understanding of one or two ways in which social class may affect a person’s life chances. Responses will be lacking range and depth. Responses will be undeveloped and partial and some may be confused. Candidates may not show a clear understanding of the concept of life chances, for example offering generalised examples of class differences. There may be an over-reliance on contemporary examples. One way with depth and detail can reach the top of this band. 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 very narrow 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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differential law enforcement • Victimisation • Dependency culture/underclass <p>A wide range of studies or other evidence eg data from official statistics could be used in support of candidates answers. Any appropriate, accurate and substantiated evidence should be rewarded.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Evaluate feminist explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment.</p> <p>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</p> <p>Level 3: 5-6 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of different feminist explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment displaying a wide range and depth. There will be explicit and frequent use of relevant theories, concepts and/or studies. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured.</p> <p>Level 2: 3-4 marks Candidates display a good knowledge and understanding of feminist explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment. There will be a good but less developed range of relevant theories, concepts and/or studies or a narrower range treated in more depth. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-2 marks Candidates display a basic knowledge lacking range and depth. Knowledge is likely to be undeveloped, partial or confused/ tangential. Some candidates may simply present a generalised feminist explanation. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.</p>	20	<p>Responses may include the following:</p> <p>Theories and concepts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liberal feminism • Marxist feminism • Radical feminism • Black feminism • Sexual discrimination • Pay gap • Gender roles • Gender socialisation • Femininity/masculinity • Horizontal/vertical segregation • Domestic division of labour • Dual labour market • Reserve army of labour • Capitalism • Post-Fordism • Patriarchy • Sexism • Closure • Sexual harassment • Sexualisation of women's work • Private/public sphere <p>In evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functionalism • Biological/nature arguments • Human capital theory • Hakim/rational choice theory • Marxism • Importance of class/ capitalism rather than gender/ patriarchy • Post-feminism

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2 Application</p> <p>Level 3: 4 marks Candidates apply knowledge of feminist explanations to understanding gender inequalities in work and employment in an excellent and explicit way. A range of different feminist explanations will be directly related to gender inequalities in work and employment.</p> <p>Level 2: 2-3 marks Candidates apply knowledge of feminist explanations of gender inequalities in a good but implicit way. Some of the explanations will be applied explicitly but others may be more implicit or generalised explanations of gender inequality without applying to work and employment.</p> <p>Level 1: 1 marks Candidates apply knowledge of feminist explanations or of gender inequalities in work a basic way. Responses are likely to contain generalised evidence/concepts.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant application.</p> <p>AO3 Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Level 4: 8-10 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to analyse and evaluate sociological explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment. There will be a range of explicit evaluative points which are accurate</p>	AO2 4 1a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feminism outdated • Gender inequalities disappearing • Emergence of women's rights/legislation • Postmodernism • Category of gender ignores differences within genders • Ignores aspects of male disadvantage eg unemployment, educational qualifications • Criticisms from within feminism eg of liberal feminists by radical feminists. • Criticisms of specific feminist studies eg relating to data, methodology or concepts. <p>Studies/writers may include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millett • Oakley • Benston • Ansley • Brugel • Johnson • Feeley • Dalla Costa & James • Walby • Sharpe • Delphy & Leonard • Lees • Ti-Grace Atkinson • Hartmann • Barrett • Burchell and Rubery • McDowell • Adkins • Hakim • Crompton and Sanderson • Brooks

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>and developed. Candidates may also offer some analysis of how explanations differ from one another.</p> <p>Level 3: 5-7 marks Candidates display a good ability to analyse and evaluate sociological explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment. There may be some evaluation and analysis via juxtaposition but there should also be some explicit evaluative points and/or explicit analysis, eg via comparison, however, these will either be underdeveloped or narrower in range.</p> <p>Level 2: 3-4 marks Candidates display a basic ability to analyse and evaluate sociological explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment. There will be a lack of range of evaluative points or responses are likely to be partial, confused and undeveloped. Evaluation may be in the form of juxtaposition of different explanations including different feminist explanations.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-2 marks Candidates display a limited ability to analyse and evaluate sociological explanations of gender inequalities in work and employment. Typically, the response will be minimal, assertive and / or tangential to the question.</p> <p>0 marks No relevant analysis or evaluation.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parsons • Rastogi • Gilmore

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 2016

