

GCE

Sociology

H180/02: Researching and understanding social inequalities

AS Level

Mark Scheme for June 2025

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 2025

PREPARATION FOR MARKING**RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor Online Training: OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are available in RM Assessor
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed-out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed-out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple-choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. There is a NR (**No Response**) option. Award NR (No Response):
 - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
 - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
 - OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.

9. *Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.*
10. For answers marked by levels of response:
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
 - To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Knowledge and Understanding: for example, studies or theories or concepts Section A: Strength of the method
	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way/detailed
	Underdeveloped: Partially explained, but requiring more depth
	Unsubstantiated/ undeveloped/ implicit / accurate without explanation/ substantiation
	Q4: Use of methodological theory Optional: Sociological or methodological evidence: concepts / statistics / social policy / theory
	Application/Interpretation Q1 - 4: explicit engagement with the source
	Lip service
	Section A: Weakness of the method Q6: Critical evaluation point
	Example/Reference
	Juxtaposition of theories without direct evaluation
	Unclear/confused/lacks sense/not creditable
	Irrelevant: not related to the topic area and/or non-sociological
	Repetition
	Not clearly focused on question set tangential – sociological but not directly relevant
	Where a page has writing on, but it is not worthy of any credit.
 Highlight	Q4 use of methodological perspective Q5 highlight each way

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	Using data from Source A, describe two conclusions on the comparison of attainment between students eligible for free school meals, and those not eligible for free school meals. <u>AO2 Application</u> Level 4: 4 marks Excellent ability to interpret the data in Source A and can describe two conclusions which could be made on the comparison of attainment between students eligible for free school meals, and those not eligible for free school meals. 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 precise or may support only one of the identified conclusions with data from the source. Level 2: 2 marks Basic ability to interpret the data in Source A. Typically, responses will be partial, for example only one conclusion may be fully described or there is a failure to support the two points with specific data from the source. Level 1: 1 mark Limited ability to interpret the data in Source A. Typically only one conclusion is described without supporting data or the candidate may simply read data from the graph without drawing a conclusion. 0 marks No relevant application.	4	Examples of possible responses might be: • A smaller percentage of free school meal pupils achieved expected levels of attainment at every stage compared to other pupils. For example, at age 5, only 57% of FSM pupils had a good level of development while 72% of other pupils did, similarly at 19 only 35% of FSM pupils had achieved 2 A Levels compared 60% of others. • Differences of attainment seem to generally widen as pupils progress through education At age 5 there was roughly a 15 percentage points difference in achieving a good level of development. However, by the age of 19, there was roughly a 25 percentage points difference in the proportion achieving 2 A Levels. • The biggest gap in attainment was found at age 16 in terms of the proportion achieving good English and Maths GCSEs, a 28 percentage points difference, while the smallest gap was in achieving a good level of development at age 5, a 15 percentage points difference. • The percentage of FSM pupils who achieve the expected level of attainment increases between the ages of 5 and 7 (increasing from 57% to 60%) but decreases at each age thereafter (falling to only 35% achieving 2 A Levels at age 19). Any other reasonable response should be rewarded but to achieve Level 3 or above the candidates should establish some kind of pattern or trend rather than simply reading off individual statistics.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 *	With reference to Source B explain why sociologists might use quota sampling in order to obtain a sample when carrying out research. <u>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</u> Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display an excellent and wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of how sociologists might use quota sampling in order to obtain a representative sample when carrying out research. 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. <i>Candidates will display developed knowledge and understanding of at least two issues relating to the question or three underdeveloped points, with some use of methodological concepts/theory.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates will display good knowledge and understanding of how sociologists might use quota sampling in order to obtain a representative sample when carrying out research. The response will be underdeveloped or the response may have breadth OR depth. Some of the concepts referred to 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. <i>Candidates will display developed knowledge and understanding of at least one issue relating to the question or underdeveloped knowledge and understanding of two or more issues.</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks	9	Candidates should show understanding of the concept of quota sampling and may refer to related concepts such as representativeness, generalisability, random/non-random sampling, practical/ethical/theoretical factors, positivism. Responses may include the following: - Quota sampling involves stratifying a sample by social characteristics such as social class, gender, ethnicity, age, location etc. Researchers then set a quota of respondents to be selected who have each relevant characteristic. This ensures that important groups are adequately represented in the sample. Thus in Source B it is clear that both men and women were represented. - Quota sampling is not a random sampling technique. It avoids the difficulties of finding a list of names to form a sampling frame and then randomly selecting from this. Hence, it may be quicker, cheaper and more convenient than other sampling methods. The researchers had to select samples of around 1,000 people in 17 countries so using other sampling methods may have been too expensive or time consuming. - Quota samples ensure that the characteristics of the sample broadly match the characteristics of the wider population. This means that any results from the survey should be generalisable to the wider population. The researchers suggested that the samples were broadly representative of the populations of the 17 countries. - Quota sampling can be seen as a scientific method of selecting a representative sample so may be favoured by positivist sociologists who seek to do research using methods which are broadly similar to those of the natural sciences. This research follows a broadly positivist approach as wants to conduct a large scale study using quantitative data and therefore uses the comparative sampling technique to collect a representative sample of a range of social characteristics.

		Candidates will display basic knowledge and understanding of how sociologists might use quota sampling in order to obtain a representative sample when carrying out research. At the bottom of the band, responses may be partial and confused or all concepts will be implicit. 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. <i>Candidates will display basic knowledge and understanding of at least one issue relating to the question.</i> 0 marks - No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding. <u>AO2 Application</u> Level 3: 3 marks Candidates will make explicit reference to evidence from Source B in explaining why sociologists might use quota sampling in order to obtain a representative sample when carrying out research. <i>2 clear applications of the source.</i> Level 2: 2 marks Candidates will make partial reference to Source B, typically using just one piece of data from the source. <i>1 clear application of the source.</i> Level 1: 1 mark Candidates will make limited or passing reference to Source B. Typically reference made to the source may be lip service only. <i>Application of the source unclear or lip service only.</i> 0 marks - No relevant application.		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 *	With reference to Source A, explain the limitations of using quantitative data to study social inequalities in relation to educational attainment. <u>AO1 Knowledge and understanding</u> Level 4: 7–8 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of some limitations which interpretivist sociologists might identify in relying on quantitative data to study social inequalities in relation to educational attainment. The response will be accurate and detailed and include a range of knowledge in the form of concepts and theory. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. <i>Candidates should consider at least three developed points, at the bottom of the band one may be slightly less developed.</i> 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. <i>Candidates should consider at least two developed points or a wider range of less developed points.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display basic knowledge and understanding, which will be lacking range and depth. Typically answers will be underdeveloped, unsubstantiated, partial and confused. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. <i>Candidates should consider at least one developed point or a narrower range of less developed points.</i>	12	Candidates should show an understanding of the terms interpretivism and quantitative data. Responses may include the following: • Interpretivist sociologists may prefer to use qualitative data which allows them to understand the meanings and viewpoints of those being researched in order to achieve verstehen. This is harder to achieve with quantitative data, e.g. qualitative data might allow researchers to understand how pupils on free school meals experience and interpret the education system. • Validity: supported with same data about the source as previous point. • In this study pupils are only crudely categorised as free school meals and others, interpretivists, might want to understand a whole range of other influences on attainment and focus on those which are seen as important by the pupils themselves. There may be an element of researcher imposition here. • This study only measures variables which can be measured objectively such as educational attainment and eligibility for free school meals. Interpretivists would argue we also need to study more subjective aspects such as the feelings of pupils about education or their interaction with other pupils, teachers etc. • This study seems to be based on official statistics and researchers do not seem to have interacted directly with the pupils being studied or achieved any rapport with them. This would have allowed them to explore the pupil's own definitions of the situation which are not considered here. • This study seems to show a correlation between free school meal eligibility and educational attainment^t. However, this doesn't necessarily prove causation and even if it does, it fails to offer a deeper understanding of the social processes which produced this effect.

		Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display limited knowledge and understanding. Typically, there may only be vague representations of topic area and a tendency towards common sense, or very 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. <i>Candidates are likely to consider just one or two limited points.</i> 0 marks - No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding. <u>AO2 Application</u> Level 4: 4 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to apply Source A and their wider sociological knowledge to this question. <i>3 clear applications of the source.</i> Level 3: 3 marks Candidates display good ability to apply Source A and their wider sociological knowledge to the question. <i>2 clear applications of the source.</i> Level 2: 2 marks Candidates display basic ability to apply Source A and/or their wider sociological knowledge to the question. <i>1 clear application of the source.</i> Level 1: 1 mark Candidates display limited ability to apply Source A and/or their wider sociological knowledge to the question. <i>Application of the source unclear or just lip service.</i> 0 marks - No relevant application.		Any other reasonable response should be credited. Candidates should be rewarded for application when they use evidence from the source to support their points.
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 *	Using Source B and your wider sociological knowledge, explain and evaluate the use of online questionnaires to investigate public opinion about gender equality across the world. <u>AO1 Knowledge and understanding</u> Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display an excellent knowledge and understanding of the use of online questionnaires to investigate public opinion about gender equality across the world. 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. <i>Candidates should consider at least three developed methodological concepts or theories. At the bottom, one may be less well developed.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates will display good knowledge and understanding of the use of online questionnaires to investigate public opinion about gender equality across the world. 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. <i>Candidates should consider at least two well-developed methodological concepts or theories or three underdeveloped ones.</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates show a basic knowledge and understanding of the use of online questionnaires to investigate public opinion about gender equality across the world. The response may be partial and confused without a clear understanding of questionnaires. 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.	20 6 AO2 1b	Candidates should be rewarded with marks for AO1 when they show knowledge and understanding of theories (e.g. interpretivism and positivism) and concepts (e.g. validity, reliability and representativeness). In application candidates should link points to the context of the source material to support evaluation points as in examples below. Positive evaluation points/strengths might include: • Positivism - As the research is based on quantitative data, it allows us to see patterns and trends and would be favoured by positivists. For example, on average, across the 17 countries surveyed, 80% of individuals personally consider gender equality to be an important cause to work towards. • Objectivity – Positivists might argue that this survey is objective and scientific because it asks standardised questions which are the same across all the populations sampled. Researchers have little opportunity to influence respondents because data is collected via questionnaires so there is less chance of researcher bias. • Reliability – This type of research can easily be repeated to see if it can be replicated by other researchers. If the samples selected were similar in composition one might expect to obtain similar results. This would make the research reliable. • Representativeness/sampling – Approximately 1,000 survey respondents in 17 countries were sampled (17,160 respondents in all) using quota sampling. There is therefore a high probability that the researchers obtained a representative sample of opinions about gender equality in countries across the world. • Ethics – In surveys such as this it is likely that respondents would be asked for their informed consent

	<i>Candidates should consider one underdeveloped idea or one or more undeveloped idea(s).</i> 0 marks - No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding. AO2 Application Level 3: 5–6 marks Excellent application skills. Candidates will relate the use of online questionnaires to the context of the research in Source B in a consistent and explicit way. <i>3 or 4 clear and explicit applications of the source.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Good application skills. Candidates will relate the use of online questionnaires to the context of the research in Source B but it may be lacking in consistency, it may be or not be explicitly relevant to the context in some parts. <i>2 clear and explicit applications of the source</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks Basic ability to relate the use of online questionnaires to the context. Responses are likely to be generalised without referring to the specific context. <i>Some attempt to apply the source material but only lip service or lacking clarity.</i> 0 marks - No relevant application	and anonymity and confidentiality would be guaranteed which would make the research ethical. • Time and cost – Given that this study was quite large in scale it took a relatively short time to complete, responses were obtained within a 2 weeks period. Using other methods such as interviewing would be much more time consuming and expensive and would probably not be practicable during the Covid pandemic. • Social policy – The study was designed to measure progress since the Beijing declaration of 1995 and therefore could measure change over time and possibly be used as a basis for developing policies on gender inequalities by governments around the world. In criticising the method/identifying weaknesses candidates might include the following points: • Interpretivists would argue that ethnographic methods are needed to achieve rapport with participants because the researcher has plenty of opportunity to build trust and make respondents feel relaxed so they will behave naturally. Using questionnaires is unlikely to achieve this so respondents are less likely to open up to researchers about their real views on gender equality and responses may be less valid. • Validity – Data from this type of research is likely to be less valid than, observation. Subjects may claim to be in favour of gender equality in a questionnaire but only observation would reveal the extent to which subjects actually put this into practice in their daily lives. • Verstehen – Interpretivists such as Max Weber argue that sociologists should gain verstehen by understanding the meanings created in their social world by actors. Questionnaires only give a fairly superficial response to questions which have been chosen by the researchers rather than exploring the meanings and interpretations of respondents in depth in relation to their understanding of gender equality.
--	--	--

	AO3 Analysis and Evaluation Level 4: 7–8 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to analyse and evaluate the use of online questionnaires in this context. There will be a range of explicit evaluative points, which are accurate and developed, considering both strengths and weaknesses of the method. <i>At this level there should be developed evaluation of at least two strengths and two weaknesses of the method.</i> Level 3: 5–6 marks Candidates display a good ability to analyse and evaluate the use of online questionnaires in this context. There will be some explicit evaluative points, but these are likely to be underdeveloped or contain a narrower range of more developed points. <i>At this level there should be developed evaluation of at least two strengths and one weakness or one strength and two weaknesses.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display a basic ability to analyse and evaluate the use of online questionnaires. 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. <i>At this level candidates are likely to consider only two developed evaluation points (strengths and/or weaknesses) or a wider range of under-developed points.</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a limited ability to analyse and evaluate the use of online questionnaires. Typically, the response will be minimal relying on only one idea, assertive, and/or tangential to the question. <i>At this level candidates are unlikely to consider more than one developed evaluation point or two undeveloped points.</i> 0 marks - No relevant analysis or evaluation.	• Researcher imposition – the researchers decided what was important and what possible responses would be available to respondents. More qualitative methods such as unstructured interviews would allow respondents to explain their views in their own words and emphasise the issues that they felt to be important. • Representativeness – the survey did not cover all countries and seems to have focused more on rich countries than poor ones. The authors also admit that populations impacted by humanitarian crises, migrant populations, ethnic minorities, and respondents with non-binary gender identities were not well represented so it may not be possible to generalise results to these groups. Any other relevant points should be rewarded.
--	---	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	* Outline two ways in which gender inequalities in UK society have decreased. <u>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</u> Level 4: 8-10 marks The candidate shows a wide ranging and excellent knowledge and understanding of two ways in which gender inequalities in UK society have decreased. 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. <i>At this level candidates will show clear understanding of two ways, each supported with at least two pieces of sociological evidence in the form of studies, statistics, reports or theory.</i> Level 3: 5-7 marks The candidate shows a good knowledge and understanding of ways in which gender inequalities in UK society have decreased. 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. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most part relevant and supported by some evidence. <i>At this level candidates will show clear understanding of two ways. There will typically be three developed pieces of sociological evidence or a wider range of underdeveloped ones. One way with depth and detail can reach the bottom of this band.</i>	10	Candidates should show an understanding of the concept of gender inequalities. Possible areas of knowledge might include: • Legislation – e.g. 1975 Sex Discrimination Act, introduction of Maternity Pay 1986. • Gender pay gap has narrowed from 47.6 per cent in 1970 to 15.1 per cent in 2022. • Employment rates have become more similar - In the early 1970s, the male employment rate was 92.1 percent, and the female employment rate 52.8 percent. In the three months to December 2022, the employment rate for males in the United Kingdom 79 percent, while for females it was 72.3 percent. • Education – girls overtook boys in A Level passes from the 1990s onwards. There are now more women attending universities than men. In 2008, men in Britain were more likely than women to have a degree-level qualification (22.3% compared with 20.5%). However, this situation reversed over time. By 2013, 27.7% of men had a degree-level qualification, compared with 28.4% of women. Since the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, schools have had to offer the same subjects to girls and boys. • Success of #metoo movement (and or other similar movements) e.g. imprisonment of Harvey Weinstein and others who have abused women. • Increased representation of women in parliament-it was 3% in 1979 but as of February 2023, there are 225 women in the House of Commons, the highest ever. This is a new all-time high at 35%. • Of the 16 government departments run by permanent secretaries, six are run by women whereas in the 1970s all permanent secretaries were men.

		Level 2: 3-4 marks The candidate shows a basic knowledge and understanding of at least one way in which gender inequalities in UK society have decreased. 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. <i>At this level candidates will show understanding of two ways but will be unable to support points with specific evidence. Alternatively one way will be explained with some supportive evidence.</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks The candidate shows limited knowledge and understanding of ways in which gender inequalities in UK society have decreased. 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. <i>At this level candidates are unlikely to show understanding of more than one way which will be supported with limited or no evidence.</i> 0 marks No relevant knowledge or understanding		• Five years ago, in 2016, there were 21 female Fortune 500 CEOs (4.2%). Since then, this number rose by 4% to 41 as of 2021. • Gender roles in families – e.g. Giddens transformation of intimacy, Gershuny lagged adaptation. • Youth culture – emergence of youth subcultures for girls e.g. Sk8er Girls, Riot Grrls, Ragga Girls etc. • Media – More positive representations of women in the media e.g. Gauntlett. • Digital communication – women have used digital media to express their views more freely, cyberfeminism, third wave feminism, groups such as Everyday Sexism Project.
--	--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 *	Assess functionalist explanations of social inequality. <u>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</u> Level 3: 5-6 marks The candidate shows an excellent knowledge and understanding of the view. There will be explicit and frequent use of theories, concepts and studies relevant to the 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. <i>At this level candidates are likely to show developed knowledge of at least three aspects of the view in the form of studies, concepts and/or sociological evidence.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display a good knowledge of the view. There will be a range of theories, 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 presented with some structure. The information presented is for the most part relevant and supported by some evidence. <i>At this level candidates are likely to show developed knowledge of at least two aspects of the view in the form of studies, concepts and/or sociological evidence or a wider range covered in less depth.</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a basic knowledge and understanding of the view. Knowledge is likely to be narrow, undeveloped, partial or confused, lacking range and depth. 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. <i>At this level candidates are likely to show developed knowledge of just one aspect of the view or a wider range with less development or clarity.</i> 0 marks - No relevant sociological knowledge or understanding.	20	Candidates are likely to make use of functionalist theory but could use New Right approaches in support. Candidates may make reference to social class and/or gender inequalities. Candidates are likely to refer to studies such as: • Parsons • Davies and Moore • Saunders • Murray • Murdock • Rastogi • Schlafly In evaluation candidates could draw on a variety of approaches including: • Marxism • Different feminist theories • Weberian theory • Tumin's critique of functionalism Candidates might also draw on empirical data as part of their evaluation, for example: • Evidence of the dysfunctional nature of class inequalities e.g. Wilkinson and Pickett. • Evidence that the movement towards gender equality has not been dysfunctional e.g. more women as MPs, CEOs etc which offer advantages for society. • Evidence that social inequalities are socially constructed rather than rooted in nature/biology. • Evidence that talented individuals are denied opportunities because of social closure/lack of life chances.

		<u>AO2: Application</u> Level 3: 4 marks Candidates apply evidence for and against the view in an excellent and explicit way. Level 2: 2–3 marks Candidates apply evidence for and against the explanations in a good but implicit way. Level 1: 1 mark Candidates apply evidence for and/or against the explanations in a basic way. Responses are likely to contain evidence/concepts which relate in a general way to functionalism/social inequality but are not directly related to functionalist explanations of social inequality. 0 marks - No relevant application <u>AO3 Analysis and evaluation</u> Level 4: 8–10 marks Candidates display an excellent ability to analyse and evaluate the view. There will be a range of explicit evaluative points against the theory which are accurate and developed. <i>At this level candidates should consider at least three developed and explicit evaluation points.</i> Level 3: 5–7 marks Candidates display a good ability to analyse and evaluate the view. There will be some explicit evaluative points, but these are likely to be underdeveloped. There will be range or depth. <i>At this level candidates should consider at least two developed and explicit evaluation points or a wider range of less developed or focused points.</i> Level 2: 3–4 marks Candidates display a basic ability to analyse and evaluate the view. There will be a lack of range and depth of evaluative points and responses are likely to be partial, confused undeveloped or juxtaposed.		Any other relevant points and evidence should be credited on either side of the debate.
--	--	--	--	---

		<i>At this level candidates should consider at least one developed and explicit evaluation point or more points but simply juxtaposed or implicit evaluation.</i> Level 1: 1–2 marks Candidates display a limited ability to analyse and evaluate the view. Typically, the response will be minimal, assertive, and/or tangential to the question. <i>At this level candidates are likely to offer just one or two limited evaluation points.</i> 0 marks - No relevant analysis or evaluation.		
--	--	--	--	--

Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2025 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

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

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

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

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

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