

Sociology

Advanced GCE **A2 7878**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3878**

Reports the Components

June 2008

3878/7878/MS/R/08

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of candidates and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

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

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Sociology (7878)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Sociology (3878)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
2532 The Individual and Society	2
2533 Culture and Socialisation	5
2534 Sociological research skills	11
2535 Research Report	15
2536 Power and Control	18
2537 Applied Sociological Research Skills	22
2538 The Personal Study	25
2539 Social Inequality and Difference	30
Grade Thresholds	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Chief Examiner Report

Overall candidate performance was broadly similar to previous sessions. This report contains detailed feedback on all units and is designed to help teachers and candidates improve on their delivery and performance; especially useful are the teacher's tips.

This session was of course the final full AS level session for this specification, with resit opportunities available next year. Looking back over the lifetime of this specification huge improvements have been made in the quality of student responses on all units. Teachers, trainers, publishers but most of all candidates should be congratulated on this achievement. At A2 candidates continue to grapple with the higher order skills of interpretation and evaluation with varying amounts of success; these remain clear skills enabling differentiation.

2532 The Individual and Society

General Comments

There was no significant difference in the numbers of candidates opting to answer either of the two questions on the examination paper this session, (although there was evidence that some candidates changed their minds after starting to write). Teachers might usefully advise their candidates to read through *all* parts of *both* questions before beginning to write - and perhaps attach most importance to the part'd' sub-questions in making their decision as to which question to opt for? Candidates should bear in mind the fact that this examination uses the 'marks = minutes' principle in terms of how long they should spend writing their responses to each sub-question. The number of candidates ignoring the rubric and answering both questions is now very low indeed.

Examiners reported seeing a wide range of responses from candidates this session. There was a feeling that this session highlighted a difference in candidate preparation for the examination; nevertheless, stronger candidates were evidently well prepared for the questions set, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, and using it to good effect in terms of the necessary skills to answer their chosen question. However, weaker candidates showed less knowledge and understanding in their answers, and often failed to show awareness of the skill domain on which assessment is based.

Comment on individual questions

Question One

1(a) Where candidates did what the rubric asked of them and used the item, they were readily able to identify and offer explanation of two ways in which food is linked to culture. Some candidates failed to use the item and so did not employ the relevant skill of interpretation and analysis. Weaker responses sometimes listed *all* the features mentioned in the item, or did not focus clearly on just *two* features.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be taught that this question is assessing their ability to interpret and analyse, (and so must refer *explicitly* to the item), and that they should identify and explain *only* the number of ways asked for. No evaluation is required.

1(b) Many candidates answered this question well and most managed to identify and explain two features of culture. Such features commonly included "language" and "religion", (whilst some candidates, primed by the item, cited "food" and "dress", and these were accepted). Weaker responses failed to identify and explain *two* features of culture, and some candidates seemed unclear as to precisely what culture comprises.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be aware that this question is assessing sociological knowledge and understanding (of key sociological concepts to do with what culture comprises and what features of it might be cited). Again, candidates should identify and explain only the number of features asked for, (not more or fewer). Evaluation is not necessary.

1(c) This question tended not to be as well answered as it might have been. Many candidates confused ways in which religion influences social behaviour with the ways other agents of

socialisation (family, media, peer groups) do so. Too many candidates resorted to commonsensical material although stronger candidates were able to focus on religion and support what they wrote about it with sociological data. Evaluation sometimes tended to be of a relatively limited nature.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be encouraged to support their answers with sociological material whenever possible and remember that part 'c' questions require them to demonstrate the skill of evaluation – as explicitly stated by the command word in this question.

1(d) Most candidates were able to show an awareness of ways in which the contemporary UK is a culturally diverse society and developed a close focus on the ethnic dimension of this diversity. Stronger candidates deployed sociological material to substantiate what they wrote, showing effective conceptual awareness and using a variety of sociological studies to substantiate their arguments and evaluation. However, other candidates seemed less well prepared to respond to this question and resorted to more “commonsensical” material, resulting in speculative and assertive answers. Some failed to acknowledge the extent to which this issue is a debated one, and tended to produce one-sided responses to the question.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be taught that command words such as “discuss” are an invitation to engage in a debate in relation to the question set. Thus a two-sided answer is both possible and desirable, preferably with supported arguments in relation to each side. Too many candidates fail to demonstrate sociological awareness and write answers which are overly reliant on “common-sense”, anecdote or speculation and devoid of any real sociological awareness.

Question Two

2(a) Again, when candidates did as the rubric required and used the item, they had little difficulty in identifying and explaining two factors that form the basis of national identity. However, there were again candidates who chose not to use the item and so failed to display the skill of interpretation and analysis. Other candidates did not focus clearly on *two* expectations, or simply listed *all* the expectations mentioned in the item.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be taught that this question is assessing their ability to interpret and analyse, (and so must refer *explicitly* to the item), and that they should identify and explain *only* the number of factors asked for. No evaluation is required.

2(b) On the whole, this question was not as well answered as it might have been. Stronger candidates were able to cite two distinct ethnic identities in the contemporary UK, drawing on some of the different textbook examples available. However, weaker candidates seemed unsure exactly what ethnic identity is and instead cited imprecise examples based on race or religion or nationality, which failed to identify or explain the cultural dimension of ethnicity.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be aware that this question is assessing sociological knowledge and understanding (of key sociological concepts associated with ethnic identities in the contemporary UK). Again, candidates should identify and explain only the number of ethnic identities asked for, (not more or fewer). Evaluation is not necessary.

2(c) The strength of most candidates' responses to this question was their understanding of the process of socialisation; however, the weakness for a number was their lack of focus on the 'national' identity specified by the question set - not all responses to the question achieved this focus. The best answers gave sound accounts of ways in which socialisation into national identity is effected by the family, media, education and religion. Again, evaluation was sometimes rather limited.

Teacher's tip

Candidates should be encouraged to support their answers with sociological material whenever possible, and need to remember the need to offer evaluation in a part 'c' question – (as they are explicitly directed to do so in this question stem).

2(d) Many candidates were able to show an awareness of what constitutes a 'British' identity and to engage with the debate about the extent to which it may be changing (and, indeed, how much it has ever existed). Strong responses to this question were supported with relevant conceptual and empirical knowledge and understanding. There was some very sound discussion of issues such as globalisation and devolution, although there were also many less well-focused answers and weaker candidates often resorted to commonsensical and/or stereotyped descriptions of 'Britishness'. Again, some failed to acknowledge the extent to which this issue is a debated one, and tended to produce one-sided responses to the question.

Teacher's tip

In any response to a question 'd', candidates must be aware that command words such as "discuss" are inviting them to engage in a debate in relation to the question set. The way to approach such questions is to offer a two-sided answer, with supporting data of a sociological nature offered in relation to each side of the argument. Candidates who write answers devoid of any sociological understanding, and instead rely only on "common-sense", anecdote or speculation will inevitably do less well than others.

2533 Culture and Socialisation

General Comments

The overall standard of responses for this session was good with evidence that many candidates were well prepared in terms of knowledge and understanding of relevant studies, sociological concepts, statistical evidence and theory. There continued to be a number of Centres where a large number of candidates produced very weak, anecdotal answers, lacking in any sound sociological material.

The Family continued to be the most popular option, followed by Mass Media, Religion and Youth and Culture. An overwhelming majority of candidates chose to answer both Family questions. Only a small number of candidates opted for Religion and Youth and Culture. There were few rubric errors with the most common being that candidates answered only one question. A small number of candidates answered four questions. Where four questions were attempted, answers tended to be brief and lacking in evidence whereas answers to only one question were typically very long and detailed. Generally candidates used their time appropriately, producing approximately three quarters of a side of A4 for part (a) and two sides for part (b). Few appeared to run out of time on the second part (b) question.

It was noticeable that there continued to be a significant number of candidates performing quite poorly on part (a) questions, including some who had produced quite strong part (b) answers and this seemed due, in part, to poor exam technique. The most common issues were:

- Candidates writing a generalised response which failed to clearly identify distinct points.
- Candidates identifying more than two points
- Candidates identifying two points which overlap to such a degree that they can only be treated as one point.
- Candidates failing to fully explain their two points, often simply identifying and giving a brief explanation.
- Candidates failing to make use of sociological theories, concepts, studies and/or statistics to develop their answer and demonstrate sociological knowledge and understanding
- Candidates using their time inappropriately on material not required by the question, for example, by including criticisms or evidence against their explanations.

Teachers' Tip

To achieve top band marks for part (a) questions, points need to be identified and then explained using relevant sociological evidence including concepts, studies, theory and/or statistics. In part (a) questions, candidates should be encouraged to identify two clear and distinct factors with explanations that do not overlap. Using a separate paragraph for each point identified and explained is a useful way for candidates to ensure that they have offered two different points.

On part (b) questions weaker answers tended to suffer from the following problems:

- Candidates had insufficient sociological knowledge and responses were mainly anecdotal or drawn from common sense. Better candidates made use of sociological theories, concepts and/or research.
- Some candidates produced answers that were well informed sociologically but they used material that was of only marginal relevance to the question on the paper.
- Candidates failed to interpret and analyse sociological data to support and develop their discussion, for example, with the use of statistics, findings of sociological studies or even examples from current events or broader social trends. As a result, their responses were superficial and lacking in supporting evidence.
- Candidates produced one-sided answers that only considered evidence agreeing or disagreeing with the view.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- Candidates produced balanced answers but these simply juxtaposed arguments or evidence with little explicit evaluation. Better responses offered critical comments, weighed up arguments and evidence and drew a reasoned conclusion about the view.
- A number of candidates wrote part (b) answers that were little longer or even shorter than their part (a) answers.

Overall, most candidates were able to gain a reasonable number of marks for evaluation in part (b) and although this skill continues to be a testing area for candidates, most made some attempt to refer to counter arguments. A large number of candidates evaluate via juxtaposing arguments and theories without any exploration of strengths and weaknesses of evidence. A sustained evaluative approach throughout the answer should be aimed for, with candidates adopting an evaluative tone from their introductory paragraph onwards. Some candidates produced responses that only gained marks for evaluation in the concluding sentences whilst others evaluated only one side of the view.

Teachers' Tip

A sustained evaluative approach can be demonstrated by candidates writing an evaluative introduction, making some pertinent evaluative points about studies, theories and ideas, and summarising the different views in relation to the question. The candidate should aim to evaluate specific sociological arguments from more than one side of the view, based on the available evidence, methods and explanations. Candidates could be encouraged to use key evaluative terms that signal that they are evaluating the evidence or the argument at that point e.g. 'however', 'on the other hand', 'conversely', 'on the contrary', 'in contrast'.

The skill of interpretation and analysis continues to be a challenge for a number of candidates who produce knowledge driven answers and fail to analyse their material and relate it to the question. Such candidates were often able to produce responses with sound knowledge and understanding of concepts, studies etc. but they did not apply this effectively to engage with and support the arguments involved.

Teachers' Tip

To achieve the highest marks in the skill of interpretation and analysis candidates need to select and analyse different types of data to support their discussion of the view in the question. This should be in the form of studies, theory, sociological concepts and/or statistical evidence on various sides of the argument. Candidates should aim to identify the most relevant data and then show how this relates to the question. Using wording drawn from the question when discussing evidence can assist in demonstrating focus on the question and development of an argument.

Overall, candidates fulfilled the requirements in terms of quality of written communication, producing work written in continuous prose and with clarity of expression, although there continue to be a noticeable number of candidates with significant errors of spelling, punctuation and/or grammar.

Comments on Individual Questions

OPTION 1 THE FAMILY

- 1(a) There was a wide range of responses to this question with most candidates able to identify two characteristics. The most common covered gender roles and socialisation. Some candidates answered through reference to key functions, although when simply listed, this approach did not adequately address the question. Better answers tended to draw on functionalist analyses of the nuclear family and used concepts such as instrumental/expressive roles, warm bath and primary socialisation. A few candidates also drew on critical approaches to the nuclear family, for example talking about the nuclear family as a cereal packet family representing a particular ideology of family life or discussing feminist interpretations of gender socialisation, e.g. Oakley's concepts of canalisation, manipulation etc.
- 1(b) This question differentiated between candidates very well. Weaker answers were typically very anecdotal and mainly focused on how women and men had become more equal with no reference to a counter view. Some candidates failed to focus on the family and simply considered roles of men and women in society more generally. Better answers were more balanced and drew on arguments on both sides but were sometimes rather narrow in focus e.g. looking mainly at evidence on domestic labour. Such answers also often relied on rather dated research. Better responses used more up to date studies and considered a wider range of issues e.g. power and decision making, emotion work, domestic violence, the concept of lagged adaptation, changing forms of masculinity and the significance of higher divorce rates and more diverse family structures. A few candidates also considered evidence of diversity e.g. in relation to class or ethnicity and its influence on gender roles. The best answers used a good range of sociological concepts and studies and offered balanced consideration of both sides of the debate.
- 2(a) Most candidates were able to identify two relevant reasons and in most cases offered at least some explanation. A range of reasons were considered with the most popular being; women focusing on careers, popularity of cohabitation and the decline of religious concepts of marriage. A significant number of candidates's confused marriage and divorce rates, often engaging in lengthy discussions of why divorce had increased rather than relating this to the decline of marriage. Better answers that cited this reason pointed to people's fears of divorce and how this had encouraged more cohabitation as an alternative to marriage. Many candidates struggled to offer conceptual or empirical material in support of their answers but there were some good answers drawing on material on secularisation; Sharpe's work on young women's attitudes and Giddens' work on confluent love.
- 2(b) This question produced a wide range of responses with clear differentiation. The weakest answers were very anecdotal, superficial and tended to be one sided e.g. either focusing on the isolation of nuclear families from relatives or on the support family members gave one another. Better answers tended to draw on evidence about issues such as domestic violence and/or the domestic division of labour although this was often not referenced to specific research. Stronger answers were more balanced and typically considered one or more negative aspects against functionalist ideas about the advantages of the nuclear family. Good responses tended to be theoretically driven, typically contrasting functionalist and new right ideas with feminist, Marxist and other critical approaches related to the 'dark side' theories, e.g. Laing and Leach. The best answers were able to support these with some empirical material e.g. Dobash & Dobash or Stanko on domestic violence and offer some critical evaluation of perspectives rather than just juxtaposing arguments. Some candidates also compared the nuclear family with possible alternatives e.g. lone parents and same sex relationships. Some also considered diversity, e.g. looking at issues such as honour killings in some minority communities.

OPTION 2 MASS MEDIA

- 3(a) This question was not generally well answered. Many candidates focused on issues of media content rather than trends in production and as a result, a significant number failed to achieve any marks at all. Others considered issues in production without clearly identifying trends, for example discussing ideas such as agenda setting, gate-keeping and news values. It seemed that some candidates were unclear about the meaning of the term 'trend'. Many candidates referred to trends in ownership and where these could be related to production they were rewarded. Some such answers were conceptually strong, considering trends such as vertical and horizontal integration, concentration of ownership and globalisation. However, only a minority of candidates were able to develop their answer, for example, by illustrating these concepts effectively with examples and evidence. Surprisingly few candidates discussed new forms of media e.g. the internet and satellite but there were some good answers on trends which made use of relevant contemporary examples.
- 3(b) There was very mixed responses to this question. Most candidates demonstrated some understanding, but there were few really outstanding answers. Weaker responses typically focused on how audiences could influence content but offered little supporting evidence or counter arguments. A number of candidates misunderstood the question and discussed effects models. Better responses typically pointed to the role of proprietors, frequently citing Rupert Murdoch. Good answers tended to make use of theoretical frameworks, typically comparing pluralist and Marxist models. They also discussed hegemonic approaches and the influence of media professionals and in some cases cited feminist arguments. While stronger answers often made good use of theories and concepts, use of empirical material and examples was usually weaker. Many candidates also tended to juxtapose theories without really evaluating them against available evidence.
- 4(a) Most candidates were able to identify two stereotypes, typically women as sex symbols and housewives. However, many answers contained limited explanation or only offered anecdotal examples of such stereotypes. Only a minority of candidates were able to draw on empirical studies or more conceptual approaches e.g. the male gaze, Ferguson on the cult of femininity, Tuchman on symbolic annihilation or Cumberbatch's content analysis research.
- 4(b) There was a range of responses to this question. A minority of weaker answers tended to focus on the negative effects of media, typically giving anecdotal examples of films which had allegedly led to violence or making superficial references to the power of advertising to shape choices. However, most candidates had at least some conceptual or theoretical understanding of the question and were able to discuss concepts such as desensitisation, catharsis and the drip-drip effect. Better answers were able to use a range of models e.g. hypodermic syringe, two step-flow, uses and gratifications and cultural effects. However, many answers were very knowledge driven and failed to relate material to the question effectively or fully evaluate the debate. Some candidate's misinterpreted material e.g. claiming that the hypodermic syringe approach supported the view. Better responses were able to distinguish between slow and gradual effects and more immediate effects and also to question the whole notion of the media having clear effects. However, disappointingly few candidates were able to go beyond debates about media violence. Only a few considered other issues e.g. possible effect of representations of women on body image and eating disorders or the Glasgow Media Group on the effects of news reporting.

OPTION 3 RELIGION

- 5(a) Only a small number of candidates opted to answer this question. A significant number focused on why religion was important without relating this to ethnic groups in the UK and in some cases these were illustrated with material relating to other societies e.g. Durkheim on Australian aborigines and Malinowski on Trobriand Islanders. Most candidates however identified two relevant reasons and made some attempt to explain them in relation to ethnic minorities. Some answers failed to specify any particular minorities but offered reasons such as encouraging community solidarity, as a defence against racism and as a means of carrying on traditions from societies of origin. Better answers were able to link these to evidence concerning specific ethnic groups in the UK. Some very good answers were seen which drew on relevant concepts e.g. cultural defence, empowerment through difference and reactions to Islamophobia or referred to empirical material e.g. the role of Pentacostalism and Rastafarianism in Afro-Caribbean communities, the role of Islam post-9/11 and Roman Catholicism among Eastern European migrants.
- 5(b) There was a range of responses to this question. Most candidates had at least a basic understanding of Marxist views and were able to refer to concepts such as opium of the people, false class-consciousness and ideological control, although surprisingly few candidates were able to offer much evidence in support or development. Some discussed the divine right of kings and hymns such as 'All things bright and beautiful' and were also able to consider other perspectives on religion such as functionalist and/or Weberian (and occasionally feminist) though these were often simply juxtaposed rather than used to evaluate Marxism. Understanding of Weber's ideas, when covered, was often weak or confused. A few candidates did not understand the question and confused Marxism with other theories such as functionalism or suggested that Marxists supported the secularisation thesis and then proceeded to discuss that debate. Some candidates engaged in lengthy discussions of Durkheim and/or Malinowski's work without reference to the Marxist view. A small number of strong answers were able to offer a genuine evaluation of Marxism, typically focusing on debates about the role of religion and social change. Some used material such as Maduro's work on liberation theology effectively to criticise Marxism. A few candidates also suggest that the Marxist view was now irrelevant as society had become more secularised.
- 6(a) This question was generally not well answered with few well-explained responses. Weaker candidates tended to produce rather common sense answers concerning how sects brainwashed people or appealed to the weak and vulnerable. Some candidates confused cults with sects. Better answers were able to cite reasons such as poverty/marginalisation, disenchantment with mainstream religions and the security/family atmosphere of some sects. Better responses offered examples or evidence from specific sects to illustrate points. Only a very few candidates were able to draw on theoretical or conceptual approaches, e.g. Weber's theodicy of the disprivileged, reactions to secularisation or post-modern approaches relating to spiritual shopping.
- 6(b) There was varied responses to this question with some excellent, well-informed discussion but also some more assertive, superficial answers that were based on opinion. Better responses were able to consider both sides of the view and make use of relevant concepts and studies. Weaker answers tended to focus mainly or entirely on one side of the debate and offered a few anecdotal arguments. Some candidates got sidetracked into discussions of research on other cultures e.g. Durkheim and Malinowski and failed to link this to the contemporary UK. Better answers drew on contemporary studies e.g. Bruce on secularisation, Davie on believing without belonging, Stark and Bainbridge on religion as a compensator, the Kendal Project and material on new religious movements and religion in ethnic minority groups. Many candidates evaluated mainly in terms of juxtaposing arguments for and against, but better candidates critically interrogated material e.g. by

questioning the validity of church attendance statistics. Some candidates effectively used contemporary material e.g. pointing out that although Blair is a Christian he largely ignored opposition from the churches to the Iraq war.

OPTION 4 YOUTH AND CULTURE

- 7(a) This question produced a range of responses. Some weaker candidates discussed experiences of education in general without clearly linking these to gender and without clearly identifying two ways. However, most were able to offer two ways, with the most popular being differences in subject choice, differences in achievement, differences in treatment by teachers and differences in the hidden curriculum. Candidates were differentiated in terms of the amount and quality of explanation of their chosen ways. The best answers tended to draw on conceptual and/or empirical material e.g. Oakley's work on gender socialisation, French's work on subject choice, Sewell and/or Mac an Ghail's work on masculinity.
- 7(b) Few really good answers were seen on this question. A number of candidates were aware of relevant material but were unable to apply the material effectively to the question nor provide a counter view. Weaker answers often failed to focus on pro and anti school subcultures but tended to refer to differences in achievement and/or experience of education between different social groups. Some candidates simply equated educational failure with membership of an anti-school subculture. Better responses were able to discuss research on school subcultures e.g. Hargreaves, Willis, Mac an Ghail, Sewell. Such answers typically pointed to the influence of factors outside school on the formation of subcultures e.g. class background, gender and ethnicity.
- 8(a) Most candidates were able to offer two relevant reasons. Lower level responses typically cited factors such as the need for protection, peer group pressure and poverty/deprivation. Differentiation between candidates was largely in terms of the quantity and quality of explanation offered. Only a few candidates were able to offer really well explained and conceptual answers, with the most common referring to the notion of status frustration and Cohen's work.
- 8(b) This question produced a significant number of very strong responses and some very weak anecdotal responses. Stronger answers tended to make significant use of examples of class based subcultures. Weaker responses were more descriptive, while better answers analysed subcultures in terms of reflecting values of social classes e.g. Teddy Boys and Skinheads were aggressively masculine, defended their territory and looked for immediate gratification reflecting traditional working class values while hippies were more intellectual and political. High-level responses often drew on Brake's typology and referred to the CCCS and the notion of resistance through rituals. Many candidates were able to draw on an impressive range of concepts and empirical material to question the influence of social class. These included Hodkinson's work on Goths as well as postmodernist approaches such as Polhemus and Hetherington on style tribes. Candidates also pointed to the influence of gender e.g. McRobbie and Garber on bedroom subculture and Kearney on Riot Grrls and ethnicity e.g. Bhangramuffins and Rastafarians. Some candidates discussed the continued influence of class on groups such as Chavs and Emos.

2534 Sociological research skills

General Comments

Candidates on the whole engaged well with this question paper. As in previous sessions, the vast majority of candidates answered every question and responses demonstrate that candidates are aware of the demands of each question and the assessment objectives relevant to each question part. Many candidates were able to acknowledge the given contexts / research design given in Item B and in question (d) and there seemed to be a general improvement in answers to questions (c) and (d) as candidates are becoming increasingly aware of the requirements needed to target the assessment objectives. Despite this, there still remains a large number of candidates who failed to really engage with the context in a sustained way. There were a lack of very good responses and few candidates managed to get high in the top band for part (d) responses and there was significant variation between Centres. In particular, poor responses were characterised by a lack of understanding of the basic research concepts required for questions (c) and (d) and there remains a stark difference between those candidates who have a strong technical understanding of key concepts and of their relevance to the research design, and the weaker candidates who either throw all the concepts in together, or leave them out completely. There is evidence of improved understanding of the difference between the terms reliability, validity and representativeness, although explanations of these concepts were often lacking. The other characteristic of weaker responses was in the lack of contextualisation where candidates offered only a generalised description of a research method for parts (c) and (d) without any consideration of the given research context.

Where candidates performed well, they had clearly been prepared for the nature of the questions and focused on the demands of each part from the outset. Good candidates are able to engage with the given research contexts and understand the need to include reference to the key research concepts and explain them in terms of being a strength or weakness. In particular, high level responses were able to reach the higher levels in part (c) questions, where they were clearly focused on the explicit strength / weakness related to the given research aim, and in part (d) questions as they successfully applied their chosen method to the research context given, rather than just mechanically outlining and assessing its usefulness. Many high achieving candidates have clearly been well prepared for targeting the assessment objectives of each question and many Centres are encouraging candidates to answer questions in a formulaic way in order to achieve this.

Teaching Tip:

Use past papers to give candidates plenty of examination practice. This unit is structured in a very specific format and candidates would benefit from practising the exact requirements of each question part.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question

1(a) The majority of candidates were able to accurately explain the concept of 'quantitative data' and the vast majority of candidates were able to score full marks. The better answers offered a clear and succinct definition, referring to the data being numerical. The best responses displayed a range of knowledge and understanding of the term by adding examples of quantitative data, making theoretical links, or explaining advantages/disadvantages. The vast majority of candidates offered a core definition, followed by an appropriate example. Very few candidates scored low marks on this paper; those who did were usually confusing quantitative data for qualitative data. There are still a few candidates who write far in excess of what is required for this paper and they need to be reminded that they should spend no longer than 5 minutes on this question.

Teaching tip:

Use past questions for practice with (a) questions. Encourage candidates to offer a core definition of the term and then a wider range of knowledge through discussion of examples, advantages, disadvantages etc.

1(b) The majority of candidates were able to successfully interpret the data and identify two main changes and give a direction of change (increase, decrease) Most candidates were able to correctly analyse the data in terms of stating the relevant percentages, but few accurately interpreted the scale of change, or, if they did, it was inaccurate; a common mistake was to state the percentage difference as a percentage *increase*, without stating it is a percentage *point* increase. Some candidates did offer a scale of change for one, but then failed to do it for the other change. As in previous sessions, some candidates are going beyond the realms of this question and offering reasons for changes which just means they are wasting time which could be spent on parts (c) and (d).

Teaching tip:

Give your candidates a range of different types of quantitative data (bar charts, line graphs, tables etc) and set them tasks relating to data interpretation.

1(c) The vast majority of candidates correctly identified one strength and one weakness and were able to offer some explanations of these. There seemed to be a distinct improvement in the quality of responses to this question and candidates were spending a more appropriate proportion of time answering it.

AO1

As well as clearly identifying both a strength and weakness, many candidates were able to reference an appropriate key concept in their explanations. Many also offered enough detailed expansion of their answer to confirm full AO1 marks for either or one of the strength/weakness. Oddly, many candidates seemed capable of achieving full marks for just one; either the strength or the weakness, and gaining just the 2 marks (for the identification and explanation only) for the second. A number of candidates attempted to identify and explain strength and weakness in terms of *key concepts* and there were some good responses produced using this idea. For example, candidates selected reliability as a strength and then discussed structured questionnaires and secondary data under the umbrella of this concept. Similarly, some candidates attempted to explain the strength of using *method triangulation*, and a few produced high quality answers, explaining in detail how this helped to verify the research. But, many who tried this did not fully explain their answer, simply stating that either reliability or validity were 'improved' without explaining how or why, and very few contextualised their response.

Teaching tip:

Using the specification, give candidates (in groups or pairs) a concept and ask them to come up with a definition and two further points of explanation (e.g. advantages/disadvantages; examples of research;)

There were some very strong answers commenting on the *sampling technique*, producing good AO1 marks (whether as a strength or a weakness); triggering consideration of access, ethical issues, and representativeness. Similarly, candidates who selected a method as a strength or weakness (unstructured interviews or structured questionnaires) largely managed to accurately link them with a key concept. A small number of candidates chose to address two weaknesses or two strengths. A minority of candidates inaccurately read the item B which stated 'structured questionnaires' to be 'structured' interviews.

In general, those candidates who selected methods as the strength/weakness tended to be able to handle the demands of the question better than those selecting other research issues, and gained 8 AO1 marks.

AO2a

This AO provided more of a challenge for candidates to gain the marks.

Most candidates easily gained appropriate identification and explanation marks, and an increasing number were referencing the context of the research ('researching the experiences of young carers'). However, very few candidates were able to pick up the final AO2a marks for including reference to the aims of the research. Candidates need to be trained to explain what effect the selected strength / weakness has on the aims of the research; in this case, improving the lives of young carers.

Teaching tip:

Give candidates past question (c)'s and Item Bs and a set structure for answering it: Identify and explain the strength; relate it to a research concept; include reference to the context and the aims of the research.

1(d) The majority of candidates allocated most of their time to this question and most candidates successfully focused on just one research method and referred to the given context. It is clear that many Centres are preparing their candidates for the demands of this question as candidates are explicit in their use of key concepts, the wider research process and the given context. There seemed to be a noticeable improvement in the quality of part (d) responses; maybe because teachers are becoming aware of the assessment criteria or maybe because candidates engaged well with this particular research context.

Most candidates chose an appropriate method; usually a form of questionnaire or interview. However, a number of candidates ignored the explicit command in the question- to choose one method. Many of these candidates seemed to think of 'triangulation' as a method in itself rather than a research design. Furthermore, weaker candidates stated 'questionnaire' or 'interview' without explaining which type, or changed methods half way through the response (.e.g. from structured to unstructured interviews). Those candidates who selected unstructured interviews tended to be able to address the issues with a little more clarity and systematic organisation than others selecting different methods. As well as being able to address the strengths and fix the response more to the given context, they were able to move more easily to the weaknesses too; this also meant that the concepts and process were more easily covered and many geared their answer around the context too.

Good candidates really engaged with the context when thinking through operationalisation and sampling techniques. For example, better responses chose sampling frames and techniques which were specifically targeted at elderly people in retirement homes. For example, by accessing a number of local homes and requesting permission to interview. This was in stark contrast to weaker responses which cited sampling techniques as a telephone directory or pensioner records at the post office – clearly these types of sampling frame are not directly related to the target research population. Good candidates were able to focus on the strengths of question based methods for gaining sensitive information and the problems relating to interviewer /researcher bias and/or socially desirable responses. As in previous sessions, a number of candidates inaccurately referred to the ‘Hawthorne effect’ in relation to interviews.

Teaching tip:

Get candidates to apply their knowledge and understanding of sampling techniques by asking them how they would get different samples; e.g. elderly people, candidates, middle class, minority ethnic groups.

Weak responses offered confused / inaccurate references to key research concepts. Although most candidates attempted to cover the issues of reliability and validity, a significant number of candidates merely applied the terms – often interchangeably – without any real explanation. Although more candidates are referring to the wider research process, weaker candidates do not express understanding. For example, they state that ‘concepts need operationalising’ or ‘ethics need to be taken into account’, but do not follow this with any elaboration or contextualisation. A number of candidates offer a generalised answer or weak understanding of the context, although as stated previously, this is improving with every session.

Nearly all candidates expressed some evaluation but weaker responses only justified their choice of method / sampling and offered no negative criticisms. Good responses included an evaluative and reflective tone throughout their responses, for example by noting the strengths and weaknesses of their sampling technique as well as the stated method and addressed ethical concerns as a researcher. Such responses were well contextualised and referred to the key concepts in an evaluative way.

2535 Research Report

General Comments.

Many interesting Reports of a very high standard were received for moderation. These candidates were able to discuss, analyse and evaluate their chosen study in a confident and mature manner. One of the main differentiators was the extent to which candidates were able to use the key concepts of reliability, validity, representativeness and generalisability in relation to their chosen study. Some candidates demonstrated an implicit understanding of these concepts whilst others disadvantaged themselves by using more than one concept in a single sentence, thus failing to make their understanding explicit. On the other hand many candidates were able to go beyond the key concepts and used a range of methodological concepts with understanding. Many Centres had obviously responded to comments that have been published in previous Reports or suggestions that have been made by Moderators in the Report to a Centre on Coursework Moderation, which aim to give constructive advice as well as highlighting strengths and good practice.

Administrative points

The dates for the submission of the MS1 form remain the same each session (10th of January or 15th of May). A number of Centres were late submitting their MS1 forms this session.

The Centre Authentication Form continues to cause some confusion for a minority of Centres. There is no need to send a form for all candidates. OCR requires that one Centre Authentication Form, signed by the teacher, be sent with the sample and candidates' signatures are obtained in a way that is convenient to the Centre and retained at the Centre.

Few clerical errors were noted this session. Nevertheless many Reports were submitted without the candidate number or with an incorrect candidate number.

Ideally, all Reports should have been submitted in the answer book provided, this would ensure that all candidates are aware of and have the opportunity to respond to the prompts at the beginning of each section.

Application of the Mark Scheme

The vast majority of Centres applied the mark scheme consistently and accurately across all Assessment Objectives. One or two Centres applied the mark scheme rather harshly but lenient application of the mark scheme was generally the issue when marks had to be adjusted. Some Centres are drifting towards becoming more lenient and consequently marks will have been adjusted.

Details of internal standardisation were received from some Centres. All Centres that have more than one person assessing the Reports should include details of the procedures used for internal standardisation and Reports should show evidence of being standardised.

The majority of candidates are now making explicit references to the key concepts in section (c) and (d). Nevertheless many do need to develop these references to justify being awarded marks in the higher mark band. Reliability is the concept which continues to cause problems for many candidates.

Some candidates failed to focus on the context of the chosen study. Consequently although they demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the research process they failed to apply this

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

knowledge and understanding to the particular study and wrote correct but generalised comments, particularly in sections c) and d).

Detailed comments were included on the front cover sheets of most Reports. There were also some excellent annotations on the Reports themselves. This is very useful in ascertaining how the Centre had applied the mark scheme.

Most candidates had used the word limit permitted thereby giving them the opportunity to develop the points they were making. Centres should be reminded that candidates who exceed the word count by more than 10% should be placed at the bottom of the relevant mark band.

Academic matters

The majority of Centres ensured that candidates reported on a variety of contemporary studies. The use of such studies can inform other aspects of the syllabus and enhances the sociological experience of the candidates.

However some Centres continue to use material that can disadvantage candidates; studies that are not sociological or in a few instances personal studies.

Using the research Report Answer Book

Section (a)

The vast majority of candidates had completed section (a) correctly. In a minority of cases it was apparent that someone other than the candidate had completed this section. It must be emphasised that the correct completion of this section is part of the task (AO1).

Section (b)

Many candidates gave detailed accounts of the research design and made accurate use of technical terms. The stronger candidates clearly and precisely identified the aims, research tool(s) and sampling technique. They also referred to relevant ethical issues. Some candidates presented a rather confused section (b) whilst others gave a vague outline of the research design and omitted some key details/issues.

Section (c)

Some of the stronger candidates wrote an excellent section (c). They gave their own interpretations as to the suitability of the research design, with reference to the aims and the context of the study. Key concepts and technical terms were used with confidence, and all aspects of the research/study were considered (some weaker candidates often omitted references to the sample in this section). Weaker candidates often repeated much of section (b) or discussed the research design in a general way without reference to the context of the study or the key concepts. All aspects of the research should be discussed, in the context of the study, when candidates are awarded very high marks for AO2(a). They should also be making explicit references to the key concepts.

Section (d)

The vast majority of the candidates did refer to the main findings and the stronger candidates were able to link findings to the aims and evaluative points. Weaker candidates continued to include far too many findings – 100 words should be sufficient. Other candidates quoted the appendix without attempting any analysis of the findings. The few candidates who had no reference to the findings were penalising themselves under AO2(a)

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

The vast majority of candidates included references to the key concepts in section (d). However, it should be noted, that these references should be developed in a manner which explicitly demonstrates the candidates' understanding before being awarded marks in the higher mark bands.

Appendices

Many candidates took the opportunity to use an appendix (see prompt at the top of section (d)) to illustrate their findings; all candidates should be encouraged to follow this good practice. Candidates who do not use appendices often include long quotes from the text and penalise themselves by using up valuable words which could have been used to analyse and/or evaluate. Once again Centres should note that any additional information e.g. details of the sampling included in the appendix, cannot be considered for assessment purposes.

2536 Power and Control

General Comments

The overall standard was similar to June 2007, although there seemed to be slightly more responses at the lower end of the mark range. Despite this, most candidates performed to a reasonable standard and seemed well prepared for this exam, particularly in terms of the skill of sociological knowledge and understanding. Where candidates appeared to be unprepared, there was often a Centre effect and teachers must ensure that all parts of the specification are covered in enough depth for candidates to write an hour-long unstructured essay. There remain a large number of candidates who offer generalised knowledge and understanding with a lack of application to the specifics of the question set. The weaker skill areas were interpretation and analysis and evaluation. The latter, in particular, was often undeveloped and too brief and there was a tendency for many candidates to simply repeat earlier points in their conclusions. On the other hand, there were some excellent responses which really engaged with the question and were strongly evaluative throughout with an impressive range of relevant studies.

The majority of candidates displayed a sound knowledge base with a broad understanding of concepts and studies. Theoretical knowledge was present in the responses which were based around a theory (e.g. Question 3) but where questions were of the 'sociological explanations' type, theoretical understanding tended to be vague and implicit. In terms of historical knowledge some candidates wrote generalised accounts of developments in social policy not related to the demands of the particular question (e.g. Question 10).

Differences within perspectives are increasingly being recognised, for example between classical Marxism and neo-Marxism and between functionalist and new-right approaches in Question 3, although weaker responses tended to describe studies by any writer they could remember when a particular theory was highlighted in the question. Another tendency amongst responses was to give equal weight to other theories, for example in Question 3 often theories other than functionalism were written about in as much detail as functionalism itself, but not utilised to make evaluative points. This meant that knowledge discussed was tangential, with little relevance to the question. Such responses tended to be basic.

Some candidates displayed such a wide ranging knowledge of studies that the responses tended towards lists of writers and there was insufficient time or lack of ability to apply these to the specific question and analyse the studies in any depth. Some candidates, therefore, achieved high marks for knowledge and understanding but did less well on interpretation and analysis given the time constraints of the exam.

Teaching tip

Candidates should be encouraged to consider why a particular study is included and look at how it relates to the question set. Set candidates exercises where they mix and match knowledge statements along with "This means that" or "The reason for this is" statements.

A minority of candidates were falling into the opposite trap where they were analysing and interpreting the question but failing to support their ideas with evidence from studies. A small minority of responses were entirely impressionistic, assertive and anecdotal. The tendency towards assertion was particularly noticeable in responses to Question 2 where a significant number of candidates had very little knowledge of sociological explanations of ethnic patterns in crime and deviance.

Interpretation of concepts in relation to contemporary examples/events was stronger in this session demonstrating the ability to relate sociological knowledge to current events. Sometimes,

however, this tended towards over-long anecdotes which were not sourced in any way. For example, citing a huge increase in knife crime for question 2 and stories about representations of crime in the media. A number of candidates did not accurately interpret the demands of the question. For example, on question 1, many ignored the phrase 'social construction' in relation to crime and deviance.

Evaluation was, again, the weakest skill area which was often entirely based on the juxtaposition of theories or studies. The majority of candidates did include some direct evaluation and key words and phrases were utilised more often, for example, 'however', 'on the other hand' 'an alternative view is suggested by...' However, it was not always clear what the nature of the evaluation was.

Teaching tip:

Candidates should be encouraged to consider the precise criticism being made when stating that someone disagrees with a concept/theory/study.

Methodological evaluation, in particular tended to be imprecise with a common tendency to state that a particular study lacked validity and/or reliability with no explanation as to why this was the case. Some candidates were evaluating throughout their responses, demonstrating the ability to evaluate positively as well as through the more common criticism of studies and theories. A few candidates attempted to evaluate positively but simply stated that 'this is a good study' without explaining why. Much evaluation is still left to the end of essays with sometimes mere repetition of points already made. Weaker candidates tended towards assertion, impression and opinion in their conclusions without supporting theory or evidence.

The planning of essays continues to improve with fewer lengthy plans which use up valuable time. Many plans were coherent and logical with evidence that candidates were referring back to them and using them to structure their essays. Some introductions were too long and generalised, again using up valuable time in establishing historical contexts or attempting to define terms which were not central to the question or which are rather obvious. Poor spelling was again evident. Some candidates who appeared to have completed their responses well within an hour did not seem to have used the time to proof-read what they had written. In particular, candidates should be encouraged to check the spelling of key theories (interactionism, not interactionalism) and key concepts (for example, self fulfilling prophecy, immediate gratification).

Many candidates in this session, however, wrote coherent and logical essays with a clear introduction, a focussed main body and thoughtful conclusions. Many candidates were using conclusions to suggest gaps in sociological knowledge and/or research and possible avenues for further research rather than simply repeating points they had already made, which is to be encouraged.

Most candidates appeared to have utilised the full hour and there were few rubric errors. Where there were rubric errors, they were candidates who answered both of the questions from one option. There were very few misinterpretations of questions in this session. Candidates must be encouraged to write their chosen question number in the box provided as, on several occasions, it was unclear which option was being answered.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

This was a popular question with the majority of candidates demonstrating some knowledge and understanding. On the whole, though, responses were not very well answered as they were generalised with a lack of focus on what constitutes 'the social construction of crime and deviance'. Many candidates just wrote about how the media allegedly causes crime; others did get credit for the use of concepts (and reference to related studies) like 'news values', moral panics or deviancy amplification, although very few answers made strong theoretical links to Interactionism or Marxism in this question. Good responses were able to discuss key studies in depth, such as Cohen, Becker and Hall.

Question 2

This was the more popular question in this option, which had better responses overall compared to Question 1, but often candidates just went through all they knew about ethnicity and crime. Many candidates referred to 'ethnic minority groups' with a lack of awareness of differences between them. Also many of these responses were not organised around a logical plan; for example, a minority of strong responses structured their responses around the debate about whether the evidence suggesting a relationship between ethnicity and crime was accurate or not. Such answers tended to score more highly in the skill of evaluation and were more able to bring in a theoretical awareness. Another common characteristic was misunderstanding of the Lawrence inquiry / McPherson report and confusion in explaining Stuart Hall's 'Policing the crisis' study.

Question 3

This was a very popular question and many candidates scored relatively highly on this, in terms of knowledge and understanding of functionalism. Good responses were able to link key concepts to contemporary examples (e.g. social unity and nationalism) and recognised different aspects of functionalist theory and associated writers. However, a common weakness was to use Marxism in evaluation of functionalism early on in the response, and then to convert the rest of the essay into a long account of Marxism which was often longer than the original account of functionalism.

Question 4

Another popular question, although less so than the other question in Option 2. Overall, responses lacked knowledge and understanding of interactionist theories; some even ignoring the theory altogether. Some attempted to address interactionism, but misunderstood it; for example, taking it to mean all in-school factors or any account whatsoever concerned with differential educational achievement. Good answers included relevant theories or studies; for example, Becker, labelling and studies on anti-school subcultures.

Question 5

Fewer responses were produced to this question. Those candidates who attempted it were generally displaying a sound knowledge and understanding of explanations of health inequalities according to social class. Stronger answers used a wide range of studies and models in the context of social class. Weaker responses wrote generalised essays on health inequalities and confused cultural with material factors. Some responses were assertive with impressionistic accounts of working class life which were very stereotypical. The stronger responses identified

key themes, such as behaviour and lifestyles, and then applied some supporting evidence. Few candidates made theoretical links with either functionalism or the new right.

Question 6

There were not many responses to this question and, on the whole, they were not as well answered as Question 5. As in Question 2, candidates often failed to differentiate between ethnic minority groups. Weaker answers were often lacking in evidence and often characterised by stereotypical assumptions.

Question 7

There were very few responses to this question, and it was the least popular question in this option. Generally, candidates had a good understanding, although there were some responses which were little more than anecdotal, indicating that some candidates chose to answer this question even though they had not been taught the topic area.

Question 8

This was also not a popular question. Good responses really focused on the 'importance' of popular culture.

Question 9

There were very few responses to this question. Stronger responses demonstrated a good understanding of social democratic approaches to welfare policy linked to some historical trends.

Question 10

This question was more popular than question 9, but overall not many candidates attempted it. Good responses built their answers around the concept of social control and linked this to feminist and/or Marxist theories. Weaker answers did not reference theoretical explanations or differentiate between different writers. Weaker responses wrote generally about the history of the welfare state without addressing the issue of social control.

Question 11

This was not a very popular question. Some candidates had some understanding of globalisation (economic, cultural forms, etc) and applied it fairly well to the question but sometimes 'global' was left out of the understanding of social movements. Generally, however, answers tended to focus more on knowledge than application to the question.

Question 12

Again, there were very few responses to this question. The answers tended to be a generalised account of everything the candidate know about NSMs and about power. Indeed, many answers focused on theories and concepts of the latter without linking this material to the question.

2537 Applied Sociological Research Skills

General Comments

Overall the performance of candidates was broadly in line with previous sessions. A number of candidates found part (a) difficult to answer, parts (d) and (e) frequently appeared to be the strongest elements of a candidate's response. Invariably there was a Centre effect with some Centres preparing their candidates thoroughly for the paper, others less so.

- (a) A large number of candidates were unable to accurately identify any of the three points in the item. Some candidates identified findings from the research as generalised strengths of unstructured interviews. A significant minority ignored the source and just outlined two general advantages of unstructured interviews.
- (b) Too many candidates merely identified the advantages or disadvantages of official statistics and paid no heed to the context of poverty. Few candidates appeared to have been able to apply their knowledge of issues of measuring absolute and relative poverty to the question. Those that did often gained full marks, although this was not a precondition of achieving at the top of the band. Few candidates appeared to identify a major strength of official statistics as the fact that they are based on very large sample sizes and thus highly likely to be representative. Many merely identified a strength as 'they are easy/cheap to access'.
- (c) A significant number of candidates merely copied the statistical data out 'long hand'. Often this 'summary' was longer than the item itself. Few candidates identified some of the wider trends notably that Bangladeshi Pakistani women were significantly disadvantaged compared to other ethnic groups. Most candidates merely made descriptive comparisons for each and every category in the table of data. Few candidates identified differences between Asian groups.

Many candidates failed to use ratio level data i.e. by using terms such as 'twice as many'/'only a quarter of'. Many candidates inaccurately felt that simply subtracting one percentage from another would give them an accurate difference. Many candidates used either the text or the statistical data but not both. Some candidates tried to explain the trends and incorrectly introduced material from their wider sociological knowledge

- (d) Most candidates were able to select accurate methods with most opting for unstructured interviews. A significant minority chose 'unstructured questionnaires'; it was understood that these were questionnaires with open ended questions, rather than blank sheet of paper (which would be the only way a questionnaire could be 'unstructured') but the Examiners – while crediting such responses – were concerned that such an inappropriate terminology was chosen so frequently. A worryingly large number of candidates appeared to think Likert-scale type questions produced qualitative data. Too many candidates cued into the phrase in the question 'representative sample', to select a stratified random sample. Many were not able to fully explain how such a sample worked or why it might produce a representative sample in such a context. Many candidates – despite having chosen unstructured interviews as a method – used this sampling technique to select very large samples (100+ was common), showing little understanding of how the interpretivist/phenomenologist researcher (with which most had accurately associated their choice of method to collect qualitative data) might collect a 'sample' nor recognizing the immense difficulty in conducting large numbers of unstructured interviews. The strongest responses often used much more appropriate and realistic non-random sampling techniques to select participants; in particular quota sampling.

Very few candidates were able to explain why their sampling technique was likely to generate a representative sample. Those who chose stratified random sampling almost universally assumed – incorrectly – that this technique would produce a representative sample and made no attempt to justify its selection whatsoever.

A similar problem emerged with the use of ‘hypothesis/es’ at the start of a response; many candidates identified their research as being from the interpretivist/phenomenologist approach but insisted on using a hypothesis, something that such researchers would view as inappropriate. This demonstrated that such candidates lacked a thorough understanding of different perspectives. It was also symptomatic of those Centres where candidates had been given ‘acronyms’ of *‘things they must address in my answer’*. Consequently candidates included hypothesis even when it was incompatible with other elements of their design.

- (e) A significant number of candidates produced shorter and less detailed answers for part [e] in comparison to part [d], despite the fact that it is worth 50% more marks. This indicates a failure of candidates to allocate time efficiently.

Good candidates were able to cue into the context of the question when evaluating the research design; ‘finding out about whether Year 11 candidates felt they had been given good advice on their options post GCSE’. Many however ignored the context completely, including those who gave very ‘contextualised’ answers to part [d]. For example, most candidates identified that participants might lie in interviews, but few stated that this might be because, *‘they were worried about what their school might think’* or *‘that they might want to make their old school look bad’*.

Likewise while many saw researcher bias playing a part in the way in which data was selected or analysed and its impact on the validity of the data, few were able to apply this to the context by referring to the fact that as the research was sponsored by the careers service then this might be done *‘to make the career’s look good’*.

Few identified the issue of particular types of respondents – those with strong views – as being more likely to agree to take part in interview nor did many identify how this would impact on the type of answers generated. Good responses identified those who had received very good or very bad advice as wanting to respond and consequently over-/under-exaggerating the quality of advice they had received, and those candidates as not wanting to take part in an interview.

A lot of candidates focussed on very practical issues such as access, funding etc without ever cueing into the fact that as the design was on behalf of the careers service that such issues would probably not be overly problematic.

Invariably weaker candidates did not refer to, or explain, key concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness or generalisation accurately. These were either not mentioned at all, used incorrectly (often apparently randomly) or lumped together in one short paragraph or even sentence; i.e. any problem or solution was identified as having an effect on the validity, reliability, representativeness and generalization of the data.

As in previous sessions many candidates appeared primed to ‘mechanically’ use the technique of triangulation as a solution to all their methodological problems. Few really seem to engage or understand this technique, which many appeared to feel is a method in its own right. Even the better responses only saw this in terms of giving candidates a closed ended questionnaire alongside their unstructured interview. Few candidates were able to contextualize their response, for example, suggesting the possibility of interviewing teachers about the advice candidates had received and whether they felt it had been of

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

good quality or identifying what advice had been given to candidates in year11. Few saw triangulation as a way of verifying data already collected.

Too many answers simply read as a pre-rehearsed list of disadvantages of unstructured interviews and stratified random sampling without reference to the context whatsoever.

2538 – The Personal Study

General Comments

The overall impression gained by Examiners this year was that there was an improvement in the standard of most of the studies but where there were very weak studies, the candidates seemed to have been ill prepared for the standard required at A2.

Not dissimilar to previous years, performance for AO1 remains Centre-specific and in many instances it appears that the Centre's teaching/guidance is being assessed rather than the candidate's own ability to carry out research.

This year as always there were many studies revolving around the old familiar themes of conjugal roles and body image. There were however a few candidates who used their sociological imagination and came up with really interesting topic titles such as "SMS or SOS – has natural conversation been lost to electronic forms of communication?" and "Nosey Parkers – an investigation into the impact of 'Facebook'".

The best candidates were those who explicitly took on board the concept of a pilot study by creating a strategy and design that was localised and small scale which could be contained within the word restrictions. They provided a brief sociological rationale to act as their background focus and then concentrated on the research process as a whole, exploring the theoretical connections of their chosen method(s), the concomitant strengths and weaknesses in relation to the key concepts of validity, reliability, representativeness and generalisability. They demonstrated that they had fully understood the importance of accessing their target population, perhaps via a gatekeeper, employing appropriate sampling techniques as well as paying due care and attention to ethical issues.

The best studies concentrated on a narrow focus with one or two clear and concise aims, which were linked explicitly to the hypothesis or research question. These aims and associated findings were later revisited in the results section and skilfully reviewed in the evaluation section.

It was encouraging to note, that there were fewer candidates who exceeded the word limit this year. Centres must be aware of the penalties their candidates will incur if they do exceed the word count as stated on the mark scheme. The word count is between 2500 and 2750 words. Some candidates did exceed the word count either overtly or covertly. Please note that if Examiners are suspicious about the word count, they will check the word count by laboriously counting the words and if indeed they are over the prescribed limit, they will penalise accordingly. It did appear to most Examiners this year that there were also more candidates producing work with less than 2300 words and because of this, their work lacked the requisite detail and subsequently scored fewer marks.

Despite reporting this for some years now, there are still some Centres who are encouraging their candidates to use footnotes or the Appendix to smuggle in 'extra' words. Sometimes this was done even though the word count was well below the recommended level! Please note that this is unacceptable and actually disadvantages candidates.

In terms of choice of methodology, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews came through as firm favourites and thankfully very few candidates opted for content analysis this year. The few that did undertake Content analysis, however, were still unable to tackle this method well and failed to discuss it as thoroughly as would be expected with other methods. Content analysis grids were generally very poor indeed.

More worryingly, it seems that this year more candidates are creating their own sociology. Candidates are still making flawed linkages to questionnaires with open-ended questions with positivism and many candidates continue to confuse structured interviews with semi-structured interviews. Some candidates even stated there was such a thing as an unstructured questionnaire! Some candidates stated they were carrying out semi-structured interviews but in fact handed out the interview sheet and got their respondents to complete the questions in their own time.

Many Examiners felt that there was more reflection when considering the piloted nature of the candidate's research. Stronger candidates were able to adequately review the strengths and weaknesses of their approach and diagnose ways in which to improve it for the full-blown study. Weaker candidates continue to be oblivious to the fact that they have conducted a small scale pilot study and some Centres are still encouraging their candidates to pre-pilot the pilot which is a) totally unnecessary and b) uses up valuable words.

It was noticed this year, that many Centres were not encouraging candidates to search out an appropriate background study to act as a focus with which to inform their research. Consequently, they had nothing to compare/contrast their own findings with, reducing the effectiveness of their findings. Conversely, there were other Centres who were allowing their Candidates to write far too much on the context, which seriously eats into the word count, and in so doing they are restricting the discussion of the overall strategy and consequently losing marks.

Examiners commented that Coursework Adviser's comments were largely heeded this year with only a few candidates deciding to ignore the advice given.

Operationalisation of central concepts continues to baffle the majority of candidates and presumably their teachers alike. This is a major failing and has a severe knock-on effect on the rest of the study. The majority of candidates are still falling into the trap of defining these key terms, which at times is taken to the banal level of defining gender etc into male and female. Candidates are advised to break the key terms down into measurable units which will then assist them in measuring what they have set out to measure.

Most Centres have taken on board ethical issues when conducting research. Even so, there were some candidates who ignored ethical issues completely. In some cases, candidates promised anonymity and blew the cover of their respondents in the appendix. Thankfully there were very few unethical studies this year as these presumably had been picked up by the Coursework Adviser when proposal forms were first submitted.

Fewer Examiners experienced incidences of malpractice this year, but in one Centre in particular, one candidate used exemplar material used for INSET training provided by OCR for Centres and copied large quantities almost verbatim. Obviously this is not allowed or encouraged. The Personal Study is by its very nature research carried out on an individual basis. Centres should be aware that if plagiarism is detected, candidates can be disqualified.

Some candidates used their research diary to consider solutions to problems to good effect, but the majority of diaries served no useful purpose at all.

Again, the bibliography seems to have fallen foul of lazy practices. Innumerable candidates did not acknowledge the author, publisher or date of publication and some candidates did not provide a bibliography at all. By this stage of their education, Centres should be encouraging candidates to accredit their sources.

Finally, in terms of administration, some Centres are not attaching a front cover assessment sheet to their candidates' studies which is needed for Examiner marks and annotation and this needs to be addressed. Also some teachers have taken upon it themselves to mark the

coursework before sending the coursework on to the external Examiner. Please note that this module is externally examined and teacher assessment is not required.

ONE Centre authentication form is required per Centre before grades can be awarded and this should be included with the scripts when sent to the external Examiner. In many instances, Centres did not provide this form.

Assessment Objective 1: Knowledge and Understanding

This section commands the highest marks. The key to scoring highly in this section is to have detailed **and** wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the whole research process. The weakest candidates in this section tended to either concentrate on a few aspects of the research process or consider it in a generic way without personalisation.

The nature of the pilot study should be explained in the rationale since it accounts for decisions and strategies as they unfold during the research process.

The best candidates provided a set of clear and concise aims that were explicitly relevant to the hypothesis/central research issue and which also linked to their referenced sociological study, used as a background focus to set the scene. Those candidates who did not provide a background study/article were then unable to link their findings to it in the results section.

Weaker candidates had aims which lacked clarity or were too ambitious. Many candidates had aims which did not relate well to their hypothesis or central research question and consequently lost focus on what it was they actually intended to measure.

Some candidates were able to link their chosen strategy and device(s) to a theoretical perspective but weaker candidates made mainly flawed connections to theory by claiming positivists use 'open ended questions'.

In terms of the research device, the research method was generally well justified, and the type of data obtained, discussed. However, some candidates were still unsure of the differences between structured and semi-structured interviews. A rather alarming number of candidates failed to include transcripts of interviews or examples of completed questionnaires, so that it was difficult for Examiners to tell if any research had actually been carried out or whether the device had been effective in measuring the study's aims.

The most able candidates used wide ranging and detailed knowledge and understanding of the key concepts of representativeness/generalisability, validity and reliability effectively and accurately whilst acknowledging the limitations a pilot study imposed upon these concepts. Weaker candidates still confused validity and reliability and used them interchangeably. Some Candidates failed to discuss any of the key concepts whatsoever in their discussion of their chosen method, yet spent an inordinate amount of time justifying their choice of questions on their device.

The most able candidates dealt with sampling procedures in a sophisticated way and within an appropriate scale. Overall, it was felt by most Examiners that Candidates were handling 'appropriate' sampling techniques much better this year with more understanding and consideration given to how respondents could be accessed with many making reference to gatekeepers. Some candidates still referred to a stratified sampling technique when confronted with gender or ethnicity but had little awareness of how to apply it in proportional terms. Randomness and representativeness continue to muddle a large number of candidates. Candidates seem to assume that generating a random sample provides representativeness, merely due to the fact that the Researcher has not been biased in his/her selection!

Many Examiners reported that many candidates were using purposive sampling incorrectly this year and in greater numbers. Some Centres translated purposive sampling as convenience/opportunity sampling and failed to see that this sampling technique requires people who fit specific criteria. Specific criteria does not mean 'respondents who I know personally and will be comfortable being interviewed'.

Weaker candidates are still confusing sampling frame with target population. Centres should address the complexity of sampling to aid further understanding in future as this is an integral part of the research process.

In terms of ethical practices, the recent emphasis on keeping the pilot studies 'clean, healthy and safe' seems to be working to good effect. Ethical issues were considered appropriately but few candidates discussed ethical dilemmas which could occur in certain cases, especially in relation to the 'full-blown' study.

Most studies had clear sections and in general spelling, punctuation and grammar posed few problems this year, although there were numerous examples of text speak beginning to appear in all sections of the study. In some Centres, candidates had not provided any separation between sections at all and it read as one long essay.

Assessment Objective 2(a): Interpretation and Analysis

Overall this was better than in previous years. The best research tied the findings to the aims of the study and the selected evidence was analysed and interpreted and compared/contrasted with the background research previously discussed in the rationale.

The most able candidates did an excellent job of justifying their chosen methodology and strategy by linking it back to their aims as well as clearly operationalising concepts by breaking them down into measurable units. Many did this well and often it was the result of responding to the advice on the proposal form. Some candidates stated their intention to operationalise concepts but then rode roughshod over it and this really did impact upon the quality of their study but overall the majority of candidates continue to define their concepts without actually realising that the concepts have to be unpacked in order to be 'measured'. Other candidates expected that operationalisation would be solved via their research device. It is quite clear to Examiners that without operationalisation being performed at the start of their research, the candidate is clearly hampered since they are unaware of what they are actually trying to discover from their pilot. It also impacts on the effectiveness of the research device.

The best candidates not only related their findings from the analysed data quite specifically to their aims but also linked their findings to the study/studies outlined in the rationale, revealing an ability to contrast or compare these with their own findings in the conclusions drawn. Weaker candidates simply presented the results in a descriptive way. It is still a cause for concern that graphs are being included without a summary and many are disembodied from the text. There were fewer reports by Examiners of page upon page of graphs.

Some Candidates however devoted too much time to the results to the exclusion of expounding on their knowledge and understanding of the research process, with negative implications for their overall mark.

Candidates do need to spend more time drawing conclusions in relation to their stated aims. Many candidates had no conclusions whatsoever and very few candidates were able to compare and contrast their findings with their background study in a sophisticated fashion. Some candidates declared they had substantive findings yet their analysis was so brief that it bore little relation to the study's overall aims.

Some candidates had far too lengthy devices and consequently only partially analysed the research questions because they found themselves with too much data to handle. This

impacted upon their ability to interpret data within the restrictions of the word count. It must be stressed that the Personal Study tests the candidate's awareness of the research process and strategy and it is recommended that the device be kept as short and as focused as possible.

Assessment Objective 2(b): Evaluation

The better able candidates were able to evaluate, analyse and be reflexive throughout. There were fewer formulaic approaches by Centres this year, which is to be encouraged.

Many candidates did not take issue with their aims or evaluate their effectiveness in any way. Very few actually made recommendations of how they could be improved for the full blown study.

Some candidates did not mention key concepts at all and in the majority of cases the key concepts were incorporated into the text without any sense of engagement or genuine understanding. The majority of candidates appeared to handle representativeness/generalisability reasonably well with a lack of representativeness being recognised as almost inevitable in a pilot but the solution however was nearly always seen in terms of merely increasing the sample size. Representativeness and generalisability were often used interchangeably and very few candidates commented upon the fact that interpretive research may not need to have these qualities in the first place. Validity and reliability continue to be used interchangeably although stronger candidates separated them out and used them to effectively evaluate not only the device but the evidence as well.

Only a small number of candidates went into detail about researcher influence/values and subjective interpretations and how this impacted on their research.

Virtually all candidates touched on further developments with a typical solution to sample size being seen as mainly having a larger sample, although the actual increase in size was never thought through and discussed. Very rarely was there a reflection on the sampling process and whether there would be changes in the full-blown study.

The best studies were reflective in tone and there was a real sense that candidates had benefited from the research in some way. Examiners felt that these candidates were able to properly appreciate and empathise with the strengths and weaknesses of carrying out their own area of research. They clearly demonstrated that they had learned from the experience and could fully address the pitfalls of being a sociologist.

In conclusion, it would appear that candidates are still experiencing the same common mistakes surrounding key research concepts and there is an inability for a large percentage of candidates to operationalise the concepts they intend to measure and resort instead to pure definition. Sampling continues to remain the most misunderstood and misapplied area of the research strategy. All Centres need to address these issues if candidates are to score highly in this unit next year.

2539 Social Inequality and Difference

General comments

Every effort was made during the assessment session to ensure that no candidate was disadvantaged as a result of the duplication of the January question and overlap between the part (d) questions on this paper. An equal number of candidates attempting both questions, and there was no difference in the mean mark awarded on either question. However, the paper did work in a different way to previous sessions, with more candidates than usual offering basic/generalised responses and fewer limited responses. This is likely to be a result of the close nature of the questions and consequent lack of choice for candidates. All factors were taken into consideration when awarding grades on this unit to ensure that candidates were not disadvantaged on this unit in comparison to others.

This report focuses on the performance of candidates on each question.

Question One

- (a) Only a very small number of candidates failed to correctly identify the two consumer items showing the largest difference between high and low income groups. The differentiation in this question came from their ability to interpret the bar chart and produce relevant and accurate statistical data to support their answer. Some leeway was given in reading the graph (up to 3% deviation from the figures quoted in the mark scheme). Candidates did not need to make any accurate calculations to secure the full marks.
- (b) This question posed few problems for candidates who could identify two criteria that parents use when deciding which consumer items to buy their children. The most popular were; educational use/purpose, use-value and value for money. Some candidate's equated value for money with being 'cheap' which is not necessarily the case and was not stated in the item.
- (c) Candidates were familiar with participant observation as a research method and could produce relevant advantages and disadvantages. The strongest responses could correctly identify an advantage such as enhanced validity; and provide an explanation of why participant observation enabled valid data to be collected which referred to issues such as rich, in-depth qualitative data from natural settings. These responses were placed in Level 3 of the mark scheme. To be placed in the top band candidates needed to engage with the research context of *researching parents and children buying consumer items in shops*. There was a significant improvement this session with more candidates able to contextualize their responses, although this remains an area for improvement. Some commented on the easy access to a potentially large sample size as the research was being conducted in shops, others on the ethical issues related to observation shoppers (and did they know they were being observed or not), others on the possibility of the parents changing their behaviour in overt studies to be seen as 'good parents' who buy educational toys. Some candidates linked this to the Hawthorne effect or social desirability. Responses could be based on overt or covert participant observation.

- (d) A large proportion of candidates produced responses to this question based on inequalities in the contemporary UK, paying only lip service to the concept of 'opportunities' in the question. Evidence was drawn from across the specification to show the extent of inequality in society, drawing on issues such as; workplace, income, labour markets, sexism, racism, media representation, educational achievement, health care/provision and poverty. Social groups such as women, ethnic minority groups, pensioners and the underclass were used as examples of the extent of inequality in society.

However, to be awarded full marks on this question the candidates needed to engage to some extent with the concept of opportunities. This could be done in a number of ways, for example through discussing promotion prospects (glass ceiling, old boys/girls networks), education and healthcare limiting life chances and in turn opportunities, income and wealth inequalities limiting access to specific goods/services (private health/education, conspicuous consumption) and opportunities to improve the quality of life. Many candidates referred to the ethnic penalty.

Some candidates produced exclusively theoretical responses drawing on the work of Davis and Moore, Tumin, Marxism and the new right ideas of Saunders. These responses tended to respond to the concept of limited opportunities but at the expense of showing wide ranging and detailed knowledge and understanding of relevant sociological knowledge.

- (e) This question produced a full range of responses, however many of them failed to address the changing nature of the class structure. A significant number of responses focused on describing the shape of the class structure and providing accounts of sociological explanations of the existence of different social strata and class membership. To be placed in the top band responses had to focus on the issue of change and to some sociological theories.

The strongest answers used concepts such as fragmentation, polarisation, blurring boundaries, post-Fordism and economic restructuring. They could support their discussion with clear and accurate sociological evidence from sources such as: Savage, Roberts, Braverman and Devine. The strongest could correctly position the debate theoretically, aligning economic and status/power relationships with Marxist and Weberian theories and discussing the debate around Neo-Marxist explanations- are they really distinct from the Weberian ones (Edgell)?

A number of responses offered solely theoretical responses, trotting through functionalist, Marxist, Weberian and post modern explanations of the class structure. Many of these were not able to focus on the notion of change and were struggling to make it to the top of Level 3 in the mark scheme. Similarly those responses which answered the question by dealing with each social class in turn; upper, middle, working and underclass had a tendency to produce descriptive accounts of the class structure, although some did successfully link this to change.

A number of responses referred to people in the 'lower classes', a phrase which teachers may need to consider.

Question Two

- (a) Most candidates could successfully identify two beliefs about poverty from item A. Some candidates mistook 'experiences' of poverty for 'beliefs' and could not be rewarded. Candidates should be encouraged to look closely at the item, including the labels of tables/graphs. Occasionally the responses did not cite any of the numerical data in their

- (b) Most candidates could identify two reasons why Amy may feel excluded or different in society from item B. The most popular responses focused on her inability to participate in the same social activities as her friends, and that her family relied on social security benefits. To be rewarded full marks candidates had to focus on the reasons why Amy *feels different/excluded*, e.g. the fact that she was aware that she was somehow different to others due to having less money/receiving fewer gifts. Candidates who simply lifted/quoted from the data directly were struggling to do this. Some candidates wrote that Amy's mums disability made Amy feel different, however, close attention to the item reveals that it did not actually say that her mum's disability was the reason for Amy's feelings of exclusion/difference.
- (c) Almost all candidates could correctly identify one advantage and one disadvantage of using structured questionnaires when researching experiences of poverty in the contemporary UK. Many responses focused on the potential for generating reliable and representative data which would be useful when establishing patterns, trends, identifying causes and correlations which are all useful when researching poverty in the UK. The most popular disadvantage was the problem of achieving valid data through questionnaires. A sizeable number of responses focused on the difficulty of establishing a rapport with the respondents when using structured questionnaires which could be considered as essential when focusing on a sensitive subject such as the experience of poverty. A significant minority of candidates seemed to misread the question as 'structured interviews' and their responses focused on interviews rather than questionnaires. While it is feasible for a researcher to be present during the administration of a structured questionnaire, their presence would not be the same as in an unstructured interview where establishing a rapport is paramount. The context of researching 'experiences of poverty' was touched on by only a minority of candidates. Some discussed problems of operationalising the concept of poverty to good effect and were able to contextualise their response that way, however they needed to link this to structured questionnaires to be awarded full marks.
- (d) There was a wide range of social groups referred to in this question, going beyond women/men, ethnic minority groups and the underclass. Groups such as children, pensioners and people with disabilities appeared in many answers. The strongest responses used evidence from a wide range of sources including: Oppenheim and the CPAG, JRF, EOC, Institute for Fiscal Studies, Low Pay Unit and the Cranfield Management Institute. Some high quality data referring to income and wealth appeared. Some candidates were held back as they referred only to different ethnic groups. Even when they focused on divisions between different ethnic groups it was felt that a wide ranging and detailed knowledge and understanding would go beyond ethnicity itself. Strong responses which focused solely on gender or ethnicity only were able to be placed in the top band providing there was a mention of at least one other social group; age, and class being most likely here. Some Centres chose to answer this question from topics rather than social groups, focusing on education, workplace, crime and health most commonly. Some of these candidates did produce strong responses, however it was felt that they were sometimes struggling to keep the focus on social groups. Responses like this were however able to achieve full marks.
- (e) This question produced a full range of responses. Most responses displayed an understanding of the underclass, although a sizeable minority did not appear to know what the underclass was. The strongest responses focused on ideas based around cultural deficiency and social structure. The strongest of these were able to cite relevant theoretical and empirical evidence and to make sustained and specific points of evaluation. Many candidates displayed knowledge of new right explanations; Murray,

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

Saunders and Marsland frequently appeared. Structural explanations were generally not displayed as strongly, although Rex and Tomlinson and Field did appear in many responses. The majority of candidates thought that the Marxist explanations of the underclass were the same as those applied to the working class. Very few mentioned the lumpen proletariat. Many assumed that the underclass were a part of the reserve army of labour, which some confused with the dual labour market. These responses were often struggling to provide explanations for the existence of the underclass as they were effectively writing about the working class and were confusing Marxist and Weberian based explanations. The work of Roberts and arguments surrounding the terminology of the underclass appeared in the responses from some Centres. Precise points of evaluation were provided in top band answers focusing on Morris, Dean and Taylor-Gooby, Charleworth and Craine.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Sociology (3878/7878)
June 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2532	Raw	60	40	36	32	29	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2533	Raw	90	65	58	51	44	38	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2534	Raw	60	45	41	37	34	31	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2535	Raw	90	74	67	60	53	46	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2536	Raw	60	43	38	33	28	24	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2537	Raw	60	41	37	33	29	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2538	Raw	60	48	43	38	33	28	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2539	Raw	90	67	60	54	48	42	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3878	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7878	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3878	18.0	37.4	59.0	77.7	90.5	100	7580
7878	17.1	40.9	67.9	89.2	98	100	5051

12631 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2008

