

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for these candidates has achieved the following marks for each section of the assignment.

## Candidate 1

### Section A

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be awarded in this section. The candidate does enough here for two marks. Although some of the phrasing is vague, there is a clearly defined issue and information around it.

### Section B

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 6 marks may be awarded here. The candidate has described one common sense view of the topic for 2 marks. Although the candidate gives two contemporary examples, one of them (Priti Patel) is not of the common sense view. The candidate gives good description of the difference between common sense and sociological view of the topic.

### Section C

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be given in this section. The candidate gives two good references, gaining full marks.

### Section D

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks are available for this section. The candidate gave:

- ◆ information from source 1 on housing costs and poverty; on working poverty and on cost-of-living increases. **(3 marks)**
- ◆ information from source 2 on absolute and relative poverty **(2 marks)** and on causes of poverty. **(1 mark)**
- ◆ an explanation of the importance of the information showing the sociological meaning. **(2 marks)** (One mark is given for the first part down to 'food' another mark is given for the last part about using it to 'estimate the level of poverty in future.')

## Section E

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks can be awarded in this section. The candidate explains the topic by making clear links between relevant information from sources and the topic.

The first paragraph does not attract any marks.

The second paragraph gets 2 marks for the first section on Marx. These marks are from the second part of E, 'explaining the topic using sociological terminology, knowledge and understanding.' The rest of the second paragraph is interesting, but it is not from the sources and does not get any more marks.

The third paragraph clearly shows how the evidence provided challenges the common sense view. However, there is little detail on how the evidence from the sources shows this so 2 marks are awarded here.

Total marks **21/30**

## Candidate 2

### Section A

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be awarded in this section. There is enough evidence here to suggest that the candidate understands the sociological aspect to the topic however there is no real information to support this.

### Section B

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 6 marks can be awarded here.

The description of the common sense view is reasonable. **(2marks)**

Two contemporary examples, are well explained. **(2 marks)**

There is no description of the difference between common sense and sociological view of the topic.

### Section C

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** in total for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be given in this section. Two good references were given. Encouragingly, both appear to have a sociological view.

## Section D

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks are available for this section. The three findings given are detailed and relevant. Unfortunately, the candidate does not write any more.

The information from the first source gets 3 marks.

There is no information from the second source given, so that cannot gain any marks, however, is there anything which goes beyond selecting and clearly summarising information from the source and moves into 'explaining the importance of essential points of information'? Unfortunately, although the findings are detailed, they are all taken from the source.

## Section E

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks can be awarded in this section. Nothing has been written for this section, so the candidate did not gain any marks.

Overall, please note the word count, which at 738, is low and the title given 'Reasons for obesity' has the potential to be more of a medical than sociological topic.

Total marks **10/30**

## Candidate 3

### Section A

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be awarded in this section. Although there are a few inaccuracies in this, there is enough for the 2 marks.

### Section B

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 6 marks can be awarded here. The common sense view is unclear and is given 1 mark. There is an attempt to give contemporary views however they are again a bit confused, but there is an attempt to show that common sense view is that 'hooligans' are mindless thugs not interested in football, which the Independent headline said. This was given 1 mark. The comparison of common sense and sociological views was not specific enough.

### Section C

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be given in this section. The candidate gave two good references.

## Section D

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks are available for this section. The findings of both sources are clear, however the attempt to interpret the sociological meaning is not as well done. Source 1 - the first one merely rewords the finding. The second and third are psychological. For Source 2, the points tend to restate the finding in a different way, however the point about the police being counter productive is valid and gets a mark.

## Section E

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks can be awarded in this section. The first paragraph attracts no marks. It is a summary of the information which fails to show sociological understanding.

The second paragraph is contradictory and does not explain how labelling is relevant in this case. The third paragraph is not relevant.

The final two paragraphs do address the common sense view and were given 3 marks.

Total marks **16/30**

## Candidate 4

### Section A

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for this section.

A maximum of 2 marks can be awarded in this section. Although this is unclear and poorly expressed, there is enough of an idea of class and education to gain a mark.

### Section B

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

A maximum of 6 marks can be awarded here. The first paragraph common sense explanation is not correct.

In the second paragraph there is an attempt to compare common sense and sociological explanations but it is too confused. There is one mark here for the common sense explanation.

The third paragraph tries to provide a contemporary example but it doesn't work.

### Section C

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

A maximum of 2 marks can be given in this section. Two references are given.

### Section D

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks can be awarded in this section. The findings from the first source are reasonably well presented however they are not completely on the topic of class and education. They were judged relevant enough to gain 3 marks. The second source findings are not clear. There is an attempt to introduce theory but neither of them is correct.

### Section E

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for this section.

A maximum of 10 marks can be awarded in this section. This is attempted previously and there is also an attempted comparison with the common sense explanation. There is one mark for stating that the sociological view is preferred to the common sense one.

Overall, please note the word count is slightly over the 1200 mark. A penalty is only applied when it is 10% or more over. The title is unclear.

Total marks **8/30**