

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

Question 1(a)

The candidate had been awarded **2/4 marks** for this question.

The first feature had been awarded **2 marks** in relation to the comments on personal opinion, expanded with subjectivity and without using research evidence. The second feature had been incorrect, so marks could not be awarded.

Question 1(b)

The candidate had been awarded **4/4 marks** for this question.

This question had a simple “describe” command. The candidate had been required to make a relevant point and then expand on it. **Two marks** had been awarded for the first feature, for stating closed questions and being predetermined. The second feature had been awarded **2 marks** for quantitative data, noting that it was easy to collate but lacked context.

Question 1(c)

The candidate had been awarded **4/4 marks** for this question. There had been up to 2 marks for each description. Description 1 had been given **2 marks** for open questions, which provided context and a clearer understanding of a person’s thoughts. Description 2 had been awarded **2 marks** for explaining the face-to-face nature of interviews and sincerity.

Question 1(d)

The candidate had been awarded **4/6 marks** for this question. Questions that asked candidates to “explain” had required them to give more information about the meaning of something, to give reasons, or to show connections. There had been 3 marks available for each explanation. The first explanation had been awarded **2 marks** for covert observation, describing that the researcher could participate in routine behaviour as participants were unaware of their presence and therefore did not act differently. Explanation 2 had been awarded **2 marks** for mentioning ethical considerations and formal consent.

Question 1(e)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks** for this question.

This question had a simple “describe” command. The candidate had been required to make a relevant point and then expand on it. The candidate had done this three times. Candidates could have referred to specific theories in their answers. There had been 2 marks available for each description. Description 1 had been awarded **2 marks** for the comment on quantitative data, statistics, and institutions affecting a population. Description 2 had also been awarded **2 marks** for stating a top-down approach and giving the example of government and police influencing populations. Description 3 had been awarded **2 marks** for identifying macro theory and explaining society as a whole rather than individuals.

Question 1(f)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks** for this question. Questions that asked candidates to “explain” had required them to give more information about the meaning of something, to give reasons, or to show connections. The first **2 marks** had been awarded for the view that individuals act as agents, meaning that people could form their own opinions and create social change. A further **2 marks** had been awarded for the example and detailed explanation of Rosa Parks and the American

Civil Rights Movement. The final **2 marks** had been awarded for micro-interactions and peers shaping a person's political views and sense of fashion.

Question 2(a)

The candidate had been awarded **6/8 marks** for this question. Candidates could have been awarded up to 3 marks for an explanation. Explanation 1 had been awarded **2 marks** for interactions with family instilling values through socialisation. Explanation 2 had been awarded **2 marks** for religion and how it could influence marriage and diet across different religions. The final explanation had been awarded **2 marks** for the explanation of peers, which had been deemed just sufficient for 2 marks, although it had been briefer than the previous examples.

Question 2(b)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks** for this question. This question had a simple "describe" command. The candidate had been required to make a relevant point and then expand on it three times. Feature 1 (**2 marks**) had been awarded for making their own clothes and anti-consumerism. Feature 2 (**2 marks**) had been awarded for distinct gender roles and the detailed explanation of these. Feature 3 (**2 marks**) had been awarded for the point on cooperation and its explanation.

Question 2(c)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks** for this question.

Questions that asked candidates to "explain" had required them to give more information about the meaning of something, to give reasons, or to show connections. **One mark** had been awarded for the explanation on co-existence and tolerance. **A further mark** had been given for the comment on negating closed-minded judgments and presenting a challenge to generalisation. **Two further marks** had been awarded for the comment that diversity created an environment welcoming to people from different walks of life, suggesting that people should not need to change to appease others. **Another mark** had been given for diversity allowing

people to contribute positively to society. **The final mark** had been awarded for the example of a fish and chip shop run by Italian immigrants.

Question 3(a)

The candidate had been awarded **4/4 marks** for this question. This question had asked the candidate to explain. It had required the candidate to give more information about the meaning of something, to give reasons, or to show connections. **One mark** had been given for the comment on challenging or reinforcing arguments for or against legislation. **Two marks** had been awarded for changing the population's view on certain subjects leading to social change, with the example of the smoking ban. **The final mark** had been awarded for the comment that qualitative and quantitative data, if used together, gave a clearer picture of a social issue.

Question 3(b)

The candidate had been awarded **3/8 marks** for this question. **One mark** had been given for the comment on subject choice. **Two marks** had been awarded for the comments on behavioural differences and support.

Question 3(ci)

The candidate had been awarded **4/4 marks** for this question. Although candidates had not been required to apply sociological theory, this had been accredited appropriately when they did so. **The first mark** had been awarded for the gender pay gap in similar jobs. **A second mark** had been given for "shelf life" due to parental leave. **A further 2 marks** had been awarded for the comments on the "gender confidence gap" and its influence on promotion.

Question 3(cii)

The candidate had been awarded **4/4 marks** for this question. **Two marks** had been awarded for each statistic and explanation.

Candidate 2

Question 1(a)

The candidate had been awarded **3/4 marks**. **One mark** had been given for personal experience, **one** for bias, and **one** for lack of real evidence.

Question 1(b)

The candidate had been awarded **3/4 marks** for this question. **One mark** had been awarded for the feature of closed questions and an example. **Two marks** had been awarded for quantitative data and the ability to complete questionnaires online.

Question 1(c)

The candidate had been awarded **2/4 marks** for this question. The two examples had been very similar. **Two marks** could have been awarded for either feature but not both.

Question 1(d)

The candidate had been awarded **4/6 marks** for this question. **Two marks** had been given for being present and experiencing what the subjects did, gaining greater insight. **Two marks** had also been awarded for identifying the disadvantage that participants might change their behaviour, making the research invalid.

Question 1(e)

The candidate had been awarded **3/6 marks** for this question. **One mark** had been awarded per feature. The candidate had not explained the final two features enough to warrant full marks.

Question 1(f)

The candidate had been awarded **3/6 marks** for this question. **One mark** had been given for the comment on language and shared understanding, **one** for the comment on individuals influencing society, and **one** for individuals changing society.

Question 2(a)

The candidate had been awarded **6/8 marks** for this question. **Two marks** had been given for the first paragraph on values being taught by agents of socialisation and the point on culture. **A further 2 marks** had been awarded for the description of norms and **another 2** for the description of rules.

Question 2(b)

The candidate had been awarded **4/6 marks** for this question. **Two marks** had been awarded for the first feature and **2** for the third feature.

Question 2(c)

The candidate had been awarded **1/6 marks** for this question. The candidate had not really explained the concept of diversity.

Question 3(a)

The candidate had been awarded **1/4 marks** for this question, given for the notion of research and validity.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for this question because their answer doesn't specifically address differential achievement in education in relation to gender.

Question 3(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for this question because they did not answer on a different social issue.

Question 3(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for this question because they did not answer on a different social issue.

Candidate 3

Question 1(a)

The candidate had been awarded **4 marks** for both accurately identifying and clearly explaining the features of common-sense explanations. **Two marks** had been awarded for explaining that common sense was naturalistic and based on personal views, and another **2 marks** for explaining that common sense failed to acknowledge bias and instead presented itself as factual.

Question 1(b)

The candidate had been awarded **4 marks** for both accurately identified and clearly explained feature of questionnaires. **Two marks** had been awarded for stating that questionnaires produced quantitative data that could easily be converted into statistics. A further **2 marks** had been given for explaining that questionnaires used closed questions, with an example provided (eg, yes or no questions).

Question 1(c)

The candidate had been awarded **4 marks** for both accurately identified and clearly described advantage. The first **2 marks** had been awarded for qualitative responses providing in-depth and personal insights. A further **2 marks** had been awarded for explaining that researchers could ask follow-up questions, allowing for deeper exploration of interesting answers.

Question 1(d)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks** for this question. **One mark** had been awarded for identifying the depth of detail provided, and **2 marks** for supporting this with a relevant example. **Three further marks** had been given for explaining how being recorded could influence participants' behaviour, leading to less accurate data, with a suitable example provided—earning full marks.

Question 1(e)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks** for this question. **Two marks** had been awarded for the macro approach, explaining that it focused on large-scale impacts on society while ignoring the individual. The second feature had gained **2 marks** for explaining that structural theories rejected the idea of free will, and the final **2 marks** had been awarded for suggesting that individuals were shaped by the structures within society.

Question 1(f)

The candidate had been awarded **5 marks** in total. The first paragraph (**3 marks**) had highlighted small-scale interactions, standing up for a cause, and used the Rosa Parks example to demonstrate how an individual could influence society. The second paragraph (**2 marks**) had gained marks for discussing free will and using Greta Thunberg as an example to show how an individual could impact institutions such as the United Nations.

Question 2(a)

The candidate had been awarded **8/8 marks** for providing a detailed and accurate response. **Four marks** had been awarded for explaining that families passed on rules using rewards and punishments. Marks had been given for describing how families taught norms, such as eating with a knife and fork, celebrating events like Christmas, and teaching manners. **Four marks** had been awarded for the comprehensive explanation of secondary socialisation: schools taught respect for authority by discouraging bad behaviour and encouraging good behaviour. An example had been provided about appropriate conduct in the workplace. **A final mark** had been awarded for recognising the role of religion in the socialisation process.

Question 2(b)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks**, with each feature clearly described and accurate. Each paragraph had received 2 marks. The first paragraph (**2 marks**) had explained how football casuals wore different clothing styles, with detail on how younger members learned from older peers within the subculture. The second paragraph (**2 marks**) had described the subculture's preference for different music, supported with relevant examples. The third paragraph (**2 marks**) had discussed how violence was viewed as an exciting activity, including the organised nature of fights with rival groups.

Question 2(c)

The candidate had been awarded **6/6 marks**, with each feature accurately described and clearly explained. Each paragraph had received 2 marks. The first paragraph (**2 marks**) had explained the concept of subcultures within a larger culture that retained their own norms and values, with examples such as Scotland and Scottish Asian weddings. The second paragraph (**2 marks**) had provided examples of cultural diversity in Leith Walk, including different shops and restaurants, and had specifically mentioned the Sicilian Bakery, known for its birthday cakes. The third paragraph (**2 marks**) had gained marks for referencing multiple festivals and celebrations that reflected cultural diversity, such as Christmas and Ramadan.

Question 3(a)

The candidate had been awarded **4/4 marks**, with marks awarded as follows: supporting claims with evidence (**1 mark**). Identifying both qualitative and quantitative research (**1 mark**), mentioning peer scrutiny (**1 mark**), and describing research as accurate and factual (**1 mark**).

Question 3(b)

The candidate had been awarded **5 marks** in total:

1 mark was awarded for stating that girls had been encouraged to pursue social subjects, and **1 mark** for comparing this to boys being encouraged into STEM subjects. **1 mark** awarded for making a comment about feminism. **1 mark** awarded for noting that girls had begun to fall behind by the age of six, and **1 mark** for mentioning that boys were often ignored.

Question 3(c)

The candidate had been awarded **2 marks**:

1 mark for mentioning the number of women in prison and **1 mark** for referring to ethnicity.

No marks were given for class and crimes of need, as the response was too vague.

Question 3(cii)

The candidate had been awarded **full marks**, receiving **2 marks** for each finding due to their accuracy and thorough explanation. **Two marks** had been awarded for identifying that people of colour were arrested more often than white people, demonstrating structural racism within the police. **Two marks** had also been awarded for stating that boys had more opportunities to commit crime, supported by an example comparing the habits of boys and girls.