

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for question 3 of the Social Issues section of the question paper component.

Candidate 1

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **3/6 marks** for this question.

1 mark for 'girls do better than boys'

1 mark for boys' peer influences

1 mark for gendered subjects' explanation. A clearer expansion of this could have achieved more marks.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **5/6 marks** for this question.

The question asks for two findings. The candidate tried to give three. All of them should be marked and the best two taken.

The paragraph on gender was awarded 2 marks. When explaining a finding, a candidate may state the finding and give a reason for this, even if the explanation was not in the study itself.

The paragraph on ethnicity was awarded 3 marks. Please note that in a question which asks for two findings to be explained for 6 marks, there is a maximum of 3 marks for each finding, it is not possible to achieve the marks by getting 4 for one and 2 for another.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4/8 marks** for this question.

1 mark for 'not as well studied'

1 mark for '60% more likely to react'

1 mark for heart attack symptoms

1 mark for better/more accurate treatment

Please note that in this question there would be a maximum of 4 marks for an explanation of the social issue without using a sociological theory and a maximum of 6 marks for only using one sociological theory, as this candidate has done.

Total marks awarded 12/20

Candidate 2

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **3/6 marks** for this question.

1 mark for 'Girls do better than boys in school and now in University too'

1 mark for gendered curriculum down to 'physics'

1 mark for last sentence, down to 'rates of pay'

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **4/6 marks** for this question.

The candidate has three findings, when the question asked for two. Mark all three and choose the best two.

First finding would get one mark, second finding would get 2 marks.

The statements are crude and a very rough summation of the study, however, at this level, they are not incorrect. Kingdon and Cassen found that Chinese and Indian pupils were best at avoiding low achievement, whereas Afro-Caribbean were the least successful on average. It would have been better if they had gone on to say that when socio-economic factors are taken into account they did no worse than white pupils of similar economic backgrounds.

The third finding, the candidate has done enough here for two marks. The overall finding of Kingdon and Cassen is that socio-economic factors are the biggest determinant of low achievement. The expansion about free school meals as an indicator is also in the study findings and deserves a mark.

Overall, paragraphs two and three would get two marks each, whereas paragraph one would only get one mark, so paragraphs two and three are counted.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **7/8 marks** for this question.

Candidates are encouraged to state the social issue clearly at the start, as this candidate has done, however there are no marks for this. 'This means...' down to '...become richer' gets 1 mark. The next sentence on functionalism gets 2 marks. The first is for the developed explanation of the first sentence using a theory, 'functionalists call this meritocracy' and the second for correctly stating the functionalist view of social mobility, that it happens a lot. There are no marks for a personal opinion. After some deliberation, 1 mark was given for the last part of the sentence 'the facts show that it is very difficult for someone who is born at the bottom to get to the top.'

The Marxism paragraph gets 1 mark down to social closure and 1 mark for the judges example. There is 1 further mark for the rest of the paragraph.

Total marks awarded 14/20

Candidate 3

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **6/6 marks** for this question.

From 'Traditionally' down to '1948' the candidate was given 3 marks. This is a good discussion on historical gender differences in education, with good exemplification.

The next paragraph starts with a critique of the current situation and introduces a theory, which although not necessary, is creditworthy. 2 marks could be awarded down to 'who are behind.'

The next part on the gendered curriculum would easily obtain 3 marks down to the end.

This answer would clearly get more marks than there are available.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **6/6 marks** for this question.

The candidate clearly identifies the first finding topic on ethnicity at the start. This allows them to include all the relevant points on the topic from the findings. The candidate then makes three relevant points on ethnicity.

For the second finding, the candidate does a similar job with the difference that schools can make by identifying this clearly as the finding area they are going to talk about. The rest of the paragraph is worth 3 marks.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **8/8 marks** for this question.

The paragraph on functionalism gets 4 marks. 2 marks for meritocracy and its explanation. A further 2 marks in this paragraph for the social mobility part.

The Marxism paragraph gets 1 mark for the first sentence. The next one explaining two classes does not get a mark on its own, however it becomes relevant in the next sentence. There are 2 marks for the sentence from 'The bourgeoisie...' down to '...social ladder.' There is one further mark for the last sentence explaining social closure.

This answer would have all 8 marks before the last paragraph, however the marks that it would get are, 2 marks from start down to '---poorer background.'

There are 2 marks for the last two sentences as well.

Total marks awarded 20/20