

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of the question paper.

Candidate 1

Please note that this is a typed script with a number of spelling and other errors. These are not counted against the candidate, as long as the meaning is clear.

Question 1(a)

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

The 6 marks are split into 3 and 3 for each explanation of a difference. In this example, the candidate was awarded **2 marks** for the first explanation which shows the difference between prejudice/stereotypes and research. The second difference was also awarded **3 marks** for contrasting blaming the individual/group with considering outside factors, while introducing the concept of blame in common sense.

Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for this question.

Two descriptions of features are needed. There are 2 marks available for each. The first feature was awarded **2 marks** however the second feature was awarded **1 mark**. Although we can 'transfer' writing which is meant to be part of one feature (or difference or advantage, etc) because there is one set of marks, we cannot count the same bit of information twice. The second feature therefore stands on its own and there is not enough for 2 marks to be awarded. It is also worth noting that at National 5, candidates will often write an advantage or disadvantage as a feature, and as long as it is relevant, then this is acceptable.

Question 1(c)

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

This answer requires explaining one advantage and one disadvantage, each for 3 marks. The advantage was awarded **2 marks** for 'learn more' and 'better understanding', both being part of being 'fully involved'. The disadvantage was also awarded **1 mark**, as participant observation is generally seen as having high validity and lower reliability.

Question 1(d)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for this question.

Two descriptions are required to be awarded 2 marks each. The candidate gives two very simple descriptions, which were awarded **1 mark** each.

Question 1(e)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The first feature was awarded **1 mark** for micro, as the further expansion is unclear. The second description was awarded **2 marks**.

Question 1(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 6 marks** for this question.

1 mark was awarded for 'macro' in relation to the structural perspective and nothing for the rest. Although it is fine to discuss a theory which is part of the structural perspective in this answer, there has to be a sign that the candidate is aware that the theory is part of the perspective, not synonymous with it.

Total for Human Society: 17 out of 30 marks

Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The candidate was easily awarded **2 marks** for each description.

Question 2(b)

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

The Amish are a sub-culture within America and the question asked about a culture studied. It was agreed and applied to all candidates, that because of the non-integrated way of living, the Amish was acceptable as a culture for this question. However, where candidates talk about the difference between the Amish and the wider US society, they are describing the features of a sub-culture, and that part of the answer would not be awarded marks. This candidate has compared the Amish culture to 'our own', making it more of a cross-cultural comparison than a culture/sub-culture one. The answer could therefore be awarded marks. However, the question asks for features, not comparisons, so only the parts which explain features could be awarded marks. There is **1 mark** for not relying on electricity. The second feature on gender norms was awarded **2 marks**.

Question 2(c)

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

Marks were awarded as follows:

- ◆ **1 mark** for 'community made up of different cultures'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'open and tolerant'.
- ◆ **2 marks** for 'Different religions in Edinburgh living alongside each other, such as churches and mosques built alongside'.

Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The candidate has taken research from the Social Issues section; however, they have managed to make it somewhat relevant to the question and therefore have been awarded **3 marks**. They identify the research, they show how different influences can shape how we are seen and how we see ourselves, thus shaping our identity as we grow.

Total for Culture and Identity: 14 out of 20 marks

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for this question.

Marks were awarded as follows:

- ◆ **1 mark** for lower classes feeling 'undervalued by their teachers'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'anti-school culture which leads to less effort in class'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'disillusioned by the education system'.

Question 3(b)

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

The first explanation of a finding was awarded **3 marks**. The second finding is incorrect and did not receive any marks.

Question 3(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 6 marks** for this question.

The candidate identifies an issue and a theory, however, there are no marks merely for that, but they help to open up other marks. The candidate goes on to gain **1 mark** for explaining that functionalism views poverty as a necessary part of society. There is a further **1 mark** awarded for explaining that poverty is used as an incentive for people to work hard.

Question 3(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** for this question as they did not provide a response.

Total for Social Issues: 8 out of 20 marks

Total: 39 out of 70 marks

Candidate 2

Question 1(a)

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

The first explanation of a difference was awarded **2 marks** as the example is not complete. The second explanation was also awarded **2 marks**. The answer does not get a mark for saying 'the common sense approach does not'. If the candidate had said, 'the common sense relies on individual experience' the explanation would have been awarded full marks.

Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The first description of a feature gets both **2 marks** however the second one was not awarded any marks.

Question 1(c)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 6 marks** for this question.

The advantage seems to be confusing participant observation with an unstructured interview as it talks about open ended questions. This did not get any marks. The second explanation however was awarded **2 marks**. It acknowledges that participant observation may be carried out covertly (does not assume that it must be) and then names and describes the Hawthorne effect. In order to gain the third mark, an explanation of the effect of this on the research results would have been necessary.

Question 1(d)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** as they did not provide a response to this question.

Question 1(e)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The response was awarded **2 marks** overall. It can be read as one feature (which would get 2 out of 2 marks) or as two separate descriptions, which would each get 1 out of 2 marks.

Question 1(f)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 6 marks** for this question.

Although the response was brief, there is enough for **2 marks** to be awarded.

Total for Human Society: 12 out of 30 marks**Question 2(a)**

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for this question.

There is only one description included, which was awarded **2 marks**.

Question 2(b)

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

The first feature on gender roles was awarded **2 marks**, while the second feature about caravans was also awarded **2 marks**.

Question 2(c)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 6 marks** for this question.

This answer is very vague. A little understanding of the term is shown, so **1 mark** was awarded.

Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The research evidence is not named, instead the 'self-fulfilling prophecy' is cited as research. Even given what the candidate is arguing, the conclusion does not match what they have said previously so no marks were awarded.

Total for Culture and Identity: 7 out of 20 marks**Question 3(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The answer is vague and would have benefitted from an example, however as it is description which is asked for, overall, it was awarded **1 mark** for the lower-class part.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 6 marks** for this question.

This answer was not awarded any marks as the candidate has not explained a finding from the study.

Question 3(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 6 marks** as they did not provide a response to this question.

Question 3(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** as they did not provide a response to this question.

Total for Social Issues: 1 out of 20 marks

Total: 20 out of 70 marks

Candidate 3

Question 1(a)

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

The first explanation of a difference was awarded **1 mark** as it only gives one side; merely to say that the other explanation of society 'does' or 'does not' as the opposite of the first explanation is not enough for another mark to be awarded. The second explanation is awarded **2 marks**.

Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The first description is incorrect. There is not always time to see the questions beforehand with a structured interview. The second feature gets both **2 marks**.

Question 1(c)

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

The advantage was awarded **2 marks** as follows:

- ◆ **1 mark** for 'as the person is part of the group they can gather more reliable information'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'done overtly or covertly'.

Please note these points are related, which they need to be to gain the marks.

The disadvantage was also awarded **1 mark** for 'if carried out overtly, the behaviour of the subject group may be affected'. Please note that the 'overtly' is made conditional by using 'if carried out', this is the correct way to approach this question. To gain further marks, the candidate should expand on this, showing how the results would be affected.

Question 1(d)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

Two good descriptions of features were given, so the full **4 marks** were awarded.

Question 1(e)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for this question.

It is not entirely clear when the first description ends and the second one starts. In this case, the answer is always marked in the way which would be most beneficial to the candidate. The first sentence was awarded **1 mark**, the second

was also awarded **1 mark**, down to 'affect us'. The rest does not get any marks. The candidate seems to get the action perspective confused with common sense. The last sentence is also incorrect.

Question 1(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 6 marks** for this question.

The first sentence gets no marks. **1 mark** was awarded further on for 'views society from the top down'.

Total for Human Society: 15 out of 30 marks

Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The first description down to 'you are witnessing' was awarded **2 marks**. The second description was also awarded **2 marks**.

Question 2(b)

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

Although there is a slight mistake (the quinceañera is for the 15th birthday), the other details are correct. There is enough in this feature for **2 marks** to be awarded. The second feature was also awarded all **3 marks** (importance of families; grandparent living with them; upholding traditions).

Question 2(c)

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

Although there is some similarity in the sentences, there is enough in this for 3 marks:

- ◆ **1 mark** for 'different cultures coming together'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'different races and religions'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'people move ...and share their culture and beliefs'.

Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** for this question.

There is no research evidence identified, nor any that can be easily inferred.

Total for Culture and Identity: 12 out of 20 marks

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

This is a good answer which considers the effect on both higher and lower social classes and was awarded the full **4 marks**.

Question 3(b)

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

The first explanation was awarded 3 marks. **1 mark** was awarded for the first sentence, then **2 marks** were awarded for the next, which mentions both receiving praise and its likely effect. The second finding is simpler and not entirely proved by the study however there is enough for **2 marks** to be awarded.

Question 3(c)(i)

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

This answer does not use a sociological theory and therefore would be restricted to 4 marks maximum. **1 mark** was awarded for the idea that those lower down find it difficult to get to the top, however, the explanation following is less convincing. **1 mark** was awarded for the link between occupation and social class however the rest is not explained well. There is a further **2 marks** for the idea that those in lower classes are given fewer opportunities, which links to the first point, and the rest of the answer.

Question 3(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** for this question as they did not provide a response.

Total for Social Issues: 13 out of 20 marks

Total: 40 out of 70 marks

Candidate 4

Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for this question.

A good answer is provided for the first explanation which gets all **3 marks**. The second one is slightly repetitious when it comes to the sociological explanation, however, there is enough for **3 marks** to be awarded.

Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The candidate provided two good descriptions which were awarded **2 marks** each.

Question 1(c)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for this question.

Although the example in the first explanation is non sociological, there is enough for all **3 marks** to be awarded. The second one has a more relevant example and again was awarded **3 marks**.

Question 1(d)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The candidate provided two very good descriptions that received **2 marks** each.

Question 1(e)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they provided very full answers which were well set out.

Question 1(f)

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

The first sentence was awarded **1 mark**. The example following that was also awarded **1 mark**. The candidate then goes on to use functionalism as an example but makes it clear that they recognise that the theory is part of the perspective. The functionalist section was awarded **1 mark** as not all of it relates to the question. The last sentence which begins 'To conclude ...' conflates the theory and perspective a little but is still worth a separate **1 mark** for, 'the institutions within shape the individuals and their behaviour and norms.'

Total for Human Society: 28 out of 30 marks

Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

They were awarded the full **4 marks** for a good description of how primary socialisation can influence human behaviour.

Question 2(b)

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

The Amish are a sub-culture within America and the question asked about a culture studied. It was agreed and applied to all candidates, that because of the non-integrated way of living, the Amish was acceptable as a culture for this question.

Even without the last sentence, which invites a comparison with mainstream culture, the previous information has enough for **2 marks** to be awarded as a feature. The second feature gets the full **3 marks**.

Question 2(c)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for this question.

The marks were awarded as follows:

- ◆ **1 mark** for the definition in the first paragraph.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'multiculturalism'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for the religions.
- ◆ **1 mark** for the places of worship.
- ◆ **1 mark** for the languages in London in the second paragraph.
- ◆ **1 mark** for cultural respect.

Further marks could have been awarded but maximum marks were achieved.

Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

A piece of research was identified and explained well for **2 marks**. The candidate goes on to talk about their identity and how this is achieved, easily getting another **2 marks**. Other marks could have been awarded but the maximum had already been achieved.

Total for Culture and Identity: 19 out of 20 marks

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

This response was awarded all 4 marks:

- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for the first sentence.
- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for the association of free school meals and lower attainment.
- ◆ **1 mark** for linking unemployment and low parental educational achievement.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'same resources such as private tutors and educational days out'.

Question 3(b)

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

The first finding was awarded all **3 marks** easily. The second finding is also accurate and was awarded **2 marks**. Although the candidate introduces another study, they do not fully explain the finding identified in Pygmalion in the classroom.

Question 3(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for this question.

Full marks were awarded as follows:

- ◆ **2 marks** for the sentence down to 'keeping the proletariat poor'.
- ◆ **2 marks** for down to 'could cause health issues'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for 'likely remain in poverty'.
- ◆ **1 mark** for the next sentence on upper class children.

Question 3(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for this question.

The first finding on health consequences of poor nutrition was awarded **2 marks**. The second finding on mental health effects of poverty was also awarded **2 marks**.

Total for Social Issues: 19 out of 20 marks

Total: 66 out of 70 marks