



2010 Sociology

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the External Print Team, Centre Services, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's External Print Team, Centre Services, at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR MARKERS

All questions in the papers provide scope for candidates to demonstrate sociological knowledge, understanding and skills at different levels.

Section A is specific in the type of information required and more detailed marking guidelines are given for this section. Points should however, be developed using appropriate sociological language and should be linked directly to the question.

Where explanation is asked for, answers should include expanded points in response to the questions. List-type or bullet-point answers are not appropriate and should not be awarded any marks.

Where the question asks for description, detail is essential and points should be developed using appropriate sociological language and linked. List-type or bullet-point answers should be awarded no more than **one** mark for each point to a total of no more than **half** the available marks. Answers that are made up of disconnected words and/or phrases should be awarded no more than half the available marks.

Where similarities and/or differences are asked for, answers that rely solely on presenting the converse of the point made, should be awarded no more than half the available marks, eg if a candidate response is: 'sociological explanations would argue that women have been socialised into housework, non-sociological explanations do not' – this would only gain one of the two marks allocated for one difference between sociological and common sense explanations.

Sections B and C are more open in terms of the range of answers candidates can produce. This leaves scope for candidates to achieve strong responses to the questions. Advice on what constitutes strong responses to specific questions is given in the specific marking guidelines, with suggestions for allocating marks. However, in general, strong responses would also be characterised by:

- answering the specific question asked eg on the aspect of labelling or on social mobility
- consistent use of appropriate sociological terms and language
- elaboration of responses that go beyond that which is required in the question set, eg by making more points and good exemplification
- ideas expressed with a high degree of clarity
- coherence demonstrated by linking relevant concepts/ideas appropriately.

For all sections, half-marks are not permitted.

The guidelines are not prescriptive, but merely illustrate the kinds of responses that are judged to be acceptable. However, given the range and scope of sociological theory and research, the guidelines are not exhaustive and markers may credit alternative responses that they judge to be acceptable.

Candidates are expected to refer to appropriate sociological theories in Sections B and C, while this should include mention of relevant theorists, marks **will not** be allocated for merely naming theorists.

Candidates are expected to refer to studies by their title and to use the author(s) name(s) and/or the date of the study. However, whilst this is considered good practice, candidates will not be awarded any marks for using the name, author and/or date.

Any other relevant points made should be credited as appropriate.

SECTION A

Question A1

Describe **two** differences between sociological and common sense explanations of human society. (4)

Candidates can be awarded a total of **4 marks**; up to **4 marks** if they make **two** elaborated differences.

For example, if a candidate explains that common sense explanations are based on opinion, whereas sociological explanations are grounded in theory and research, then this would count as one elaborated difference.

Common sense explanations included the following points:

- based on opinion
- may be individualistic or naturalistic
- lack objectivity
- carries notions of being factual.

Sociological knowledge includes the following aspects:

- based on particular theories which have been tested through research
- attempts to be objective
- attempts to be value free or acknowledges role of values in formulating theories
- challenges taken for granted assumptions.

Candidates who use examples to demonstrate differences may also be credited depending on the quality of their answer.

Examples may include:

- people marry because they love each other vs. people marry because it is a social expectation
- people are unemployed because they are lazy and don't want to work vs. the structure of employment has changed
- people are poor because they do not budget properly vs. people are poor because of low wages and low benefits
- people commit suicide because they are unhappy vs. rates of suicide are socially distributed and can be attributed to social factors such as unemployment, religion, urbanisation, etc.

Question A2

Describe **two** strengths of feminism. (4)

Award up to **4 marks** for answer; up to **2 marks** for *each* strength described. Description is asked for in the question and therefore the answer requires description and detail.

Award **1 mark** for key features that are stated rather than described and for answers that lack sociological languages/terms.

Answers may include description of the following:

- good at explaining the reasons behind gender inequalities in society
- good at explaining the patriarchal nature of society
- good at explaining bias in law formation and implementation
- good at explaining conflict in society based on gender
- good at explaining male stream sociology.

Question A3

Describe **one** similarity and **one** difference between Marxism and Neo-Marxism. (4)

Award up to **4 marks** for this answer, up to **2 marks** for *each* feature described. Description is asked for in the question and therefore the answer requires more than simple description.

Award **1 mark** for key features that are stated rather than described and for answers that lack sociological language/terms.

Answers may include description of the following:

Similarities:

- both perspectives are conflict theories based on social class
- both perspectives claim exploitation of proletariat by the bourgeoisie
- both claim capitalism is not the best way to organise society.

Differences:

- differing ideas of revolution
- development of concept of hegemony by the Neo-Marxists
- Marxists emphasise economy/base; Neo-Marxists claim too much emphasis on economy.

Question A4

Explain **one** strength and **one** weakness of structural theories. (6)

Candidates can be awarded up to **6 marks** for this question.

Award up to **3 marks** for each strength/weakness explained.

Question requires candidate to explain **one** strength and **one** weakness. Analysis/Evaluative comments should be awarded higher marks. For example, when candidate phrases answers in a way that draws contrasts.

Answers may include explanation of the following points:

Strength:

- structural theories claim we are shaped by the structures of society. They are therefore good at explaining the influence of forces and structures such as economic factors, ownership, class and social institutions such as the family affect and influence society
- structural theories are good at explaining trends in society/because societies
- within structural theories there are huge differences in emphasis eg functionalism v Marxism (conflict v consensus).

Weakness:

- structural theories are often criticised for not putting the social actor at the centre of their explanations and underestimating them
- tends to locate explanations at the level of the individual/group
- tends to see human interaction in a vacuum (what about history and social structure)
- may look at 'meaning' but does not always provide origins of that meaning
- leaves itself open to accusations of 'subjectivity' and 'common sense'.

If candidate simply identifies weaknesses then award **1 mark** for *each one* identified. If candidate makes a clear distinction between each perspective award up to **3 marks** for each identified.

Question A5

Explain **two** differences between conflict and consensus theories. (6)

Award up to **6 marks** for this answer; up to **3 marks** for *each* difference explained.

Explanation is asked for in the question and therefore the answer requires description and detail.

Award **1 mark** for key features that are described rather than explained and for answers that lack sociological language/terms.

Answers may include explanation of the following points:

- consensus theory tends to stress harmony, integration and stability whereas conflict theories tend to emphasise conflict and contradictions in society
- consensus theorists tend to see the structures of society as being made up of integrated social institutions working in harmony whereas conflict theories tend to see the institutions of society as dominated by one group and working predominantly in their interest eg for feminists this would be men
- functionalist theory stresses value consensus whereas conflict theory see values as imposed eg Marxists see values imposed by bourgeoisie.

Candidates who answer only using specific theories may be awarded up to **6 marks** for this answer, depending on the quality of their answer.

NB Answers must be expressed as differences that include both theories, eg consensus theories claim that... whereas conflict theories claim that...

Answers that merely express the difference as one theory does X but the other type of theory doesn't should only be awarded up to half the available marks (depending on the quality of response).

Question A6

Describe **any three** steps in the research process. (6)

Candidate can be awarded up to **6 marks** for this question. Allow up to **2 marks per** step described. Only one mark should be given for each if the response is limited – for example one word answers and/or simple statements that lack sociological language/terms.

Credit candidates who explain features as advantages.

Answers may include description of the following:

Theory stage:

- researcher chooses theory.

Hypothesis:

- a particular idea that a sociologist wants to explore, set out as a statement or a series of statements or predictions which s/he then tests by carrying out research.

Operationalisation:

- describe how to put research into practice. Includes 4 sub-stages: defining concepts, choosing a sample; choosing a method; deciding on specific measurements.

Fieldwork:

- conducting research
- researcher carries out research using appropriate methods eg participant observation
- researcher uses a relevant sample.

Processing of Results:

- once research is completed researchers analyse findings
- collation and analysis of results
- sociologists analyse data to confirm or refute the original hypothesis.

Presentation of Results:

- results are presented eg in journals, articles, books and so on.

Question A7

Describe **two** advantages of using unstructured interviews. (4)

Candidates can be awarded up to **4 marks** for this question. **2 marks** advantage described, but only up to a maximum of **1 mark** for each if the responses are limited.

Credit candidates who explain features as advantages, up to full marks depending on the quality of the answer.

Answers may include description of the following points:

- allows researcher to explore issues in an in-depth way
- researcher is not restricted to a set of pre-set questions
- researcher can clarify points and explore issues
- good for ascertaining meanings, feelings, motives etc.

Question A8

Explain **one** advantage and **one** disadvantage of using any research method that generates qualitative data. (6)

Up to **6 marks** can be awarded. Up to **3 marks** may be awarded for *one* advantage and **3 marks** for *one* disadvantage explained. If candidate gives one-word answers then no more than **1 mark** should be awarded for each advantage or disadvantage.

Markers should note some advantages/disadvantages may be expressed as features and vice-versa – this is acceptable as long as the point is stated clearly by the candidate.

Answers may include explanation of the following points:

Participant Observation

Advantages:

- first hand knowledge and information
- in depth picture of social behaviour
- good for explaining issues relating to feelings, meanings, interactions and processes.

Disadvantages:

- if covert-ethical issues arise
- high involvement of researchers time and therefore high cost
- can be biased
- Hawthorn effect
- as the data is descriptive it can be difficult to quantify
- difficult to record data.

Observation

Advantages:

- first hand knowledge and information
- in depth picture of social behaviour
- good for explaining issues relating to feelings, meanings, interactions and processes.

Disadvantages:

- high involvement of researchers time and therefore high cost
- can be biased
- as the data is descriptive it can be difficult to quantify
- difficult to record data.

Unstructured interviews

Advantages:

- allows researcher to explore issues in an in-depth way
- researcher is not restricted to a set of pre-set questions
- researcher can clarify points and explore particular points
- good for ascertaining meanings, feelings and motives.

Disadvantages:

- can lose track of the interview's purpose
- easy for respondent to digress
- data tends to be descriptive and therefore can be difficult to quantify
- can be time consuming for researcher and respondent
- can be difficult to compare data.

Personal Documents

Advantages:

- can give insight into a particular situation or time
- may be the only source available
- can be used to support other evidence.

Disadvantages:

- may be biased
- difficult to verify
- difficult to authenticate.

NB Candidates may also answer in general and/or use any of the above examples to illustrate their point.

SECTION B

Question B1 – Education

Explain the extent to which *gender* or *social class* or *ethnicity* affects educational achievement in modern UK society. Use two contrasting theories and relevant studies in your answer. (30)

This question is worth **30 marks** and requires evaluation. The marking guideline is as follows:

Introduction:	4KU	
Evaluation of 2 contrasting theories:	6KU	6AE
Evaluation of 2 relevant studies:	6KU	4AE
Conclusion/further evaluation:		4AE

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *the theories* refer to the plural and therefore, for full marks, candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of theories and studies includes *evaluation* and therefore, to gain full marks in these sections, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. Studies **must** refer to the theories discussed. Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

The question must refer specifically to the extent of differential achievement as relates to class, ethnicity or gender.

NB Achievement is used in a very broad sense, and for the purpose of this essay encompasses attainment, inclusion, personal development, jobs, credentialism and concepts of success.

Introduction:

Up to **4 marks** can be given to this part of the discussion.

This section can include general points about the topic or may relate more specifically to the question asked.

Candidates are asked to evaluate differential achievement in education with regards to class/gender/ethnicity and an introduction may include definitions and reference to this in their introduction. Candidates may also make more general points about changes in education. Well thought out explanations should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range.

This could include introductory remarks, key features and definitions of education, such as:

- contributes to the socialisation process including formal and informal, secondary and anticipatory
- provides society with a skilled workforce
- range of provision available
- academic and vocational aspects.

However, this could also include an introduction to differential achievement

- concept of meritocracy
- exam results
- entry to Further and Higher Education
- the nature of intelligence
- achievement and attainment.

These points may appear throughout the essay, integrated with evaluation of theories and studies.

NB: Other important points should be credited as appropriate.

Theories:

Up to **12 marks** are available for this section. To gain full marks, the discussion of each theory must include:

- candidates are required to use the theories to evaluate the extent to which differential class/gender/ethnicity affects educational attainment in modern UK society
- identification of key features of the theories should be awarded up to **6 marks**. These descriptions should use the appropriate sociological language associated with the theory and refer to the theory specifically – eg Marxism and the influence of class on educational achievement
- evaluation of theories identified should be awarded up to **6 marks**. Points must be evaluative and not descriptive, for example focusing on strengths and weaknesses. To gain all **6 marks** candidates must link evaluative points to the question (ie achievement in education) and the extent to which this is still a significant aspect of education today, for instance to what extent would Marxists agree/disagree that there are no barriers to education/attainment. Additional points may be awarded additional marks from the conclusion/further evaluation.

Candidates, who highlight all of the aspects above and do so in a cogent manner, using the points to discuss differential achievement in education, should be awarded high marks.

Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Theories could include:

- functionalism
- Marxism
- Weberianism
- neo-Marxism
- interactionism
- feminism
- any other pertinent sociological theory.

Candidates are asked to evaluate **two** contrasting theories. Where candidates use two similar theories, marks should only be awarded up to a total of *half* the marks available for this section. Evaluation must also relate to the question they have been asked, ie to what extent is there still evidence of differential achievement linked to social class.

Where three theories are used – no additional marks may be allocated from the 12 marks for theories.

Studies:

Up to **10 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies linked to the theories evaluated *to support their discussion* and for full marks candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following for each study:

- findings for up to **3 marks**
- if they support/refute the theory/argument (evaluation) for up to **2 marks**.

Maximum marks should be given if all points above are discussed, depending on the cogency of arguments and relation of studies to theory.

Studies must be relevant to the theories that are being discussed or to a point the candidate wishes to support. Candidates may be credited if they use two studies to discuss only one perspective, but draw on these studies to illustrate different points.

However, candidates who do not relate the studies to a theory overtly should not be awarded any evaluative marks. Marks may be awarded for accurate findings.

Further Evaluation:

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **4 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate these aspects. These aspects could be throughout the answer or in the conclusion. Marks should not be awarded for repetition of points previously made.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to and enhance the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength
- more than one strength and/or more than one weakness of the theories discussed
- evaluation is over and above that required in the studies section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- comparison is made between perspectives. For example, which ones are strong on particular aspects – Marxists are useful in explaining differential achievement between classes but feminist perspectives are useful in explaining differentials in attainment between genders.

SECTION C

Question C1 – The Family

Analyse the impact of changes in family patterns. Use two contrasting theories and relevant studies to support your answer. (30)

This question is worth **30 marks** and requires evaluation. The marking guideline is as follows:

Introduction:	4KU	
Evaluation of 2 contrasting theories:	6KU	6AE
Evaluation of 2 relevant studies:	6KU	4AE
Conclusion/Further evaluation:		4AE

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *the theories* refer to the plural and therefore, for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of theories and studies includes *evaluation* and therefore, to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. Studies **must** refer to the theories discussed. Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

This question is specifically about the changing family patterns and candidates may refer to this in their introductory remarks and must address this issue in their discussion of theories.

Introduction:

Up to **4 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates are asked to discuss the changes that have taken place with regard to changing patterns of relationships and how this has impacted on traditional family structures. The introduction may include definitions and references to this or more general points about changes in roles within the family and family structures.

Well thought out explanations should be awarded marks at the top end of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range.

Points may include:

- family has many different forms – nuclear/reconstituted/single parents
- families are not merely those who are married but those who co-habit
- family size has changed over the years
- divorce – changes in the law/attitudes
- family as a unit of consumption
- changes in sociological study from families to relationships.

Changing patterns of relationships may include the following:

- reducing family size as a result of changing job market
- changes in labour market and effects on women within family life
- changing patterns of work and effects on family life and roles within the family
- change in family structure – takes many forms, eg nuclear, extended, reconstituted, lone parent and the effects on conjugal roles.

Answers should focus on changes to structures of the family.

These points may appear throughout the essay, integrated with evaluation of theories and studies.

NB: Other important points should be credited as appropriate.

Theories:

Up to **12 marks** are available for this section. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- candidates are required to use the theories to discuss the extent to which family patterns have changed and the effect this has had. Candidates must link features and evaluation of theories to the question – ie link it to the extent to which changes have effected the family
- identification of key features of the theories should be awarded up to **6 marks**. These descriptions should use the appropriate sociological language associated with the theory and refer to the theory specifically – eg functionalism and role allocation/significance of the family in the process of socialisation
- evaluation of theories identified should be awarded up to **6 marks**. Points must be evaluative and not descriptive – for example focusing on strengths and weaknesses. To gain all **6 marks** candidates must link evaluative points to changes in family structures and the extent to which they have contributed to the changes in gender roles, for instance to what extent Feminists would agree/disagree that there have been significant changes in the role of women within the family.

Additional points may be awarded additional marks from the conclusion/further evaluation.

Candidates who highlight all of the aspects above and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks. Theories could include:

- functionalism
- Marxism
- new right
- feminism
- Weberianism
- any other pertinent sociological theory.

Candidates are asked to evaluate **two** contrasting theories. Where candidates use two similar theories, marks should only be awarded up to a total of *half* the marks available for this section. Evaluation must also relate to the question they have been asked, ie to what extent the changing family patterns have affected the family.

Studies:

Up to **10 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies *to support their discussion* and, for full marks, candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following for each study:

- findings for up to **3 marks**
- if they support/refute the theory/argument (evaluation) for up to **2 marks**.

Maximum marks should be given if all points above are discussed, depending on the cogency of arguments and relation of studies to theory.

Studies must be relevant to the theories that are being discussed and/or to a point the candidate wishes to support. Candidates may be credited if they use two studies to discuss only one perspective but draw on these studies to illustrate different points.

However, candidates who do not relate the studies to a theory overtly should not be awarded any evaluative marks. Marks may be awarded for accurate findings.

Further Evaluation:

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **4 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate these aspects. These aspects could be throughout the answer or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidate gives details that are pertinent to, and enhance, the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength
- more than one strength and/or more than one weakness of the theories discussed
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- comparison is made between perspectives, eg which ones are strong on particular aspects – liberal feminists are good at explaining changes to conjugal roles that have resulted in greater equity.

Question C2 – Welfare & Poverty

Evaluate the link between poverty and gender. Use **two** contrasting theories and relevant studies in your answer. (30)

This question is worth **30 marks** and requires evaluation. The marking guideline is as follows:

Introduction:	4KU	
Evaluation of 2 contrasting theories:	6KU	6AE
Evaluation of 2 relevant studies:	6KU	4AE
Conclusion/Further evaluation:		4AE

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *the theories* refers to the plural and therefore, for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of theories and studies includes *evaluation* and therefore, to gain full marks in this section, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. Studies **must** refer to the theories discussed. Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

The question is specifically about the relationship between poverty and gender and candidates may refer to this in introductory remarks and must address this issue in their discussion of the theories and studies.

Introduction:

Up to **4 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates are asked to discuss the extent to which poverty and gender are linked and answers may include definitions and reference to this in their introduction. Candidates may also make more general points about poverty, stratification, benefits and so on. Well thought out explanations should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range.

Introduction may include general points relating to the study of poverty or introduce the discussion on the links between poverty and gender. These may include:

- differences between absolute and relative poverty
- poverty is socially distributed
- some groups affected more than others, eg the sick and those with disabilities
- the relationship between poverty and the stratification system.

Points relating more specifically to poverty and gender could include:

- some groups affected more than others, eg the sick, those with disabilities and the unemployed
- children, women and the elderly particularly affected by poverty
- effects include malnourishment, under nourishment, morbidity and low self-esteem
- the underclass and marginalisation
- changes in the labour market, such as the increase in part-time work and temporary contract, paid and unpaid work
- the relationship between poverty and social policy.

Candidates should focus their answer on the relationship between gender and poverty.

These points may appear throughout the essay, integrated with evaluation of theories and studies.

NB: Other important points should be credited as appropriate.

Theories:

Up to **12 marks** are available for this section. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- candidates are required to use the theories to discuss the extent to which there is a link between poverty and gender
- identification of key features of the theories should be awarded up to **6 marks**. These descriptions should use the appropriate sociological language associated with the theory and refer to the theory specifically – for instance Marxist and neo-Marxist explanations of poverty point to the relatively few opportunities for social mobility in society regardless of gender
- evaluation of theories identified should be awarded up to **6 marks**. Points must be evaluative and not descriptive – for example focusing on strengths and weaknesses. To gain all **6 marks** candidates must link evaluative points about theories to a discussion as to the extent to which there is a relationship between gender and poverty. Additional points may be awarded additional marks from the conclusion/further evaluation.

Candidates who highlight all of the aspects above and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks.

Candidates are asked to evaluate **two** contrasting theories. Where candidates use two similar theories, marks should only be awarded up to a total of *half* the marks available for this section. Evaluation must also relate to the question they have been asked, ie poverty and gender.

Theories might include:

- functionalism
- Marxism
- new right
- feminism
- individualism
- culture of poverty
- any other pertinent sociological theory.

Studies:

Up to **10 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies *to support their discussion* and, for full marks, candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks, for each study candidates must include the following:

- findings for up to **3 marks**
- if they support/refute the theory/argument (evaluation) for up to **2 marks**.

Maximum marks should be given if all points above are discussed, depending on the cogency of arguments and relation of studies to theory.

Studies must be relevant to the theories that are being discussed or to a point the candidate wishes to support. Candidates may be credited if they use two studies to discuss only one perspective but draw on these studies to illustrate different points. However, candidates who do not relate the studies to a theory overtly should not be awarded any evaluative marks. Marks may be awarded for accurate findings.

Further Evaluation:

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **6 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate these aspects. These comments could be throughout the answer or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidates give details that are pertinent to, and enhance, the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or more than one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidates discuss the way in which different theories would advocate different solutions to poverty, eg individuals helping themselves, change to distribution of wealth
- candidates point out that definitions and measurements of poverty carry political implications. For example, in the UK measurement of relative poverty has greater emphasis than that of absolute poverty.

Question C3 – Crime and Deviance

Evaluate the significance of *gender* in the sociology of crime and deviance. Use two contrasting theories and relevant studies in your answer. (30)

This question is worth **30 marks** and requires evaluation. The marking guideline is as follows:

Introduction:	4KU	
Evaluation of 2 contrasting theories:	6KU	6AE
Evaluation of 2 relevant studies:	6KU	4AE
Conclusion/further evaluation:		4AE

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *the theories* refers to the plural and therefore, for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of theories and studies includes *evaluation* and therefore, to gain full marks in these sections, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. Studies **must** refer to the theories discussed. Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Introduction:

Up to **4 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates are asked to discuss the significance of gender and an introduction may include definitions and reference to this in their introduction. Candidates may also make more general points about crime and deviance. Well thought out explanations should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range.

General points may include:

- definition of crime and deviance
- crime and deviance as a social construct
- relationship between class and deviance.

Points relating more specifically to the relationship between gender and deviance may include:

- differing crime rates for men and women
- types of crime committed by each gender
- reporting of crime
- gender make-up of prison population.

Candidates should focus their answer on the extent to which gender is significant in the sociological study of crime and deviance.

These points may appear throughout the essay, integrated with evaluation of theories and studies.

NB: Other important points should be credited as appropriate.

Theories:

Up to **12 marks** are available for this section. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- candidates are required to use the theories to discuss the extent to which gender is significant in the study of crime and deviance
- identification of key features of the theories should be awarded up to **6 marks**. These descriptions should use the appropriate sociological language associated with the theory and refer to the theory specifically – for instance Marxists concentrate on the influence of the superstructure in explaining the effects of class on crime and deviance rather than the influence of gender
- evaluation of theories identified should be awarded up to **6 marks**. Points must be evaluative and not descriptive – for example focusing on strengths and weaknesses. To gain all **6 marks** candidates must link evaluative points about theories to a discussion as to the extent to which crime and gender are linked. Additional points may be awarded additional marks from the conclusion/further evaluation
- candidates who highlight all of the aspects above and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks.

Two relevant, contrasting sociological theories from:

- functionalism
- Marxism
- new left realism
- feminism
- interactionism
- subcultural
- any other pertinent sociological theory.

Candidates are asked to evaluate **two** contrasting theories. Where candidates use two similar theories, marks should only be awarded up to a total of *half* the marks available for this section. Evaluation must also relate to the question they have been asked, ie the significance of gender.

Studies:

Up to **10 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies *to support their discussion* and, for full marks, candidates need to discuss *more than one* study. To gain full marks candidates must include the following for each study:

- findings for up to **3 marks**
- if they support/refute the theory/argument (evaluation) for up to **2 marks**.

Maximum marks should be given if all points above are discussed, depending on the cogency of arguments and relation of studies to theory.

Studies must be relevant to the theories that are being discussed or to a point the candidate wishes to support. Candidates may be credited if they use two studies to discuss only one perspective but draw on these studies to illustrate different points. However, candidates who do not relate the studies to a theory overtly should not be awarded any evaluative marks. Marks may be awarded for accurate findings.

Further Evaluation:

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **4 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate these aspects. These comments could be throughout the answer or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidates give details that are pertinent to, and enhance, the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or more than one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidates draw strong contrasts between theories, eg looking at the deviant, at agents of control, structure of society, etc
- candidates discuss the implications of each in terms of solutions to crime and deviance, eg interactionism would look at agents of control, Marxism in ending capitalism.

Question C4 – Mass Media

Analyse the extent to which bias, influence and attitude formation are important issues in the sociology of the mass media. Use two contrasting theories and relevant studies in your answer. (30)

This question is worth **30 marks** and requires evaluation. The marking guideline is as follows:

Introduction:	4KU	
Evaluation of 2 contrasting theories:	6KU	6AE
Evaluation of 2 relevant studies:	6KU	4AE
Conclusion/further evaluation:		4AE

However, to be awarded marks under these categories, candidates must have met the requirements for the allocated marks, eg *the theories* refers to the plural and, therefore, for full marks candidates must discuss more than one theory. Similarly, the discussion of theories and studies includes *evaluation* and therefore to gain full marks in these sections, candidates must make evaluative comments on the studies used. Studies **must** refer to the theories discussed. Specific guidelines on each section are given below.

Introduction:

Up to **4 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates are asked to discuss the media and bias, influence and attitude formation and an introduction may include definitions and reference to this in their introduction. Candidates may also make more general points about the media such as socialisation and bias. Well thought out explanations should be awarded marks at the top of the range. Very short and simple descriptions should be awarded marks at the lower end of the range.

General points may include:

- the concept of bias can be applied in various ways eg gender, political bias
- forms of mass media eg TV, newspapers, magazines, books and so on
- purpose of the media – to inform/make money?
- do the media reflect or set social values
- ownership and control and relationship to socialisation.

Points relating specifically to socialisation and the media could include:

- portrayal of women
- portrayal of minority groups
- stereotyping
- role of media as an agent of social progression
- link to ideology
- language.

These points may appear throughout the essay, integrated with evaluation of theories and studies.

NB: Other important points should be credited as appropriate.

Theories:

Up to **12 marks** should be given for this part of the discussion. To gain full marks the discussion of each theory must include:

- candidates are required to use the theories to analyse the media in relation to bias, influence and attitude formation
- identification of key features of the theories should be awarded up to **6 marks**. These descriptions should use the appropriate sociological language associated with the theory and refer to the theory specifically – for instance neo-Marxists and hegemony
- evaluation of theories identified should be awarded up to **6 marks**. Points must be evaluative and not descriptive – for example focusing on strengths and weaknesses. To gain all **6 marks** candidates must link evaluative points about theories to a discussion as to the extent to which there is a link between bias, influence and attitude formation and the media. Additional points may be awarded additional marks from the conclusion/further evaluation.

Candidates who highlight all of the aspects above and do so in a cogent manner should be awarded high marks. Candidates who draw distinctions or comparisons between theories should also be awarded high marks.

Theories could include:

- functionalism
- Marxism
- pluralism
- feminism
- interactionism
- hypodermic syringe model
- any other pertinent sociological theory.

Candidates are asked to evaluate **two** contrasting theories. Where candidates use two similar theories marks should only be awarded up to a total of half the marks available for this section. Evaluation must also relate to the question they have been asked eg in this case bias, influence and attitude formation.

Studies:

Up to **10 marks** could be given to this part of the answer. Candidates must use studies *to support their discussion* and, for full marks, candidates need to discuss more than one study. To gain full marks, for each study candidates must include the following:

- findings for up to **3 marks**
- if they support/refute the theory/argument (evaluation) for up to **2 marks**

Maximum marks should be given if all points above are discussed, depending on the cogency of arguments and relation of studies to theory. Studies must be relevant to the theories that are being discussed or to a point the candidate wishes to support. Candidates may be credited if they use two studies to discuss only one perspective, but draw on these studies to illustrate different points. However, candidates who do not relate the studies to a theory overtly should not be awarded any evaluative marks. Marks may be awarded for accurate findings.

Further Evaluation:

Evaluative comments, coherence and reasoned conclusions should be awarded high marks. Up to **4 marks** could be given to candidates who demonstrate these aspects. These comments could be throughout the answer or in the conclusion.

These marks should be awarded where:

- candidates give details that are pertinent to, and enhance, the discussion
- evaluation is over and above that required in the theory section, eg describes more than one strength and/or more than one weakness
- evaluation is over and above that required in the study section, eg explains limits of the research, demonstrates links with other research, or draws contrasts with other studies used in the answer
- candidates use contrasting theories to review the way they see the consumer, eg recipient as active, recipient as passive
- candidates comment on the implications of theories discussed, eg media needs to be controlled, or no control as people are rational and will make their own choices.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]