

# NQ Sociology Verification Summary 2025–26

## Verification information

<b>Subject</b>	Sociology
<b>Verification activity</b>	Event
<b>Round</b>	1
<b>Date published</b>	April 2026

## National Units verified

<b>Unit code</b>	<b>Unit level</b>	<b>Unit title</b>
J2DE 75	SCQF level 5	Sociology: Culture and Identity
J2DB 75	SCQF level 5	Sociology: Human Society
J2DG 75	SCQF level 5	Sociology: Social Issues
J2DF 76	SCQF level 6	Sociology: Culture and Identity
J2DD 76	SCQF level 6	Sociology: Human Society
J2DH 76	SCQF level 6	Sociology: Social Issues

# Comments on assessment

## Assessment approaches

Many centres used our unit assessment support packs to assess candidates, often dividing the assessment standards into sections and assessing continuously throughout the academic year rather than setting one end-of-unit assessment.

One centre offered candidates the opportunity to choose from a diverse range of social issues for J2DG 75 Sociology: Social Issues, such as the gender pay gap, poverty, homelessness, and male suicide. However, centres should support candidates in choosing their topic to ensure that the social issue they choose is appropriate for sociological examination. We observed a few occasions where candidates' chosen social issue was overly complex, which restricted their ability to provide responses that met the minimum standard.

## Action points

Centres should:

- continue to flag assessment standards next to questions and use the candidate assessment record or a centre-devised alternative to record achievement
- submit for prior verification any centre-devised assessments or any of our unit assessment support packs that they have altered considerably
- keep up-to-date with published changes to assessment, referring to the Sociology subject pages for any changes

## Assessment judgements

Many centres demonstrated evidence of good practice, with assessors noting where candidates achieved the assessment standards throughout each candidate response. This resulted in evidence that was clear to follow for candidates, internal verifiers and external verifiers. Several centres provided detailed feedback, which offered candidates commentary on their performance and identified their areas of strength, where they had met minimum competence, or required development. One centre had not adopted this as standard practice, which made it challenging to identify where they had made assessment decisions. Where centres used ticks or

initials without giving an explanation of their assessment judgements, it was difficult to see where assessors felt candidates had met minimum competence or excelled in a response.

Most centres demonstrated very good internal verification procedures, which included detailed feedback from the internal verifier. Internal verification meetings provided evidence of professional dialogue taking place between assessors and internal verifiers. However, this was not the standard across all centres.

Some centres did not make it clear what the final decision or action was when disagreements between the assessor and internal verifier took place. On occasions where the internal verifier did not support the assessor's judgement, some centres did not provide sufficient explanation regarding any actions.

## **Action points**

We recommend that:

- assessors provide some commentary on assessment judgements to further assist candidate performance, and benefit internal verifiers and external verification
- internal verifiers provide some detail in their feedback to assessors on their agreement or otherwise on judgements

## **General comments**

Centres should take care when entering details onto the verification sample form that 'pass or fail' indications match, and that unit codes are correct. On this form, 'interim evidence' relates only to where one outcome from a unit is submitted. If candidates have completed the unit but it still requires remediation, then this is a 'fail' at this time. In addition, centres should ensure that they clearly identify the staff involved in the various roles, such as assessor and internal verifier. Candidate identification methods should be consistent throughout the forms submitted.