

2025 ASSESSMENT REPORT

BHS315116 SOCIOLOGY

General Comments

The 2025 Sociology folio demonstrated students' interest in the discipline of Sociology and the wide scope of issues of inequality that could be explored. High-achieving students were able to provide clear correlations between the causes and outcomes of inequality supported by Australian, sociological peer reviewed literature. Teachers are encouraged to direct students to focus on developing skills in comparing data sets within graphed presentations and following formal investigation structures.

Folio Component

General Comments

Across all markers, several common themes emerged.

1. Clarity of Sociological Focus:

- a. Many investigations drifted into psychology or social psychology, particularly when exploring topics like social media. Students are reminded that the investigation project requires a sociological focus on inequality related to one of the five topics provided in the guidelines.
- b. Some students attempted topics related to deviance (youth deviance, Aboriginal deviance). These were often ethically fraught and resulted in superficial or inappropriate theoretical focus. This investigation is designed to provide you with an opportunity to demonstrate your understanding of theory around aspects of inequality, not theories of deviance.

2. Topic Selection and Scope:

- a. Stronger folios chose narrow, clearly defined questions rather than broad themes.
- b. SES (Socioeconomic Status) continued to appear despite being excluded as a category.
- c. Some inquiries lacked a clear statement of research aim or question, or presented topics so broad (e.g., "gender inequality in school") that focused writing was difficult.

3. Ethical Considerations:

- a. Several folios contained ethically unsuitable research tools (e.g., surveying minors about body image or mental health). Students are reminded that they should not be asking anyone about their physical or mental wellbeing as it is in breach of their ethical responsibilities. Students interested in researching themes around physical or mental health (e.g., provision of health services to people living in regional areas) should consider methodologies such as interviewing health providers.
- b. Some students de-identified participants incorrectly or included identifying information.

4. Use of Secondary Sources:

- a. Stronger folios used recent, Australian, and explicitly sociological literature. Older research is fine to include if it is being used in a historical context.
- b. Weaker folios relied on outdated sources and/or international sources without justification, non-sociological definitions (e.g., Merriam-Webster, Britannica), or generic online resources (Boundless, Lumen, Wikipedia, ThoughtCo).

5. Presentation including Cover Page:

- a. Most folios were well-structured and used appropriate headings, although some exceeded word limits and/or used first-person voice.
- b. The guidelines state that students must include their social category, focus topic, and research question on their cover page, as well as a clear statement of research aim and total word count.

Introduction

A strong introduction effectively “sets up” the investigation by outlining the essential elements of the sociological problem (e.g., the shortage of childcare options in regional areas), presenting reliable and robust evidence to demonstrate the existence of the issue, and identifying the sociological implications or harms that may arise.

1. Strengths:

- a. Strong introductions clearly articulated the specific inequality being investigated. These submissions were able to get to their point quickly, clearly and concisely. They provided empirical evidence from current Australian data to outline the problem (e.g., WGEA, HILDA, AIFS, ABS), and relevant sociological concepts to frame the issue.
- b. If any sociological theory was discussed within the Introduction, it was brief and served the purpose of indicating to the reader which lenses would later appear in the analysis/discussion.

2. Common Issues:

- a. Introductions were often overly broad, discussing inequality in general terms without specifying the research question.
- b. Many Introductions included unnecessary definitions of basic concepts, which added little value.
- c. Some Introductions failed to identify the social category, focus topic, or statement of inquiry, and several relied on “common knowledge” rather than empirical evidence.
- d. In some cases, Introductions were excessively long, reducing the word count available for the analysis and discussion sections. At times, the lack of clarity meant the reader could not determine the actual focus of the investigation.

Methodology / Research Design

A methodology describes and justifies the research approach. It is important that an appropriate methodology is used to respond to the research question. The research tool (survey, observation checklist, interview questions), ethics acknowledgement forms (if not using the one supplied by TASC) and raw data must be included in the appendices and specifically cited in the Methodology section as Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C, etc.

1. Strengths:

- a. Some folios demonstrated strong methodological awareness, including clear justification of research tools, explicit explanation of sampling methods, direct alignment between the literature review and data collection, and effective use of qualitative interviews where sample sizes were small.
- b. Submissions that adopted a simple but well-designed methodology often produced robust, meaningful data, providing a strong foundation for a high-quality analysis and discussion section.
- c. Ethics statements should directly speak to each of the elements raised in the guidelines, and students should specifically state how they overcame any relevant ethical issues.

2. Common Issues:

- a. Some submissions had a disconnect between introduction and methodology: students raised interesting issues but did not design tools that could measure them.
- b. Frequently, there was an inadequate description of sample characteristics (age, gender, sample size, where/how obtained).
- c. Students are encouraged to justify their methodological choices (e.g., why interviews vs surveys; why closed vs open questions).
- d. Complex methodologies were common and often misguided, where a single, well-executed method would have been stronger. For example, students can conduct interviews OR surveys; they do not need to do both.
- e. Frequently, a student has collected so much data that they are challenged by presenting these data in a meaningful way within the word limit of the task.
- f. Missing research tools or unformatted copies of surveys without ethical disclaimers were common. Ethical considerations were frequently brief and did not address each of the elements raised in the guidelines.
- g. In general terms, investigations which included some form of media content analysis were frequently methodologically flawed. Specifically, collecting data from an individual's social media or news feeds produces unreliable data. Better-performing projects, which included some form of content analysis, used digitised newspapers (available for free from Libraries Tasmania) or clearly defined film sets (e.g., Academy Award winning films from the past decade).

Results

Students are not required to display ALL data they have collected, but instead select data which appropriately addresses the research question and purposefully present that using charts or tables. It is expected that every chart or table shown in the Results section is explicitly referred to in the subsequent Discussion/Analysis section. The results displayed in this section should align with the issues and questions raised in the introduction section.

1. Strengths (Quantitative data):

- a. Strong folios presented quantitative results in clear, APA standard charts or tables that were appropriately labelled and included both percentages and n-values.
- b. The selected chart type (e.g., bar chart, pie chart) was appropriate for the research question and data collected, and the presentation made it easy for the reader to identify information directly relevant to the investigation.

2. Strengths (Qualitative data):

- a. Stronger folios thematically coded their interview data and presented these themes in well-structured tables. Full interview transcripts, which have been colour-coded by theme, should appear in the appendices.
- b. Some submissions summarised interview responses on a question-by-question basis rather than by theme; however, these typically demonstrated less analytical depth and sophistication.

3. Common Issues:

- a. A large number of submissions included an excessive number of charts, many of which presented irrelevant data that did not contribute meaningfully to the investigation. Some submissions included over 10 charts or tables, but typically, 2-4 carefully constructed charts or tables would be perfectly adequate for the purposes of responding to a research question.
- b. Charts were often inserted as unedited screenshots from Microsoft Forms or Google Forms and were not presented to an acceptable standard (e.g., missing titles, legends, labels, or explanatory captions as required by APA conventions).
- c. Students should not expect markers to interpret raw visuals; all tables and charts must be clearly explained.
- d. In qualitative methodologies, a common issue was the inclusion of lengthy, unprocessed interview transcripts in the Results section rather than directing the reader to the most relevant statements through thematic organisation or selective quotation.

Analysis and Discussion

The quality and specificity of data are critical to a strong Analysis and Discussion section. This section provides an opportunity for students to interpret and make meaning of the findings presented earlier. It is also where students should apply an appropriate theoretical framework to analyse their results, demonstrating how their research contributes to an understanding of the sociological issue under investigation.

1. Strengths:

- a. Sophisticated submissions aligned their findings with the literature and evidence introduced earlier (in the Introduction section) and applied appropriate theoretical frameworks to deepen their analysis.
- b. These students were able to identify which theories best explained their data and articulate the broader implications of their results. Such submissions demonstrated a detailed understanding of relevant sociological theorists and concepts (e.g., Walby, Bourdieu, Hochschild).

2. Common Issues:

- a. Weaker Analysis and Discussion sections simply restated results rather than analysing them.
- b. A recurring concern was the lack of sociological theory application, or theory included superficially but not integrated into the discussion.
- c. In some cases, arguments claimed inequality existed even when the data did not support it.

- d. Students should avoid using definitive language such as “interview data proves that inequality occurs in the workplace”. Instead, more measured phrasing should be adopted. For example: “Analysis of interview data supports the notion that inequality exists within workplaces.” This approach more accurately reflects the interpretive nature of sociological research.

3. Limitations:

- a. All submissions are expected to include a critique of the investigation. This typically occurs in the paragraph before the conclusion.
- b. This critique should form part of the word limit and should therefore not be in the Methodology section.
- c. Typical critiques noted small sample sizes, convenience sampling from non-random sources, and a reliance on anecdotal data for interviews.

Referencing & APA Compliance

4. Strengths:

- a. Strong submissions used APA 7 accurately in both in-text citations and the reference list. These folios drew on sociological texts, peer-reviewed journals, and contemporary Australian data sources.
- b. In these stronger reports, all in-text citations aligned precisely with the entries in the reference list, demonstrating careful editing and a thorough understanding of APA conventions.

5. Common Issues:

- a. Inconsistent or incorrect APA formatting, including missing in-text citations for secondary research and in-text citations without matching entries in the reference list.
- b. Non-sociological definitions (dictionary.com, WHO, Wikipedia) were often used.
- c. Other referencing issues included the incorrect referencing of edited books (e.g., Germov & Poole), the misclassification of online journal articles as websites, students failing to cite their own primary research (e.g., “Figure 1” not referenced in the Discussion and Analysis section) and a lack of acknowledgement of AI-assisted text or chart creation, where used.

2025 Investigation Project Marking Guidelines

Note: The inclusion of the 2025 marking guidelines is intended as a guide only and is indicative only of the 2025 academic year.

Rating C- C C+	Rating B- B B+	Rating A- A A+
<p>CRITERION 5 Use ethical sociological research methods. Standard elements – 1, 2, 5 & 8</p> <p>The key consideration for this criterion is the ethical process undertaken by the candidate to answer the question that has been posed in alignment with the research design and method. Evidence for this criterion can be in the introduction, research design and method, results and stated limitations. This will include the extent to which the candidate can:</p>		
<p>A minimal expectation for a C-:</p> <p>Investigate an inequality issue for one of the social categories identified in the project guidelines (E1)</p> <p>Investigate one of the three topics as specified in the project guidelines. (E1)</p> <p>Designs and uses an appropriate research method that is included in the appendices, e.g. simple questionnaire, content analysis or interview. (E1)</p> <p>Provides a brief statement of the method. Participants or research design selection is outlined briefly. (E1)</p> <p>Addresses some ethical considerations and how they might be minimised within the research design and method. Provides evidence of addressing ethical concerns with participants. (E1)</p> <p>Locates and uses at least three different types of sources relevant to the issue. One of these sources is the primary research. (E2)</p> <p>State results – raw data is processed. May be presented in a simple format, e.g. a</p>	<p>A minimal expectation for a B-:</p> <p>Investigates an issue of inequality for one of the social categories identified in the project guidelines (E1)</p> <p>Investigates one of the three topics as specified in the project guidelines. (E1)</p> <p>Designs and administers an appropriate research method e.g. questionnaire, content analysis or interview. May use more than one method of gathering data OR a level of complexity using variables e.g. age groups or gender. (E1)</p> <p>Provides a concise statement of method including sampling, number or selection of participants and other relevant research design information. (E1)</p> <p>Directly addresses most of the ethical considerations and identifies how they were minimised during the research process. Provides evidence of informed consent from participants. (E1)</p> <p>Uses at least three different sources relevant to the issue. One of these sources is the primary research. The report</p>	<p>A minimal expectation for an A-:</p> <p>Investigates an issue of inequality for one of the social categories identified in the project guidelines (E1)</p> <p>Investigates one of the three topics as specified in the project guidelines. (E1)</p> <p>Designs and administers an effective research method e.g. questionnaire, content analysis or interview. May use more than one method of gathering data OR a level of complexity involving variables or question branching e.g. age groups or genders. (E1)</p> <p>Provides a detailed statement of method including sampling, number of participants and other information relevant to participants or the research design. (E1)</p> <p>Directly addresses key ethical considerations and actively manages ethical risks in seeking informed consent from participants. (E1)</p> <p>Comprehensively uses data from their primary research</p>

<p>graph not in percentages, dot points of findings. Data from Interview sources may be direct quotations presented without being organised into themes. (E5)</p> <p>MAY INCLUDE:</p> <p>Simple evaluation of the research design or results. (E8)</p>	<p>utilises a variety of information from multiple sources. (E2)</p> <p>States and summarises results – raw data is converted to percentages. The trends shown in the graphs are identified in a short statement. Data from interview/s are summarised/organised into themes. (E5)</p> <p>Data is presented to show a relationship to the issue and social categories. (E5)</p> <p>SHOULD INCLUDE:</p> <p>Outlines the quality of both the process employed and the collected information. (E8)</p>	<p>linked to a wide range of information from multiple sources. (E2)</p> <p>States and organises results – raw data is converted to percentages. The trends shown in the graphs are identified in a short statement. Data from interview/s are summarised/organised into useful themes. (E5)</p> <p>Data is organised to show analysis of the relationship to the issue and social categories (E5)</p> <p>EXPECTED TO INCLUDE:</p> <p>Evaluation of the quality of both the process employed and the collected information. (E8)</p>
---	--	---

C5 (E1)

- If the project does not address the ethical guidelines, i.e., if felt to be 'unethical', the Investigative Project is to be marked as it is, and the marker is required to advise the Marking Coordinators. Marking Coordinators may advise that a penalty be applied by at least one rating step to Criterion 5, e.g. C+ to C.
- Where the report does not include a copy of the primary research instrument (appendices) and a description of the design process (research design and method), the project is to be marked and the marker is required to advise the Marker Coordinators. The Marking Coordinators may advise that a penalty be applied by at least one rating step to Criterion 5, e.g. C+ to C.

CRITERION 5 standard elements 1, 2, 5 & 8			
5.1	creates a research design within provided ethical parameters and research methodologies	selects and uses research methodologies and ethical parameters and creates a research design	selects and uses ethical parameters and the most effective research methodologies and creates a sophisticated research design
5.2	locates a primary source and a limited range* of secondary sources related to an issue	locates a primary source and a range* of secondary sources relevant to an issue	locates a primary source and a wide range* of secondary sources relevant to an issue
5.5	uses given categories to organise information to indicate relationships, patterns and trends	selects and uses categories to effectively organise information to indicate relationships, patterns and trends	selects and uses appropriate and useful categories to methodically organise information for analysis of relationships, patterns and trends
5.8	identifies omissions or deficiencies in available sources.	analyses impact of omissions or deficiencies in available sources.	evaluates impact of omissions or deficiencies in available sources
* USE ETHICAL SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH METHODS			

<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C- C C+</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B- B B+</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A- A A+</p>
<p>CRITERION 6: Use evidence to support a sociological point of view. Elements 1, 2, 3 & 6.</p> <p>The key consideration for this criterion is the sociological understanding and knowledge of equality and inequality in CAS. Evidence for this criterion will include the alignment between the question posed, the secondary research conducted and the sociological analysis of the topic within the discussion. This will include the extent to which the candidate can:</p>		
<p>A minimal expectation for a C-:</p> <p>Summarise and present quantitative and/or qualitative data relevant to the issue simply, e.g. a table or a graph showing one trend. (E1)</p> <p>Select and use at least two secondary sources relevant to the issue. (E2)</p> <p>Attempt to analyse/discuss the link between the primary research results/data, secondary sources, and the issue. (E3)</p> <p>Discusses the issues raised through the primary and secondary sources. (E3)</p> <p>Form a conclusion related to the research question based on primary information collected and secondary sources. (E3)</p> <p>Use a limited range of sociological concepts and terminology throughout the report to discuss the nominated issue. (E6)</p> <p>Attempts to link empirical evidence and sociological concepts. (E6)</p>	<p>A minimal expectation for a B-:</p> <p>Summarise and present quantitative and/or qualitative data relevant to the issue. May use more than one type of format, or include data, organised to show more than one type of characteristic of the participants, e.g. gender. (E1)</p> <p>Select a range of relevant, current sociological sources from the various categories suggested (preferably Australian), each of which contributes substantially to the report. (E2)</p> <p>Uses a range of appropriate sociological literature to support the observations and analysis of the findings from the primary research. (E2)</p> <p>Analyse/discuss the connections between the results/data, secondary sources, and the issue. (E3)</p> <p>Demonstrate some analysis and discussion of the issues raised through the primary and secondary sources. (E3)</p> <p>Form a valid conclusion consistent with the research question based on primary information collected and secondary sources. (E3)</p> <p>Use a range of relevant sociological concepts and terminology throughout the report to discuss the</p>	<p>A minimal expectation for an A-:</p> <p>Summarise and present quantitative and/or qualitative data relevant to the issue that demonstrates a complexity either in format or data presentation, e.g. comparisons on characteristics of the participants, e.g. gender or age. (E1)</p> <p>Selects a wide range of relevant, current sociological sources from the various categories suggested (preferably Australian), each of which contributes substantially to the report. (E2)</p> <p>Organises and integrates a balanced range of appropriate sociological literature to support the discussion and analysis of the findings from the primary research. (E2)</p> <p>Analyse/discuss the sociological connections between the results/data, secondary sources, and the issue. (E3)</p> <p>Demonstrate a depth of analysis and discussion of the issues raised through the primary and secondary sources (E3)</p> <p>Use logical processes to evaluate research findings and draw valid conclusions</p>

	<p>nominated issue. Some limited analysis should be included. (E6)</p> <p>Describe links between empirical evidence and sociological concepts and may refer to theories. (E6)</p>	<p>consistent with the research question based on primary information collected and secondary sources. (E3)</p> <p>The report uses a wide range of sociological concepts and terminology to analyse and discuss the nominated issue. (E6)</p> <p>Explains links between empirical evidence and sociological concepts and may include theories. (E6)</p>
<p>C6 (E6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Investigation Project that does not contain any sociological sources, content or terms applied to the issue of inequality, in the introduction and discussion, is to be referred to the Marker Coordinators for consideration. A D rating on C6 may be applied if the Investigation Project does not reflect the discipline of Sociology. 		

CRITERION 6 standard elements – 1, 2, 3 & 6			
6.1	summarises quantitative and qualitative data in a limited range of formats	summarises quantitative and qualitative data in a range of formats	summarises quantitative and qualitative data in a wide range of formats
6.2	uses a limited range of relevant empirical and textual evidence to support observations and analysis	uses a range of relevant empirical and textual evidence to support observations and analysis	uses a wide range of relevant empirical and textual evidence to support observations and analysis
6.3	assesses research findings and draws conclusions consistent with the research question	analyses research findings and draws valid conclusions consistent with the research question	evaluates research findings and draws valid conclusions consistent with the research question
6.6	outlines links between empirical evidence and sociological concepts and theories.	describes links between empirical evidence and sociological concepts and theories.	explains links between empirical evidence and sociological concepts and theories.
* <i>USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A SOCIOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW</i>			

<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C- C C+</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B- B B+</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A- A A+</p>
<p>CRITERION 7: *communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions Elements – 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5</p> <p>The key consideration for this criterion is the quality of the written report. Evidence for this criterion will include how the response to the focus topic aligns with the presentation of information, written conventions, accuracy of expression, citation/referencing, and appendices content. This will include the extent to which the candidate can:</p>		
<p>A minimal expectation for a C-:</p> <p>Address an aspect of inequality that is sociological. (E1)</p> <p>Attempt to follow the project guidelines format to produce a report that includes an introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. (E1)</p> <p>Meet the word limit within 10% plus or minus, i.e. be at least 680–1320 words. (E1)</p> <p>Select at least one method to present results that show the primary data. (E1)</p> <p>Uses formal language appropriate to report writing format (may have inconsistencies e.g. use of first person). (E2)</p> <p>Attempts to make a connection between the secondary sources and the primary data gathered in the investigation (E2)</p> <p>Try to identify sources of the information, images, ideas and words that are not the learner’s own. Attempts to use APA conventions for referencing but may have inconsistencies or inaccuracies. (E3 & 4)</p> <p>Uses three different types of sources. (E5)</p>	<p>A minimal expectation for a B-:</p> <p>Address an area of inequality and investigate an issue that is sociological. (E1)</p> <p>Follow the project guideline suggestions (or similar) for the written report, including introduction, methodology, results, analysis, discussion, and conclusion.</p> <p>Meet the word limit within 10% plus or minus, i.e. be within 1320 words. (E1)</p> <p>Select appropriate method/s to present results that show the primary data gathered in a way that is readily understood. (E1)</p> <p>Communicates ideas and explanations clearly, selecting and consistently using appropriate language conventions appropriate to the report writing format. (E2)</p> <p>Show a clear connection between the background information in the secondary resources referred to and the primary data gathered in the investigation. (E2)</p> <p>Clearly and consistently uses the references so that they support the primary data in the report, i.e. relevance is clear. (E2)</p> <p>Identifies sources of the information, images, ideas, and words that are not the learner’s</p>	<p>A minimal expectation for an A-:</p> <p>Address an area of inequality and critically investigate an issue that is sociological. (E1)</p> <p>Effectively follow the project guidelines (or similar) for the written report, including introduction, methodology, results, analysis, discussion, and conclusion. (E1)</p> <p>Meet the word limit within 10% plus or minus, i.e. no greater than 1320 words. (E1)</p> <p>Select appropriate method/s to accurately and effectively present results that clearly outline the primary data gathered. (E1)</p> <p>Communicates complex ideas and explanations coherently, selecting and consistently using appropriate language conventions appropriate to the report writing format. (E2)</p> <p>There are evident connections between the background information in the secondary resources and the primary data gathered in the investigation. (E2)</p> <p>Consistently integrate</p>

<p>The reference list mostly adheres to the required format – the intent to reference is clear but may not be accurately applied. (E5)</p>	<p>own. Referencing conventions and methodologies for APA are mostly followed consistently, and minor errors may occur. (E3 & 4)</p> <p>Use three different types of resources, all cited and in the reference list. (E5)</p> <p>The reference list adheres to the required format for APA with the intent to reference correctly. (E5)</p>	<p>sources so that they support and or extend the content of the report, i.e. their relevance is clear. (E2)</p> <p>Identifies sources of information, images, ideas and words that are not the learner’s own. Referencing conventions and methodologies for APA are followed with a high degree of accuracy, e.g. distinction made between edited books and books, conventions for multiple-authored texts followed, and internet sources correctly referenced. (E3 & 4)</p> <p>Use three different types of resources, all referenced correctly. (E5)</p> <p>Referencing adheres to the required format for APA with an appropriate, well-structured reference list. (E5)</p>
--	---	---

C7 (E1) (E2)

- Markers must penalise Criterion 7 by at least one rating step for inappropriate use of appendices (should not contain more than 250 words excluding questionnaires, data and/or interview transcripts, relevant to the report, acknowledged within the report) and/or referencing. Example C+ to C.
- Markers must penalise by at least one rating step, Investigative Projects that are significantly (plus or minus 10%) under or over the prescribed word count under Criterion 7. Example B+ to B.

CRITERION 7 Standard elements – 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5			
7.1	constructs representations, as directed, that addresses the basic intent of a question or issue	selects, constructs and uses appropriate representations to produce a response that is readily understood	selects, constructs and uses appropriate representations to accurately and effectively convey meaning, adapting representations to specific audiences and purposes
7.2	communicates basic ideas and explanations clearly, correctly using appropriate language conventions	communicates ideas and explanations clearly, selecting and consistently using appropriate language conventions	communicates complex ideas and explanations coherently, selecting and consistently using appropriate language conventions for specific audiences and purposes
7.3	differentiates the information, images, ideas and words of others from the learner's own	clearly identifies the information, images, ideas and words of others used in the learner's work	clearly identifies the information, images, ideas and words of others used in the learner's work
7.4	identifies the sources of information, images, ideas and words that are not the learner's own. Referencing conventions and methodologies are generally followed correctly	clearly identifies sources of the information, images, ideas and words that are not the learner's own. Referencing conventions and methodologies are followed correctly [^]	clearly identifies sources of the information, images, ideas and words that are not the learner's own. Referencing conventions and methodologies are followed with a high degree of accuracy
7.5	creates appropriate reference lists	creates appropriate, structured reference lists	creates appropriate, well-structured reference lists
* COMMUNICATE SOCIOLOGICAL IDEAS, INFORMATION, OPINIONS, ARGUMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS			

Written Component

Section A

General Comments

High-performing students in Section A demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of sociological concepts. Their strong responses were characterised by sustained, well-structured arguments that precisely interpreted the questions and fluently applied sociological terminology. Crucially, these responses effectively synthesised course content, relevant theories, and the provided stimulus material.

Conversely, weaker responses struggled with accuracy in written expression and lacked both theoretical depth and coherent argument structure, and often retold elements of the stimulus without any connection to sociological theoretical explanations.

Question 1 – Socialisation, Social Control and Conformity

4.83% of students responded to this question

Criterion 1: Analyse theories of socialisation, identity construction and deviance

Stronger responses began by defining and explaining the importance of some system of social control to the smooth functioning of society. The centrality of the process of socialisation as a mechanism of social control was outlined. These responses highlighted the role of socialisation leading to the internalisation of norms and hence social control as well as mechanisms of external social control via sanctions (positive/negative). The key role of institutions as agents of informal and formal social control was explained.

Students needed to examine the contribution of competing sociological perspectives and theories in attempting to account for the process of socialisation and social control. The strongest responses were able to successfully evaluate the strengths and limitations of competing theories and perspectives. Stronger responses were able to use the different theoretical perspectives as a lens to critically evaluate theories – for instance, macro vs micro perspectives. Some of the different perspectives and theorists that were frequently mentioned were:

- Functionalist: Emile Durkheim; Talcott Parsons; Travis Hirschi
- Conflict: Karl Marx; Louis Althusser (1970); Pierre Bourdieu
- Feminist: Frances Heidensohn
- Symbolic Interactionist: Erving Goffman; Howard Becker
- Post-Structuralist: Michael Foucault: Self-surveillance and discipline.

Hirschi's Control Theory was widely utilised in responses, as was Becker's Labelling Theory and even Sutherland's Differential Association Theory (Cultural Transmission). It is important that students recognise that this question is not focused on discussing and evaluating theories of deviance. Responses that used these theories in their response needed to ensure that they focused on the relevance of these theories in explaining the process of socialisation and mechanisms of social control. Merely outlining and evaluating these as 'theories of deviance' was not the focus or intent of this question. In some instances, students would have achieved better results if they had answered a different question that did not require this narrow focus.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

A number of students found the stimulus challenging to integrate meaningfully into their responses. Stronger responses used the stimulus material well to demonstrate their understanding of relevant terms, concepts and theories. Some students were able to successfully draw evidence from stimulus other than Stimulus 1 to support their responses. Weaker responses struggled to adequately engage with the stimulus and made superficial mention of the stimulus or merely restated its content without critically engaging with it to show their understanding of relevant concepts and theories related to socialisation and social control.

The strongest responses were those that developed a clear, coherent argument framing their response under the perspectives and associated theories. It is important that students are versed and able to explain key concepts clearly – for instance, socialisation and social control were often poorly defined or not defined at all.

Question 2 – Socialisation and Identity Construction

9.38% of students responded to this question

Criterion 1: Analyse theories of socialisation, identity construction and deviance

Students who examined the contribution of competing sociological perspectives in attempting to account for the process of identity formation were rewarded. The strongest responses were able to successfully evaluate the strengths and limitations of competing theories and perspectives. Quite a few responses only considered symbolic interactionist theories. Stronger responses were able to critique and evaluate interactionist theories with alternative perspectives. Below are some of the different perspectives and theorists that were mentioned.

Symbolic Interactionist Theories were the most prominent and widely discussed. These included:

- George Herbert Mead – and his discussion of identity formation through role taking (“I”/“Me”) and the stages in the emergence of a sense of self (‘preparatory’/imitation – ‘play’ – ‘game’).
- Charles Horton Cooley and the theory of the Looking-Glass Self.
- Erving Goffman – (Dramaturgical Theory) the role of performance and the way identity is not fixed but flexible and changes depending on the audience and situation.

Structural Functionalist Theories – Emile Durkheim & Talcott Parsons were mentioned in relation to their argument regarding the role of primary and secondary, and tertiary socialisation as a mechanism through which people internalise the values, norms and role expectations of society, which become part of their identity.

Conflict Theories – Karl Marx (and Pierre Bourdieu) was mentioned. Explaining how identity was shaped by factors such as one’s class position, leading to the formation of a class consciousness and hence class identity through the socialisation process. Bourdieu’s concept of habitus as internalised patterns of thinking and behaving, as well as the accumulation of cultural capital, were discussed as an outcome of the socialisation process.

Feminist Theories – some mentioned that feminist sociologists argue that identity is shaped by gender power relations in society. Thus, the socialisation process in institutions such as family, media, school, workforce and peers teaches and reinforces gendered behaviours that influence self-concept, opportunities and identity.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

Stronger responses formulated a clear analysis of the role played by agents of socialisation in the construction of identity. These responses began by defining and then discussing the meaning and purpose of socialisation. They identified what is learned via the socialisation process and how the process of interaction with others enables individuals to construct identity.

Strong responses developed a clear argument regarding the stages and agents of socialisation and how this played a role in identity construction. Conversely, weaker responses tended to spend much of their time summarising the socialisation process and what is learned through socialisation without making a clear and explicit connection to the process of identity construction. Conversely, stronger responses used the stimulus material well to demonstrate their understanding of relevant terms, concepts and theories. Weaker responses made superficial mention of the stimulus or merely restated its content without critically engaging with it to show their understanding of the theories of identity development.

Question 3 – Alternative Sociological Theories of Deviance

71.58% of students responded to this question

Most students successfully answered Question 3 with an essay response that incorporated two or three relevant deviance theories. The most effectively used evidence came from Stimulus 3, 'Alternative Sociological Theories of Deviance', which students frequently paraphrased or quoted. Students could have also enhanced their analysis by successfully integrating other stimuli from Section A that related to concepts of youth identity or social control.

Criterion 1: Analyse theories of socialisation, identity construction and deviance

High-performing students were able to include a wide range of sociological terms and concepts in their essays. This included additional information from the course, such as current ABS data on crime, to incorporate into their argument. These students successfully connected theoretical explanations to broader societal factors that may shape deviant behaviour, showing insight into how such influences disproportionately affect particular groups within Australian society. Stronger responses consistently used evidence from both the stimulus and course materials to deepen their explanations, demonstrating thoughtful engagement with the task.

Strong responses provided depth on the theories selected, accurately connected the sociologists associated with these theories, and included both the strengths and limitations of the theory being discussed. Evidence from Stimulus 3: Alternative Sociological Theories of Deviance was wisely chosen, allowing connections to Cohen (1955) and subcultures, plus Durkheim's 'anomie'. Labelling Theory was a popular inclusion with stronger responses picking up on the role of the media (in Stimulus 3) and moral entrepreneurs.

Although Stimulus 3 provided limited detail, stronger responses were able to identify or reasonably extrapolate characteristics of individuals involved in deviant behaviour and connect these to the broader theories. Students who achieved this effectively also discussed how social or institutional responses to deviance could reinforce or perpetuate cycles of marginalisation. Many of the strongest responses cross-referenced Stimulus 3 with supporting evidence from other stimulus materials, such as Stimulus 4 or examples of identity formation from Stimulus 2, to corroborate their interpretation of deviance theories and strengthen the clarity of their argument.

Weaker responses only included minimal theoretical information, and students are reminded that the question specifically asks for students to 'analyse and evaluate alternative sociological theories in relation to deviance'. The minimum expectation is that two deviance theories be discussed. Students are also reminded that evidence from stimuli in Section A needs to be included within paragraphs, and that often the most applicable evidence for Question 3 is the associated stimulus on 'Alternative Sociological Theories of Deviance'. In an analysis of sociological theories with respect to crime, it is important not to be distracted by primary deviance or the relativity of deviance.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

Stronger responses were focused on answering the set question, which specifically asks, 'why some people are more likely to be involved in criminal behaviour in CAS'. Sociological theories of deviance were utilised to consider youth and crime, not just deviant behaviour. Their essays began with a focused introduction which included a thesis statement directly addressing the set question. They also linked criminal behaviour in their analysis of sociological theories within their body paragraphs and in the conclusion of the essay. Formal academic language was utilised, including third third-person view. The inclusion of evidence from the stimuli in Section A is also an important success factor in showing markers that students' knowledge is being applied to the current exam paper.

Weaker responses were not focused on answering the set question and failed to address either youth crime or criminal behaviour. Little or no connection to the stimuli in Section A was made. Students are reminded that pronouns such as 'I' or 'we' (first person view) or 'you' (second person view), are better avoided to ensure a more formal response. Students should also endeavour to be as accurate as possible with language conventions, including spelling and the use of capital letters for proper nouns. Listing features of a sociological theory is best avoided. Instead, these should be discussed/analysed with respect to evidence from the stimuli within a formal paragraph structure.

A significant number of responses struggled to form strong, explicit links between the theoretical approaches to deviance and the details of the stimulus material. Some essays relied heavily on other stimuli, which sometimes resulted in arguments drifting away from deviance and instead focusing on tangential sociological ideas such as relativity or identity construction.

Some responses did not acknowledge the limitations of the deviance theories used, missing an important analytical component of the criterion.

While many students could recall the broad ideas behind a theory, weaker responses showed difficulty using specific key sociological terms associated with each theory. For example, students who discussed Structural Strain Theory often omitted reference to the five adaptations to anomie, resulting in explanations that lacked precision. These gaps limited the sophistication of their theoretical application to the stimulus.

Question 4 – Relativity of Deviance

14.21% of students responded to this question

Criterion 1: Analyse theories of socialisation, identity construction and deviance

This question elicited a broad range of responses. Stronger students maintained close attention to the wording of the question and centred their discussion on the relativity of deviance, rather than offering general descriptions of deviant behaviour. These responses demonstrated a clear understanding that definitions of deviance are socially constructed and vary across time, place, and social groups. Many students made effective use of the stimulus, particularly by highlighting how different forms of body art can be perceived as either acceptable or unacceptable depending on social and cultural context. Labelling Theory was commonly and appropriately applied, with stronger students engaging in extended analysis of the theory. A small number of students also drew on the written component of Stimulus 4 to introduce ideas related to anomie, demonstrating theoretical insight. Purposeful integration of other stimuli, especially Stimulus 3, strengthened the overall quality of these responses.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

Weaker responses tended to outline theories of deviance in broad or generic terms without linking them explicitly to the concept of relativity. These responses often lacked depth, clarity, and focus, providing definitions or summaries rather than applying theory to the theme of relativity. Some students struggled to incorporate the stimulus materials effectively, failing to connect the stimulus to their argument. Overall, weaker responses did not demonstrate a sustained or coherent engagement with the central idea that deviance is relative.

Section B

General Feedback

High-performing students in Section B demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of the role of institutions in Contemporary Australian Society. Sophisticated responses were characterised by sustained, well-structured arguments and detailed theoretical analysis that precisely outlined the topic and fluently applied sociological theory. Crucially, these responses provided accurate coverage of two institutions and at least two alternative sociological explanations with connections to the stimulus material.

In comparison, weaker responses struggled with accuracy in written conventions, did not address the minimum requirements of the criteria assessed and often neglected to provide the minimum two (2) theoretical analyses required.

Question 5 – Stratification

50.27% of students responded to this question

Responses to the stratification question varied, with a significant number demonstrating strong analysis. These stronger answers effectively discussed stratification in relation to at least two, and often three, institutions. Both the functionalist and conflict perspectives were commonly used frameworks, and Talcott Parsons was a frequently cited theorist.

Criterion 2: Analyse theories about institutions

Overall, responses to Question 5 demonstrated a wide range of quality and depth. Most students chose to analyse the institutions of family, education, or work, while only a small number engaged with the media. The strongest responses opened with a clear and accurate sociological definition of social stratification and moved swiftly into an explanation of its purpose and effects within society. These responses incorporated at least two examples from the stimulus and integrated them seamlessly into their analysis. Students who performed well demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of how stratification is created and maintained, drawing on a broad range of theoretical perspectives, including those of Bourdieu, Marx, Weber, Parsons, Durkheim, Bowles and Gintis, Walby, Hochschild, and Putnam. They discussed both vertical and horizontal forms of stratification, made effective use of legislation where appropriate, and compared contrasting sociological theories – such as Marxism and functionalism – to explain why certain groups benefit more than others. These answers employed precise sociological terminology and followed a clear, logical structure that made the arguments coherent and persuasive.

In contrast, weaker responses tended to describe inequality in broad or generalised terms without clearly linking it to the concept of social stratification. Some students did not define key terms, while others relied too heavily on definitions rather than applying them to the stimulus. Theoretical perspectives were often used superficially or inaccurately, with references to functionalism, Marxism, or feminism that were not directly connected to the processes through which stratification is produced or sustained. Several students spent considerable time outlining the general functions of institutions without making explicit connections to the question. Many of these responses focused primarily on inequalities within families rather than examining how family-based social strata shape life chances. Additionally, weaker responses often made only vague or superficial use of the stimulus and lacked clear organisation, which made their arguments difficult to follow.

Overall, the stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of social stratification as a sociological concept and applied this understanding effectively to the stimulus. Weaker responses showed an emerging awareness of inequality but did not sufficiently connect their observations to the mechanisms, theories, and processes that underpin stratification.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

A number of weaker responses would have been strengthened by presenting their ideas in a more coherent and logically ordered manner. Although there is no prescribed sequence in which institutions must be discussed, the stronger responses demonstrated a clear thematic structure. These responses organised paragraphs around key ideas rather than around individual institutions, which allowed students to integrate multiple institutions within a single paragraph while maintaining a consistent focus on the demands of the question. By contrast, some weaker responses drifted from Question 5 into the content of Question 8, while others discussed stratification without establishing clear links to how it is created or maintained. Greater attention to planning under timed conditions would help students sustain focus and develop more purposeful, analytically driven arguments.

The stimulus was often acknowledged only briefly in weaker responses, which significantly limited the quality of analysis. In several cases, students produced theoretically sound discussions but failed to connect these insights meaningfully to the material provided.

Candidates are reminded to explicitly identify the stimulus elements they are citing or paraphrasing, as this not only strengthens the argument but also distinguishes their own examples from those drawn from the stimulus. Regular practice in integrating stimulus material would assist students in meeting the expectations of Section B more consistently.

To prepare effectively for this section of the examination, students should develop confidence in using precise sociological language and in spelling the names of theories and theorists correctly. They should also be able to apply multiple theoretical perspectives to the institutions under consideration, demonstrating how each contributes to an understanding of social stratification.

Stronger responses were characterised by detailed engagement with theory and by clear explanations of how stratification is produced and maintained within institutions. These responses employed a wide range of concepts and integrated them smoothly into the discussion. Many also drew on relevant course material and external sources, such as ABS statistics or data from the Australian Education Union, to enrich their analysis. In addition, stronger responses evaluated the strengths and limitations of theories by placing them in conversation with one another, which contributed to a more sophisticated and nuanced argument.

Conversely, weaker responses sometimes relied on theories of deviance that were not suited to explaining institutional stratification or failed to connect theoretical claims to the stimulus. Some students listed the limitations of a theory without offering any explanation or without introducing an alternative theoretical perspective that would clarify these limitations. As a result, these responses lacked the depth and analytical precision expected in Section B.

Question 6 – Power and Politics

5.38% of students responded to this question

This question required students to demonstrate a clear understanding of the distribution and exercise of power within the Australian context. Students were expected to focus on the following core argument: Power in Australia is concentrated among a small, elite group who use it to exert influence and maintain advantage over other social groups. Power is accessed and maintained through the political arena. Similarly, differences in power can be challenged and altered through collective action to address political influence.

Criterion 2: Analyse theories about institutions

Strong responses addressed all components of the core argument by clearly explaining who holds power in Australia, how this power is accessed and exercised, the central role of political processes, and the ways power is challenged. These responses identified the specific groups, institutions, or individuals that make up the Australian power elite, such as corporate leaders, senior political figures, media owners, and Caucasian men. They then explained the mechanisms, resources, and institutional pathways through which these groups gain and maintain power to their benefit, including lobbying, control of economic resources, influence over policy-making, and strategic use of media. Stronger essays also recognised that the acquisition and maintenance of power largely occur within the political arena, through parliamentary systems and government policy, yet this power is continually subject to challenge. Legislation such as the *Sex Discrimination Act 1982* was used to illustrate how political processes can contest entrenched power structures.

In addition, these responses discussed how established power arrangements are disrupted through social movements, collective action, grassroots activism, and other forms of civic engagement.

Stronger essays incorporated specific Australian examples to illustrate theoretical concepts relating to the distribution, exertion, and contestation of power. These responses demonstrated clear connections between sociological theory, the dynamics of power and politics, and evidence drawn from the stimulus.

Weaker responses, by contrast, often failed to engage with the central focus of the essay question and instead retold aspects of the stimulus without substantive analysis. They included minimal theoretical explanation, and when theory was referenced, it was not linked to issues of power or politics. Many weaker essays drifted into discussions of stratification and inequality without clearly articulating how these concepts differ from power. Overall, these responses showed limited understanding of the political aspects of the topic, offering little or no discussion of legislative change, social movements, or the maintenance of power. Students should also avoid relying on rigid or outdated descriptions of gender roles within the family without acknowledging the changes in family power dynamics that have occurred.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

Students are reminded to address all components of the question. This year, the first part of the question 'Explain and evaluate how power is exercised in social institutions (family, education, work, media)' required students to explain and evaluate how power is exercised, which the majority of responses gave clear responses to. However, the majority of responses neglected to discuss the role of power and politics in at least two (2) of these institutions. Notably absent from responses was a discussion of the role of politics in the exertion of power in Contemporary Australian Society. Very few papers included evidence of political action or legislative change in their response to support their discussion.

Stronger responses included a clearly structured introduction that referred to both power and politics and the two institutions selected. Those responses were aligned with the conventions of a formal academic essay, including well-structured paragraphs, with accurate use of spelling and grammar rules. The essay topic was clear throughout the essay with explicit connections to the theories applied and the stimulus examples.

It is important that students not just use the stimulus but also make connections to matters of power and politics. Stimulus 7 suggested that 'Some parents believe private schools give their kids a chance to make the right connections that will help them later in life', which could be used as evidence of cultural capital, a means of power, and an acknowledgement of social status aligned with school systems.

Question 7 – Interrelationships of Institutions

13.98% of students responded to this question

Criterion 2: Analyse theories about institutions

Students were generally able to identify the interrelationships between at least two institutions in their responses. Overall, this year's examination papers reflected a solid 'C' standard, with most

students applying theory effectively and supporting their arguments with evidence drawn from the stimulus material or relevant statistical data.

Higher-achieving students stood out by evaluating theory through a broader range of theoretical perspectives. They addressed the limitations of particular theories more effectively by introducing alternative perspectives as part of their critique, rather than relying on brief or superficial commentary.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

Students' essay structure was generally sound, with most essays clearly addressing the set questions. Stronger responses consistently integrated the stimulus material throughout their writing, while weaker responses tended to provide only basic explanations of the two interrelationships and did not draw on examples from the stimulus.

A key issue this year was how students approached this particular question, which affected Criterion 7 for many. An effective approach to this question is to organise the essay around the concepts of socialisation, change, and inequality. Norms, values, and beliefs learned in one institution can be reinforced in another through socialisation; similarly, change in one institution often prompts change in another, and stratification or inequality in one institution typically appears in others as well. Many students struggled to structure their essays in a way that enabled them to address interrelationships clearly and comprehensively.

Question 8 – Changes Over Time

30.38% of students responded to this question

Many students appeared to have engaged thoroughly with the 2024 TASC external assessment report for Sociology, as a large portion of responses placed significant emphasis on outlining changes to institutions through key legislation. While demonstrating awareness of legislative contexts was helpful, many responses struggled to balance this discussion with a deep analysis of the stimulus or interpretation of changes through specific sociological theoretical lenses. Stronger responses maintained this balance, but across many responses, the overemphasis on legislative description limited opportunities for higher-level analysis and evaluation.

Criterion 2: Analyse theories about institutions

Stronger responses discussed a minimum of two institutions, if not three institutions, and did this with detail. Stronger responses used specific examples of legislation that changed and discussed in detail the implications in contemporary Australian society as a result. Some students used theories to discuss the functions of the institutions and not explicitly the changes; however, they used legislation well to discuss and evaluate the changes. Stronger responses structured paragraphs by institution and in each paragraph discussed the institution's functions, including theory, legislative and historical changes and capably used alternative theories to compare and contrast as they explained the causes and implications.

Higher-performing responses provided a clear evaluation of the impacts of key legislative changes and major social events on Australian institutions over time, consistently viewing these impacts through appropriate sociological theoretical lenses. These responses demonstrated informed comparisons between theoretical perspectives – such as contrasting Functionalism with

Interactionism – and outlined each theory’s strengths and limitations in explaining institutional change. Stronger essays also discussed specific impacts of legislation, such as a detailed analysis of how the *Family Law Act 1975* influenced Australian family structures, and showed how a particular theory would interpret such changes.

Weaker responses gave a simplified recall of historical changes and attempted to use theory to explain. Weaker responses focused heavily on describing legislation and its historical context without linking these details meaningfully to theoretical perspectives or the stimulus. While knowledge of legislation is relevant, many responses did not integrate this information with sociological analysis, resulting in essays that lacked depth. Some students tended to veer off topic, shifting into discussions of institutional stratification or interrelatedness rather than focusing on change over time. Many weaker responses also struggled to apply sociological terms and concepts, limiting both the sophistication of theoretical evaluation and the quality of stimulus analysis.

Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions

Although students employed a variety of valid approaches to structuring their essays, the strongest responses were those organised either by institution or by social issue. Within these body paragraphs, students examined the institution, identified the social issues that emerged, and used alternating theories to explain how these institutions create and maintain stratification. High-achieving responses incorporated direct quotations from the stimulus multiple times and clearly linked these to relevant concepts and theories. These students justified their arguments, presented alternative viewpoints when evaluating the stimulus, and explicitly connected their discussion back to the main question in each paragraph.

In contrast, weaker responses tended to provide broad and generalised descriptions of theories and institutional contributions to stratification. Their references to the stimulus were often vague, relying on broad paraphrasing rather than specific evidence. Many used the stimulus only once and offered little or no additional support for their claims. These responses often failed to clearly explain how the institution contributed to or reinforced stratification and did not link the discussion sufficiently to the essay question. Additionally, spelling, and grammatical errors were more frequent, and essay structure was weaker, with unclear or incomplete introductions, body paragraphs, and conclusions.

Some students did not refer to the stimulus at all or did not accurately connect it to the theory to address the topic question. Students should be reminded to identify the stimulus explicitly by number – for example, “Stimulus 2” – to ensure clarity and accuracy.

Stronger responses presented sustained arguments and analysis throughout, supported by clear essay structures that enabled effective exploration of institutional change. These responses balanced discussion of legislation, interpretation of stimulus material, and theoretical evaluation in meaningful ways, showing a strong understanding of the task requirements. They also demonstrated strong control of academic writing conventions, resulting in coherent and logically developed arguments.

Weaker responses, though often including the stimulus, frequently failed to integrate it meaningfully, producing essays that felt fragmented or disconnected. Recurring spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors reduced clarity, and the limited use of sociological

terminology weakened the sophistication of arguments. Some students relied almost entirely on legislative descriptions without referencing sociological theories of institutions, which significantly limited their ability to meet the criteria. In several responses, incorrect assumptions about the stimulus were made due to superficial analysis or a misunderstanding of the information presented.

2025 Written Exam Marking Tool

Note: The inclusion of the 2025 marking guidelines is intended as a guide only and is indicative of the 2025 academic year.

Section A – Criterion 1 – Standard Elements 2, 4 and 5 (shaded)

The focus of this criterion is the use of sociological explanations of socialisation, identity construction or deviance in CAS. This should include the use of sociological concepts and theories to respond to the essay topic with reference to the provided stimulus.

CRITERION 1: *ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT SOCIALIZATION, IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION AND DEVIANCE											
A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	T+	T	T-
2. Explains sociological issues and situations, correctly using a wide range of terms and concepts			2. Describes sociological issues and situations, correctly using a range of terms and concepts			2. Outlines sociological issues and situations, correctly using a limited range of terms and concepts					
Applies a wide range of sociological terms and concepts to appropriate examples from the stimulus and the course to give a detailed explanation of sociological issues in CAS.			Applies a range of sociological terms and concepts linked to appropriate examples from the stimulus and the course to describe sociological issues in CAS.			Uses a limited range of sociological terms and concepts linked to appropriate examples from the stimulus and the course in CAS.			No sociological concepts applied to an issue in CAS.		
4. Evaluates strengths and limitations of alternative theoretical perspectives on socialisation, identity construction and deviance			4. Analyses strengths and limitations of alternative theoretical perspectives on socialisation, identity construction and deviance			4. Describes strengths and limitations of alternative theoretical perspectives on socialisation, identity construction and deviance					
Describes accurately and in detail, sociological theories that seek to explain socialisation, identity construction or deviance.			Explains the key concepts of sociological theories that seek to explain socialisation, identity construction or deviance.			Describes the key concepts in the theories that seek to explain socialisation, identity construction or deviance.			T rating on C2: Only one, or no theory, used to explain socialisation, identity construction or deviance.		

Critically analyses and evaluates sociological theories of socialisation, identity construction or deviance.	Describes the strengths and limitations of sociological theories of socialisation, identity construction or deviance.	Displays a basic awareness of the strengths and limitations of sociological theories of socialisation, identity construction or deviance.	Not done
5. Argues a well-reasoned and coherent point of view on an aspect of socialisation, identity construction and deviance using a wide range of evidence, concepts, and theoretical perspectives	5. Argues a point of view on an aspect of socialisation, identity construction and deviance using a range of evidence, concepts, and theoretical perspectives	5. Presents a position on an aspect of socialisation, identity construction and deviance using a limited range of evidence, concepts, and theoretical perspectives	
Argues a well-reasoned and coherent point of view on an aspect of socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance using a wide range of relevant evidence from the stimulus and course.	Argues a point of view on an aspect of socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance using a range of relevant evidence from the stimulus and course.	Presents their position on an aspect of socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance by supporting ideas with some relevant evidence from the stimulus and course.	Little or no attempt to use evidence from the stimulus or course.
Develops a sustained and convincing argument in response to the question that integrates alternative theoretical explanations and/or perspectives on socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance.	Develops a logical argument in response to the question that utilises alternative theories and/or perspectives on socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance.	Selects and uses at least two theoretical explanations and/or perspectives on socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance.	Only one or no sociological theory on socialisation, identity construction and/or deviance given.

Section B – Criterion 2 – Standard Elements 2, 4 and 5 (shaded)

The focus of this criterion is the use of sociological explanations of institutions, power and politics in CAS. This should include the use of sociological concepts and theories to respond to the essay topic with reference to the provided stimulus.

CRITERION 2: *ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT INSTITUTIONS											
A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	T+	T	T-
2. Explains sociological issues and situations, correctly using a wide range of terms and concepts			2. Describes sociological issues and situations, correctly using a range of terms and concepts			2. Outlines sociological issues and situations, correctly using a limited range of terms and concepts					
Applies a wide range of sociological terms and concepts to relevant examples from the stimulus and the course to give a detailed explanation of sociological issues in CAS.			Applies a range of sociological terms and concepts to relevant examples from the stimulus and the course to describe sociological issues in CAS.			Uses a limited range of sociological terms and concepts to relevant examples from the stimulus and the course to outline sociological issues in CAS.			No sociological concepts applied to an issue in CAS.		
4. Analyses and evaluates theories that seek to explain the institutions of family, education, work and the media			4. Analyses theories that seek to explain the institutions of family, education, work and the media			4. Describes theories that seek to explain the institutions of family, education, work and the media					
Describes accurately and in detail, sociological theories that seek to explain the institutions of family, education, work, and the media.			Explains the key concepts of sociological theories that seek to explain the institutions of family, education, work, and the media.			Describes the key concepts in the theories that seek to explain the institutions of family, education, work, and the media.			T rating on C2: Only one, or no theory, used to explain the role of two institutions and/or only one institution is discussed.		
Critically analyses and evaluates sociological theories of the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media by examining the strengths and limitations.			Identifies the strengths and limitations of sociological theories of the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media.			Displays a basic awareness of the strengths and limitations of sociological theories of the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media.			Not done		

5. Argues a well-reasoned and coherent point of view on an aspect of institutions in CAS using a wide range of evidence, concepts and theoretical perspectives	5. Argues a point of view on an aspect of institutions in CAS using a range of evidence, concepts and theoretical perspectives	5. Presents a position on an aspect of institutions in CAS using a limited range of evidence, concepts and theoretical perspectives	
Argues a well-reasoned and coherent point of view on an aspect of the institutions of the family, education, work and/or the media using a wide range of relevant evidence from the stimulus and course.	Argues a point of view on an aspect of the institutions of the family, education, work and/or the media using a range of relevant evidence from the stimulus and course.	Justifies a position on an aspect of the institutions of the family, education, work and/or the media by supporting ideas with some relevant evidence from the stimulus and course.	Little or no attempt to use evidence from the stimulus or course.
Develops a sustained and convincing argument that integrates alternative theoretical explanations and/or perspectives on the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media to produce comprehensive and cohesive explanations on an issue.	Develops an argument that utilises alternative theories and/or perspectives on the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media to produce a cohesive explanation on an aspect of the issue.	Selects and uses at least two theoretical explanations and/or perspectives on the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media to present a position on an aspect of the issue.	Only one or no sociological theory on the institutions of family, education, work and/or the media given.

Sections A and B – Criterion 7 – Standard Elements 1 and 2 (shaded)

The focus of this criterion is the ability to respond accurately and clearly to the selected essay question utilising a formal essay structure. This should include the accurate use of written conventions and grammatical rules including paragraph structure and spelling.

CRITERION 7: *COMMUNICATE SOCIOLOGICAL IDEAS, INFORMATION, OPINIONS, ARGUMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS											
A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	T+	T	T-
1. Selects, constructs, and uses appropriate written, oral/signed, multimodal and mathematical representations to accurately and effectively convey meaning, adapting representations to specific audiences and purposes			1. Selects, constructs, and uses appropriate written, oral/signed, multimodal and mathematical representations to produce a response that is readily understood			1. Constructs and uses written, oral/signed, multimodal and mathematical representations, as directed, that addresses the basic intent of a question or issue					
Answers the question in a logical, coherent, and relevant manner through sustained argument/discussion that addresses all aspects of the question.			Proposes an answer to the question with valid, logical argument/discussion that addresses most aspects of the question.			Attempts to answer the question with some argument/discussion that addresses some of the aspects of question.			Does not answer the specific question. Less than 200 words. Answer is information only		
Essential element – Cite the stimulus and makes clear links to the question topic. Quotes and/or paraphrases from the stimulus. Gives a detailed interpretation of information by providing sound justification, through links to concepts, theories, and the issue.			Essential element – Cite the stimulus and link to the question topic. Quotes and/or paraphrases from the stimulus. Interprets the information in a logical and relevant way, linking to the concepts, theories, and the issue.			Essential element – Cites the stimulus and attempts to link to the question topic. Quotes and/or paraphrases the stimulus and attempts to explain and link to the issue.			Does not cite/use the stimulus – T rating on C7 No reference, paraphrasing or quoting from the stimulus.		
Draw valid and logical conclusions based on their arguments based on the question.			Draw valid conclusions concerning the question.			Draw basic conclusions concerning the question.			Little or no connections made. No conclusions drawn.		

2. Communicates complex ideas and explanations coherently, selecting and consistently using appropriate language conventions for specific audiences and purposes	2. Communicates ideas and explanations clearly, selecting and consistently using appropriate language conventions	2. Communicates basic ideas and explanations clearly, correctly using appropriate language conventions	
Provides a complex and cohesive essay response to the question.	Effectively and clearly structures an essay in response to the question.	Composes a basic essay structure in response to the question.	Unstructured – no essay conventions followed.
Accurately uses complex grammatical conventions, language, spelling and punctuation in written response.	Accurately uses grammatical conventions, language, spelling and punctuation in written response.	Mostly accurate use of appropriate grammatical conventions, language, spelling and punctuation in written response.	Significant errors in the appropriate and accurate use of grammatical conventions, language, spelling and punctuation.