Written Examination Paper

Section A – Socialisation, Conformity And Deviance

Question 1

It was about defining deviance and its relativity. It required an explanation of the way difference or diversity, and deviance could be seen by diverse groups/subcultures. The relativity of deviance needed to be addressed and the fact that at times it is actually conformity to the norms of a subculture, while against the norms of the broader culture.

Candidates needed to indicate that they understood why some acts or behaviour can come to be defined as deviant, how the socialisation process has a dramatic impact on the internalisation of norms by the individual, and how deviance is a social construct.

Competent candidates included key words, which mentioned that those individuals or groups whose behaviour is defined as deviant, different, or marginal are more likely to be susceptible to negative labelling by the conforming majority of contemporary Australian society.

There were many examples in the Stimulus articles, which could be quoted to explain the relativity of deviance and connection to time, place, gender, culture and age.

Answers should have included some discussion of subculture, difference, deviance and conformity. Links to the stimulus material were absent in some cases, thus significantly reducing the impact of the response.

Some candidates ignored or just neglected to mention any of the key words from the question and just wrote about ‘the four theories of deviance’, and then did not provide any effective evidence or supportive stimulus material to consolidate their argument. Clearly this material would have been more effectively applied to question 2.

Stronger answers effectively discussed who had the power and the moral authority to apply deviant labels, drawing on Becker’s labelling theory. They also included Lemert’s distinction between primary and secondary deviance. Candidates who included a discussion of these interactionist accounts of deviance were rewarded.

Question 2

There were some very strong responses to this question, which demonstrated that candidates had prepared well for this question and were familiar with the finer details of the theories and the key concepts related to deviance. They knew the explanations, could link to the given stimulus, and evaluate theories of deviance relating to the stimulus material.
Stronger candidates were able to integrate examples from at least 2 if not all 3 of the stimuli provided, making clear connections to the theories. Some candidates struggled with the application of structural strain theory to the stimulus, misinterpreting the application of this theory with the examples provided.

This was an easy choice, as indicated by the number of candidates who chose this question, but those who reeled off the prepared 4 theories and left it at that, were not responding to the given material and the actual question, which was about young people. There was a tendency to state… ‘The last theory is …’

There were some obvious prepared introductions. Candidates need to address the set question not one they have rehearsed during the year.

A number of candidates used Macquarie Fields as an example of a ‘deviant’ community; low SES and therefore comparisons could be made. However, this should not be the total focus of an answer.

There were many instances of ‘dump’ responses. Poor spelling of concepts was common.

Candidates should also read all stimulus articles, as they may be able to incorporate an example from all, or 2/3 of them. Some responses neglected to answer the essay topic of why young Australians might be deviant and focussed too much on just overviewing the theory content. Many candidates struggled with the accurate spelling of each theory and key concepts.

The majority of responses focussed on the 'scene' subculture. Some candidates identified the functions and dysfunctions of deviance and related them to the stimulus. For criterion 5 - sociological terms and concepts – candidates referred to sanctions, self-fulfilling prophecy, moral panic, recidivism and so on. There is no need to give the source of the definitions.

Most candidates wrote in great detail but were not always able to provide sufficient analysis and connection to the stimulus, or critique of each theory.

More able candidates focussed on the provided stimulus material and made links to theories throughout their essay. They included a wide range of relevant concepts and were also able to articulate the greater detail of the theories and provide criticisms.

**Question 3**

For many candidates, the recognition of the role of socialisation in the system of social control was not made clear. Distinctions between the formal and informal elements of this system were not discussed either, despite cues in the stimulus material.

Some candidates did not recognize or understand the reference to the ‘prisoners of our culture’ in the stimulus article. Many candidates did not confidently discuss the idea that
while culture is a major influence on our behaviour, behaviour can be modified. Many did not even cite the key phrase in their answer and this is something that should be encouraged.

Sanctions should also be addressed here

**Question 4**

Most candidates were able to explain the process of construction of identity from a sociological perspective. There was a wide range of responses, all of which were marked on the merit of their constructed argument, with no preconceived ‘set’ answer expected by the marker.

Some candidates began with a discussion of culture and subculture and social norms; folkways, mores and laws. This then led into a discussion of how the individual learns the culture of their society and forms their own identity.

Some candidates addressed the issue through the agents of socialisation, such as family education, media and peer group. Better answers used the stimulus well in support of socialisation theory. Able candidates were able to critique this by addressing the issue of agency and the role of the individual’s free will in the process of socialisation.

Good answers were also constructed around Interactionist, Conflict and Functionalist Theories. Again, use of the stimulus as examples for the theories of Cooley, Mead and Goffman was crucial and able candidates drew on the available material well. Some answers incorporated both these theories and primary and secondary socialisation very well.

In addition to socialisation theories, some candidates also drew upon deviance theories such as Cultural Transition Theory, Labeling Theory and Structural Strain Theory. Better answers linked these competently to the stimulus material discussing the idea of conformity, difference and deviance as part of identity construction, dominant and sub culture.

The marker was impressed with the variety of constructed arguments that demonstrated a depth of knowledge of sociological theory, theorist and terminology. A reminder to candidates that it is essential to use the stimulus material within the constructed argument as a small number of candidates had obviously prepared for an answer on socialisation but did not support their ideas with reference to the stimulus, or with very little reference. This year, the material provided gave a wide range for candidates to draw upon and the best answers did so, interweaving it into their constructed argument.
Section B – Institutions, Power And Politics

Question 5

Some more capable candidates were able to demonstrate effectively how specific legislation impacts on major social institutions over time. The great majority of candidates drew on their knowledge of the institutions of family and education. Successful responses made it evident that they were answering the question before them, providing links back to this question and also links to the stimulus material. Integrating theoretical explanations thoroughly and consistently within their writing was a strong indicator of depth of analysis.

Less capable candidates failed to provide definitions of power and politics. This, despite their inclusion in the question, key words, and suggested as definitions in the guidelines. Less capable candidates consistently provided little reference to the stimulus material, and often no real reference to alternative explanations.

More able candidates were able to identify the complex process of gendered relations and power when discussing work and family; drawing on concepts such as patriarchy and the sexual division of labour in their answers.

Less able candidates referred only loosely to the women’s movement or feminism, but were unable to elaborate on the dramatic impact this movement has had upon society. Many missed opportunities to include easy concepts such as workforce participation rates and accessibility of abortion and the contraceptive pill.

Stronger answers identified that children in higher SES families experienced the institution of education differently from other less advantaged individuals; correctly identifying the impact of exposure to social cultural values and norms experienced in the family and how this could lead to advantage and power in the institution of education. These candidates were able to integrate the concepts of cultural capital and hidden curriculum, for example, into their responses.

Better responses were able to describe the impact of the introduction of a range of legislations, exploring how low SES individuals continue to struggle as a result of insufficient levels of public funding. These candidates were able to develop their responses further by then going on to link changes in educational funding to the job market, identifying that those with the greatest degree of educational success are often those that ultimately secure high skill and high income powerful occupations. Some candidates were able to identify a range of educational legislative changes and policy but could not adequately explore the consequences of this policy making. The stimulus material for education provided sufficient material to develop these ideas.

The institution of work was rarely drawn upon in many discussions in particular figure 2 Male age specific labour force participation rates. Those more capable candidates who did draw on the stimulus material provided were able to identify changes in labour force participation rates and linked these to changes in broader society, drawing on concepts such
as peripheral employment, unemployment, casualisation of the labour market, underemployment and impact of globalisation. More able candidates were able to link their argument with confidence to a range of theoretical explanations. Those that integrated such discussion within the body of the essay, invariably rated higher than those candidates who indicated a superficial understanding of theory by just ‘dumping’ a theory paragraph at the end of the essay.

It was surprising to see the number of candidates who failed to utilise the Media stimulus material, which provided opportunities to explore the role of the institution of media in constructing social problems, even at times directing policy reform and or change. More able candidates were able to demonstrate their careful consideration of this stimulus material by evaluating the complex relationship between the impact of political legislation and the influence of media on public opinion.

**Question 6**

Overall, this question was answered well by a majority of candidates with several exemplary responses. The candidates who excelled explicitly related their analysis to the question and provided a detailed definition of stratification, identified the basis of stratification in Contemporary Australian Society and explored areas where stratification is clearly evident in the institutions. This was demonstrated through an examination of the structures and ideologies that perpetuate patterns of inequality in the institutions of society. Most candidates focussed on family and education, although the family stimulus did not provide a great deal of evidence for stratification. Very few candidates utilised the evidence provided in the work stimulus about how inequality for women had changed, or made connections to the education stimulus.

Strong responses characteristically demonstrated a detailed knowledge and understanding of sociological concepts and theories which they applied consistently throughout the essay citing both course material and the stimuli as evidence to substantiate their understanding. Some responses would have been further strengthened through an acknowledgement of the interactionist perspective or an individual's agency, in recognising that the existence of stratification for groups in society is not a fatalistic determination of life opportunity.

Weaker responses to this question typically exhibited some of the following problems: limited or no reference made to the stimulus material, using concepts without defining them or making up completely unrelated definitions for concepts, limited or no evidence of theory, retelling the stimulus material with no evidence of sociological concepts, theories or analysis. Phrases such as ‘forced’ and ‘punished’ were used by some candidates to describe how women are allocated the expressive role in the household, rather than describing the social expectations of gender roles and gender socialisation.

Some candidates had overly prepared their responses to this question and had not made sufficient connections to the stimulus and were too focussed on alternative explanations.
A common problem with a number of answers was the complete absence of stimulus material indicating that candidates had memorised the essay and were unable to apply their knowledge flexibly to the exam question.

**Question 7**

Overall, a sound attempt was made to answer this question. Some very strong answers clearly showed that changes in one institution create changes in another. Those candidates who discussed the Feminist Perspective, particularly in relation to family change did so in a competent and precise way. There was a clear explanation of how the Feminist Movement created freedom for women and this has led to changes in family structure, expectations and the role of women in the work force.

It is recommended that if candidates elect a focus question to guide their preparation, there is a need to be flexible in which institutions they are able to discuss as the stimulus may not be predictable.

Candidates are reminded that while historical changes are relevant in developing their understanding of the process of modernisation, it should not be the focus of their essays when talking about contemporary society.

Stronger candidates were able to integrate the theoretical perspectives into their essay; the best actually using the theories as the focus of their argument, rather than as an afterthought. They applied their knowledge to the set question and linked this to the stimulus material. A number of changes over time were introduced such as the diversification of family type which was linked to the Family Law Act, technology, attitudinal shifts, increased participation in education and the work force. Changes to education focused on public and private schooling and historical and contemporary access, HECS fees and gender changes initiated largely by the feminist movement. Also changes in Contemporary Australian Society are reflected in political/legislative changes; Baby Bonus, Paid Parental Leave.

Weaker candidates simply summarised the content of the stimulus and made little or no effort to link to or introduce alternative explanations. Some candidates had a larger focus on family and less on their second institution. There needs to be an effort to deal with both institutions equally. There were some strong responses which also linked family and work and/or education and work.

**Question 8**

By far the biggest issue for candidates was making sure they were actually answering the question. Many wrote about the different institutions but failed to discuss how they were interrelated.
Strong responses used the stimulus materials very well and addressed the question comprehensively. These answers used the stimulus materials throughout their discussion to develop a logical argument about the inter-relationships between two institutions.

Most candidates wisely chose to discuss two institutions in detail rather than try to bring a third institution into the discussion. Avoid listing institutions in the introduction if they are not going to be discussed in the body of the essay.

Many candidates cited the stimulus clearly (eg. Stimulus 1), which was helpful. Some paraphrased or re-stated some stimulus materials, but failed to demonstrate how this related to the question. Weaker responses made little or no reference to the stimulus materials.

Robust responses revealed an excellent understanding of a wide range of sociological terms and concepts throughout their discussion in relation to the question, stimulus materials and other evidence from the course. These answers demonstrated a strong command of the language of sociology. Weaker responses used few, if any sociological terms and concepts, relying heavily on everyday language.

In relation to Criterion 6, strong responses conveyed an understanding of the divergent perspectives in Sociology, such as Functionalist and Conflict, in relation to the question, stimulus materials and supported by further evidence from the course. Furthermore, these answers aligned the discussion of a range of theories, concepts and areas of research, with the relevant sociological perspectives, eg. Functionalist, Conflict, Feminist, Meritocratic, etc. Solid answers provided some degree of evaluation of the theories in relation to the question and stimulus. Weaker responses provided little or no evidence of their understanding of alternative sociological explanations.

Overall Comments

Candidates should use their reading time wisely and very carefully choose the questions they decide to answer. There were so many answers which clearly belonged to a different question.

In Section A, Question 1 asked for deviance to be defined and an explanation of the relativity of deviance.

Question 2 asked for alternative theories of deviance to explain deviant acts. Candidates could write about 4 main theories, but it is probably better to write about 2 in depth and link these to the stimulus material rather than listing 4 theories superficially.

Question 3 asked for socialisation involving internalisation of norms, and mechanisms of social control.

Question 4 asked how socialisation shapes an individual’s self-identity.
Many candidates simply wrote about 4 theories of deviance to answer all these questions and did not effectively link the theories to the stimulus articles. In other words they did not answer the question and would have been penalised on Criterion 4.

The answers in Section B were somewhat better, with most candidates writing about 2 institutions. But again look carefully at the wording of the question.

Question 5 asked for a discussion on power and politics.

Question 2 was about stratification.

Question 3 was about changes over time.

Question 4 was about interrelationship between the institutions.

Remember too, that the criteria still must be addressed. Some candidates overlooked criterion 6 which calls for ‘alternative theoretical explanations’; there was no mention of theories.

**Externally Assessed Folio – Investigation Project**

This is the first year that Investigation Projects were submitted electronically. There were many interesting and different topics which were clearly linked to inequality, and many were of a high standard. More competent candidates demonstrated a well-developed ability to base the folio research task upon both past and current Australian sociological research concerning areas of inequality.

Candidates must ensure that they are clear about the issue of inequality and how this is not the same as difference or limited opportunities. Likewise the issue of agency can account for an individual’s choices in life. Some less able candidates seem hardly to have consulted with their teacher or the TQA guidelines re: suitable topics, with a number of candidates choosing topics with very loose connections to Inequality. They then failed to locate suitable sources of secondary sociological literature to support their ideas. A number of reports would have been strengthened by the inclusion of sociological sources, particularly the use of key concepts.

A number of reports claimed to have carried out ‘participant observation’ when they were in fact content analyses. There was also some confusion regarding Primary Research undertaken with some candidates conducting a survey and referring to this as an experiment and adopting the experimental method when describing elements of the survey methodology.

There were some candidates who clearly had rushed their report leaving their own name or their teacher and college name on their folio.

One candidate claimed that there were ‘no ethical considerations’ when the report contained an interview with an adult previously unknown to the candidate. An ethical consent form must be signed. This is retained by the teacher. Many candidates who only vaguely referred
to ethical concerns then went on to describe a form of primary research which clearly should have involved a more careful consideration re: lasting harm for example, or imposition upon privacy. Also some candidates referred to a large sample size taken from workplaces, but do not mention that they had indeed use the pro forma attached to the TQA guidelines to seek explicit permission.

I draw your attention to Module 4 of the syllabus which relates to Sociological Research Methods:

Throughout the year candidates will explore sociological research processes, including research methodology, ethics, collation and analysis of data and report writing. (Sociology TQA Level 3, p. 16)

Candidates also need to pay attention to their questionnaires. Avoid double barrel questions. Ensure that the questions are relevant to the hypothesis or aim. Many research tools were too long, and the information was underutilized.

Research methods that include interviews should provide copies of the questions and answer transcript with key findings from this research summarised in the results section not just in the discussion. Results need to be stated.

In the results section it is important that candidates make some attempt to convert raw data by creating graphs, presenting percentages, or gathering key quotes from their primary research. Graphs must be titled and labelled adequately.

Candidates should refrain from the inclusion of unnecessary appendices that do not contribute to the overall content of the report. A number of candidates repeated data from the results in their appendices. Appendices must be referred to in the body of the report.

It is important that candidates complete all sections of the report format, rather than omitting sections to save on the word count. Each section contributes significantly to the overall requirements of the folio and its assessment. For example, much information which should have been in the discussion was in the introduction.

Proof reading was not evident. This is important, especially when many word processers have auto-correct, and words are changed to something out of context. Be sure to get the authors’ names right. Habibis was often misspelt, as was Van Krieken. Formal language should be used, and inappropriate, emotive, or subjective language avoided. Seek outside help with this if necessary. It is essential to develop these skills.

Also worrisome was the use of old definitions of mass media. It is no longer the case that there is ‘no contact between sender and receiver’. The second media age refers to interactive media.

The standard of referencing was poor in too many cases, particularly in-text referencing. References which appeared in the report were not on the list, and vice versa. In-text
references should match reference list. Direct quotations require a page number. Remember referencing is important for criterion 7.

Refer to TQA’s ‘How do I reference (cite) the source of other people’s information, images, ideas or words I use in my work?’ in conjunction with TQA’s Authenticity and Academic Integrity: A Guide which is available at [http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/1468](http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/1468).

There was a lack of sociological texts consulted, and a range of references was often lacking. A number of candidates had very few references at all, and some had only one other type of source besides their primary research. This results in a D for criterion 7. Remember to give the primary research a title and add it to the reference list.

**Note:** The report supposes that the research is already carried out, so it should not be written in the future tense. Far too many were.

Many reports were under 1000 words. While candidates are not penalised for submitting short reports, shorter reports invariably lack the analysis and discussion of sociological sources that contribute to higher level results. Candidates are urged to make the most of the 1200 words they are allowed to submit. On the other hand, some candidate with otherwise strong responses seem to have tried to pad out their introduction with theory which only loosely related to their topic, using up copious amounts of their precious word counts.

Candidates who performed strongly provided a clear outline of their research method, and how this met ethical guidelines. They were able to follow correct report procedure and referencing, had selected a topic that clearly dealt with the issue of inequality, and the impact on an individual’s or group’s life chances. They provided an account of their results in graph or annotated form, and made sociological connections using sociological sources. The primary research was supported by a number of secondary sources from a sociological perspective. Limitations of the research were mentioned.
### SOCIOLOGY (BHS315111) – 2012

(Subject to refinement)

**Criterion 4 – Analyse and evaluate ideas and information related to sociology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A+</strong></td>
<td>Answer the question through sustained argument/discussion</td>
<td>Answer the question with valid argument/discussion</td>
<td>Answer the question with some argument/discussion</td>
<td>Not answered the question</td>
<td>Less than 200 words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Give a detailed interpretation of information by providing sound justification</td>
<td>Interpret information in a logical and relevant way</td>
<td>Explain the relevant information</td>
<td>No reference to the stimulus or stimulus paraphrased with no interpretation or explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-</strong></td>
<td>Validate interpretations by supplying relevant evidence from the stimulus throughout the argument</td>
<td>Justify interpretations mostly supported by relevant evidence from the stimulus</td>
<td>Justify interpretations supported by some relevant evidence from the stimulus</td>
<td>Little or no attempt to interpret stimulus</td>
<td>No relevant links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B+</strong></td>
<td>Critically analyse the stimulus using sociological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>Competently analyse the stimulus using sociological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>Analyse the stimulus using sociological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>Few or no sociological concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Critically evaluate the quality and validity of the stimulus</td>
<td>Evaluate the quality and validity of the stimulus</td>
<td>Recognise and use valid information from the stimulus</td>
<td>No evaluation of information from the stimulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-</strong></td>
<td>Draw valid and logical conclusions.</td>
<td>Draw valid conclusions.</td>
<td>Draw basic conclusions.</td>
<td>Little or no connections made</td>
<td>No conclusions reached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C+</strong></td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Ignore irrelevant material</td>
<td>Assess only on discussion relevant to the question /stimulus</td>
<td>Do not penalise contractions or ampersands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D+</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Ignore irrelevant material
- Assess only on discussion relevant to the question /stimulus
- Do not penalise contractions or ampersands
### Sociology - Written Paper Marking Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 5 - Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of sociological terms and concepts</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly link sociological terms and concepts to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Link sociological terms and concepts to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make some attempt to link sociological terms and concepts to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No attempt to link sociological terms and concepts to the question Concepts not relevant to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define and demonstrate a clear and detailed understanding of a wide range of sociological concepts and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Define and demonstrate a solid understanding of a range of sociological concepts and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate sound understanding of basic sociological terms and concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Few or no concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support their use of terms and concepts with relevant and detailed examples from the stimulus and the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support their use of terms and concepts with relevant examples from the stimulus and the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support use of terms and concepts with examples from the stimulus and the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No examples from the stimulus Concepts not relevant to contemporary Australian society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a wide range of sociological concepts to contemporary Australian society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply a range of sociological concepts to contemporary Australian society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply some sociological concepts to contemporary Australian society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No sociological concepts applied to contemporary Australian society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 6 - Construct an argument that includes alternative theoretical explanations</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly link theoretical perspectives to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Link theoretical perspectives to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make some attempt to link theoretical perspectives to the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a sustained and convincing argument which integrates alternative theoretical perspectives to produce comprehensive/cohesive explanations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop an argument which utilises alternative theories to produce a cohesive explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display basic awareness of major sociological theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only one sociological theory or no theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make clear and detailed linkages between empirical data and theoretical perspectives and concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make links between empirical data and theoretical perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make some attempt to link theories to empirical data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theories not linked to stimulus article/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of sociological theories and perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the strengths and limitations of sociological theories and perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display a basic awareness of the strengths and limitations of sociological theories and perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Award Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year</strong></td>
<td>10% (49)</td>
<td>14% (68)</td>
<td>44% (206)</td>
<td>31% (147)</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year</strong></td>
<td>11% (55)</td>
<td>18% (90)</td>
<td>42% (211)</td>
<td>29% (146)</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year (all examined subjects)</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous 5 years</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous 5 years (all examined subjects)</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Distribution (SA or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year</strong></td>
<td>23% (110)</td>
<td>77% (360)</td>
<td>27% (126)</td>
<td>73% (344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year</strong></td>
<td>21% (105)</td>
<td>79% (397)</td>
<td>30% (150)</td>
<td>70% (352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous 5 years</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>