IQM3008 A2 Teacher reference commentary

Sociology and Psychology, Component 2: Paper 1 - Sociology, Sample 2026

TEACHER STANDARDISATION | Selected extracts | Subject review required before distribution

Current source binding

Combined question and answer paper SHA-256:
66b0d2a514e56bc4b0358d89a4538397190eda04bfd671e8d5c150324d74e180

Staff mark scheme SHA-256: 8d49dfd3cffafd7ea0b09c399 295f662c829e7ca818cf9efd18f43bb4e391b86

These selected synthetic responses support discussion of how to apply the marking guidance. They do not form a complete assessment response. Use the approved question paper and marking scheme alongside this document. Use this proposed commentary after the independent marking exercise. The reference judgements require subject confirmation.

Selected task B5

S01 explains a possible labelling-to-exclusion-to-secondary-deviance pathway and limits the claim with temporal order and agency.

Example X

Repeatedly calling the second person a criminal can stigmatise them and make it harder to take part in ordinary activities. They may feel excluded, but I cannot assume that everyone given a label will offend again.

One limitation is that the first offence happened before the label, so the label cannot explain the initial act. People may also reject the label; evidence about the person's later choices would be needed to show whether exclusion led to another offence.

Proposed mark: 5 / 6

Marking explanation: Award 5/6. Credit: Identifies a relevant labelling concept such as stigma, identity or secondary deviance.; Explains how repeated labelling or exclusion may restrict opportunities or reshape identity.; Identifies a valid limitation such as agency/resistance or inability to explain the initial offence.; Explains why the limitation matters.; Develops what additional factor or evidence is needed to establish the claimed consequence.. No credit for: Links that mechanism to a possible later response or deviant affiliation in this case..

Example Y

Being called a criminal may make someone feel left out.

The label came after the first offence.

Proposed mark: 2 / 6

Marking explanation: Award 2/6. Credit: Identifies a relevant labelling concept such as stigma, identity or secondary deviance.; Identifies a valid limitation such as agency/resistance or inability to explain the initial offence.. No credit for: Explains how repeated labelling or exclusion may restrict opportunities or reshape identity.; Links that mechanism to a possible later response or deviant affiliation in this case.; Explains why the limitation matters.; Develops what additional factor or evidence is needed to establish the claimed consequence..

Example Z

Repeatedly labelling the second person a criminal can create stigma and restrict conventional opportunities. Exclusion from local activities may weaken their ties to people who could support ordinary participation. If the person starts to accept the label and is drawn towards others treated similarly, secondary deviance may become more likely. This is a possible process, not an inevitable result of the label.

A limitation is that labelling theory does not by itself explain why the initial offence occurred, because it happened before the label was applied. The person can also resist the label, and others with the same label may respond differently. Evidence about their earlier circumstances and later choices would be needed to show that exclusion caused further offending rather than merely following the first offence.

Proposed mark: 6 / 6

Marking explanation: Award 6/6. Credit: Identifies a relevant labelling concept such as stigma, identity or secondary deviance.; Explains how repeated labelling or exclusion may restrict opportunities or reshape identity.; Links that mechanism

to a possible later response or deviant affiliation in this case.; Identifies a valid limitation such as agency/resistance or inability to explain the initial offence.; Explains why the limitation matters.; Develops what additional factor or evidence is needed to establish the claimed consequence..

Selected task C1

S01 provides a strong distinction between integrative and conflict accounts with a supported conditional judgement.

Example X

Socialisation teaches norms and values through family, school, friends and work. It can create agreement because people learn rules for getting along. Functionalists say schools teach shared values and prepare people to cooperate. This can support social order.

But people do not all learn or accept the same things. Marxists argue that school can teach ideas that support the powerful, and feminists say gender roles can be unequal. Different groups may have their own norms and disagree with wider society.

So socialisation can create some agreement, but it can also reproduce conflict. It depends on whose values are taught and whether people accept them.

Proposed mark: 6 / 12

Marking explanation: Best fit 4–6; award 6. The response defines socialisation through agents and explains functionalist integration, then contrasts Marxist, feminist and subcultural accounts with a conditional judgement. It is relevant and developed, but its comparison and evaluation are less sustained than a top-band response.

Example Y

Socialisation teaches people how to behave. Families and schools teach rules. This can make people agree and get along.

People can learn different rules. Marxists say the rich can teach ideas that help them. People may disagree.

So socialisation can create agreement but also conflict.

Proposed mark: 3 / 12

Marking explanation: Best fit 1–3; award 3. The response says that family and school teach rules that may support agreement, then notes Marxist conflict and concludes that socialisation can produce agreement and conflict. These are relevant basic ideas, but explanation, application and evaluation remain very limited, with no sustained analysis or developed supported conclusion.

Example Z

Socialisation teaches people norms, values and roles through agents such as family, school, peers and work. It can create agreement because shared expectations make interaction more predictable. A functionalist account argues that schools teach common rules and a sense of belonging, helping people cooperate beyond the family. For example, learning to queue or respect others' safety can make shared spaces usable.

However, socialisation does not simply create consensus. Marxists argue that education and family life can transmit ideas that make existing class relations seem normal, so agreement may reflect unequal power rather than a genuinely shared interest. Feminists similarly examine how gender roles may teach girls and boys different expectations, reproducing unequal domestic and occupational positions. Subcultures and peer groups may also teach norms that conflict with wider expectations; people can resist or reinterpret what they learn.

These views show that socialisation creates some practical agreement, but do not establish that everyone accepts the same values or benefits equally. Functionalism explains how shared rules support coordination, while conflict perspectives explain whose rules become dominant. Agreement is therefore conditional: it may be strongest around basic interaction norms, while values connected to authority, class or gender remain contested. Socialisation can produce both integration and conflict, and its effect depends on the agent and the social position of those being socialised.

Proposed mark: 12 / 12

Marking explanation: Best fit 10–12; award 12. The response defines socialisation, explains functionalist integration, contrasts Marxist and feminist conflict arguments, applies subculture/resistance, and gives a sustained conditional judgement about shared norms versus contested power. Conceptually detailed, relevant application and explicit evaluation support the top of the band.

Selected task C4

S01 distinguishes actual offending from recording and punishment while comparing power-based and other explanations.

Example X

Power can affect which behaviour is called a crime and who is punished. Marxists argue that powerful people can influence laws. Labelling theory says some people may be treated as criminals more often. This affects crime control.

Other things can explain offending, like poverty or peer groups. Recorded crime also depends on people reporting it.

Power is important but may not explain every crime. It affects laws and punishment, while other factors affect what people do.

Proposed mark: 6 / 12

Marking explanation: Best fit 4–6; award 6. The response links power to law-making and punishment, applies labelling theory to unequal treatment, and recognises that social conditions and reporting also affect recorded crime. It reaches a relevant but briefly supported judgement; comparison and evaluation are limited.

Example Y

Power can affect who gets called a criminal and who gets punished. Rich people may have more influence.

Some people commit crimes for other reasons too.

Power matters but does not explain every crime.

Proposed mark: 3 / 12

Marking explanation: Best fit 1–3; award 3. The response makes a basic point that wealth may influence who is labelled and punished, notes that people offend for other reasons, and gives a brief conclusion. It contains little explanation, application or evaluation and no sustained analysis or developed supported conclusion.

Example Z

Power can influence how crime is defined, recorded and controlled. Marxist approaches argue that law may protect property and dominant economic interests, while corporate harms can receive less attention than visible street offences. Labelling theory shows that authorities can apply deviant labels selectively, and that exclusion after a label may shape later opportunities. Feminist accounts also ask whose experiences are treated as serious and how gendered power affects victimisation and control. These perspectives explain why official crime patterns are not a neutral count of all harm.

Yet recorded crime must be distinguished from actual offending. Reporting, detection and enforcement affect statistics; a rise after a new reporting system may reflect better recording. Power can influence visibility and punishment without being the only cause of offending. Social conditions, peer relationships, opportunity and individual choices may help explain why some offences occur. Functionalist accounts argue that reactions to deviance can reaffirm boundaries, though that does not explain unequal enforcement or prove that every sanction is fair.

Power is therefore central to patterns of control and to which harms become visible, especially where organisations or disadvantaged groups have unequal influence. It is less complete as a single explanation for every act of offending. The strongest account combines power with social context and separates incidence from recording and punishment. Differences in power are a major explanation of crime control, but their explanatory reach varies by offence and by stage of the justice process.

Proposed mark: 12 / 12

Marking explanation: Best fit 10–12; award 12. Explains power in law-making, labelling, corporate harms and gender, distinguishes actual offending from recording/enforcement, compares functionalism and social explanations, and concludes on the varying reach of power. Detailed and sustained evaluation.