

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**SOCIOLOGY****9699/33**

Paper 3 Education

**May/June 2024****MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 50

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles  
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require  $n$  reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

**2 Presentation of mark scheme:**

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

**3 Calculation questions:**

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

**4 Annotation:**

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

**Using the mark scheme**





















Some of the questions are marked using a point-based system, awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Some of the questions are marked using level of response. For these, the level description represents performance **at the top of the level**.

For levels of response marking you should:

- award a mark at the top of the level if all criteria in the level are met.
- consider the level descriptions across the full range, bearing in mind that it is not necessary for a candidate to give a faultless performance for maximum marks to be awarded within any single category!
- award marks on a 'best-fit' basis; thus, compensation between higher and lower achievement for different criteria is acceptable.

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning
	Benefit of the doubt given / the point is just about worthy of credit
	Explanation of the point
	Explanation of why it is a strength/ limitation
	Development / description of the point.
	Evaluation point
	Developed point
	General point using sociological material but applied to the question
	Point is irrelevant to the question
	Juxtaposition of point
	Material used to support the point
	Not answered question
	Repetition
	This material receives no credit, additional points not required
	Too vague
	Point that has been credited
	Incorrect response
	Irrelevant material
	On page comment
	Off page comment
	Identification of a point

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> ways the hidden curriculum can contribute to social cohesion.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conformity through school rules and regulations e.g. school uniform, assembly.</li> <li>• Respect for authority through structure of the school.</li> <li>• Teamwork through projects or sport.</li> <li>• Religious and secular school rituals.</li> <li>• Specialisation enabling the division of labour and inter-dependence.</li> <li>• Use of Marxist model to show cohesion resulting from ideological control, etc.</li> <li>• Any other relevant example.</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>two ways</b>. For each example up to 2 marks are available:</p> <p>1 mark for identifying an example of a way the hidden curriculum can contribute to social cohesion.</p> <p>1 mark for showing understanding of how this way contributes to social cohesion</p> <p>(2 × 2 marks)</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Explain <u>two</u> reasons why females might be advantaged in schools.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Female-friendly teaching and assessment, such as coursework</li> <li>• High number of female teachers, acting as role models</li> <li>• Teacher perceptions of females as cooperative and hardworking</li> <li>• Feminised curriculum</li> <li>• Female participation in pro-school subcultures valued by teachers.</li> <li>• Any other relevant reason.</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>two reasons</b>. Up to 4 marks are available for each reason.</p> <p>1 mark for making a point / identifying a reason (e.g. Female-friendly teaching and assessment, such as coursework).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining that point/identifying a reason (e.g. Coursework rewards time spent on tasks, neatness of presentation etc. which may fit with feminine identity)</p> <p>1 mark for selecting relevant sociological material such as a study/concept/theory/empirical evidence to support the point (e.g. Francis and Skelton <u>or</u> the feminisation of schools)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining how the material supports the point (e.g. Francis and Skelton argue that the feminisation of schooling is a form of positive discrimination in favour of girls <u>or</u> girls are rewarded for conforming to their gender identity.)</p> <p>(2 × 4 marks)</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>‘Ethnicity has limited impact on educational attainment.’</b></p> <p><b>Using sociological material, give <u>two</u> arguments against this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different teacher expectations of pupils based on ethnic stereotypes</li> <li>• Streaming/setting and differential access to resources based on ethnic stereotypes</li> <li>• Different interpretations of behaviour and different disciplinary response (e.g. exclusions) related to ethnicity</li> <li>• Ethnocentric curriculum</li> <li>• Racism expressed between pupils/subcultures</li> <li>• Family expectations and motivations varying by ethnic group</li> <li>• Cultural capital or habitus, e.g. language codes, knowledge of dominant culture, familiarity with school norms</li> <li>• English not first language spoken at home e.g. difficult for new immigrants/refugees trying to adapt to an education system that uses, for them, a foreign language</li> <li>• Peer group involvement, school subcultures linked to ethnicity</li> <li>• Statistical evidence of under/low achievement linked to ethnicity</li> <li>• Any other relevant argument against the view</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>two arguments</b>. Up to 6 marks are available for each argument.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This question is asking for arguments against the view. There are no marks for explaining the view or giving arguments supporting the view.</i></p> <p><b>Levels of response</b> Use the following levels to mark <b>each</b> argument.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 5–6 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One clear and developed argument against the view that ethnicity has limited impact on educational attainment.</li> <li>• Sociological material, such as concepts, theories and evidence, is used to support the argument against the view. The material selected is appropriate and focused on the question with its relevance made clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2: 3–4 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One clear but underdeveloped argument against the view that ethnicity has limited impact on educational attainment.</li> <li>• The material selected is appropriate but not fully focused on the question. Sociological evidence is used but its relevance to the argument is not made clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1: 1–2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One point disagreeing with the view that ethnicity has limited impact on educational attainment which is undeveloped or lacking clarity.</li> <li>• Any material selected lacks focus on the specific question.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 0: 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response worthy of credit.</li> </ul>	12



Question	Answer		Marks									
4	<p><b>Evaluate the view that education enables working-class children to achieve social mobility.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><b>In support of the view</b></td><td><b>Against the view</b></td></tr><tr><td>Points</td><td><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Increases in inter and intra-generational mobility.</li><li>Functionalist view of meritocracy to ensure efficient role allocation – Davis and Moore.</li><li>Parsons on universalistic norms and achieved status.</li><li>Evidence of working-class achievement</li><li>Policies such as compensatory education increasing equal opportunities.</li><li>Increase in qualifications at all levels.</li></ul></td><td><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Limited inter-generational mobility</li><li>Marxist view that education is designed to prepare labour force for capitalism.</li><li>Myth of meritocracy</li><li>Bourdieu’s argument that cultural capital is required for success in education.</li><li>Material deprivation limits opportunity in education.</li><li>Policies such as marketisation limit working-class access to opportunity.</li><li>Some policies designed to support social mobility may have the opposite effect, e.g. grammar schools, vocational education.</li><li>Ethnic and gender disadvantages reinforced by class position.</li></ul></td></tr><tr><td>Research evidence/ theory</td><td>DfE statistics Goldthorpe et al Chitty, Heath, Saunders</td><td>DfE statistics Youth Cohort Study Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Feinstein, Flaterhy, Bull, Tanner, Mortimore and Whitty, Sullivan, Leech and Campos, Paterson and Iannelli, Breen, Davies</td></tr></table>			<b>In support of the view</b>	<b>Against the view</b>	Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Increases in inter and intra-generational mobility.</li><li>Functionalist view of meritocracy to ensure efficient role allocation – Davis and Moore.</li><li>Parsons on universalistic norms and achieved status.</li><li>Evidence of working-class achievement</li><li>Policies such as compensatory education increasing equal opportunities.</li><li>Increase in qualifications at all levels.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Limited inter-generational mobility</li><li>Marxist view that education is designed to prepare labour force for capitalism.</li><li>Myth of meritocracy</li><li>Bourdieu’s argument that cultural capital is required for success in education.</li><li>Material deprivation limits opportunity in education.</li><li>Policies such as marketisation limit working-class access to opportunity.</li><li>Some policies designed to support social mobility may have the opposite effect, e.g. grammar schools, vocational education.</li><li>Ethnic and gender disadvantages reinforced by class position.</li></ul>	Research evidence/ theory	DfE statistics Goldthorpe et al Chitty, Heath, Saunders	DfE statistics Youth Cohort Study Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Feinstein, Flaterhy, Bull, Tanner, Mortimore and Whitty, Sullivan, Leech and Campos, Paterson and Iannelli, Breen, Davies	26
	<b>In support of the view</b>	<b>Against the view</b>										
Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Increases in inter and intra-generational mobility.</li><li>Functionalist view of meritocracy to ensure efficient role allocation – Davis and Moore.</li><li>Parsons on universalistic norms and achieved status.</li><li>Evidence of working-class achievement</li><li>Policies such as compensatory education increasing equal opportunities.</li><li>Increase in qualifications at all levels.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Limited inter-generational mobility</li><li>Marxist view that education is designed to prepare labour force for capitalism.</li><li>Myth of meritocracy</li><li>Bourdieu’s argument that cultural capital is required for success in education.</li><li>Material deprivation limits opportunity in education.</li><li>Policies such as marketisation limit working-class access to opportunity.</li><li>Some policies designed to support social mobility may have the opposite effect, e.g. grammar schools, vocational education.</li><li>Ethnic and gender disadvantages reinforced by class position.</li></ul>										
Research evidence/ theory	DfE statistics Goldthorpe et al Chitty, Heath, Saunders	DfE statistics Youth Cohort Study Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Feinstein, Flaterhy, Bull, Tanner, Mortimore and Whitty, Sullivan, Leech and Campos, Paterson and Iannelli, Breen, Davies										

Question	Answer			Marks
4		In support of the view	Against the view	
	Relevant concepts	Competition, Meritocracy, Compensatory education	Material deprivation, Cultural deprivation, Ideological state apparatus, Cultural capital, Marketisation	
	The above content is indicative and other relevant approaches to the question should be rewarded appropriately.			

**Question 4 levels of response**

The maximum mark for **Question 4** is 26.

Examiners should award up to 10 marks for AO1, up to 6 marks for AO2, and up to 10 marks for AO3.

Level	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	Marks
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good knowledge and understanding of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>The response contains a wide range of detailed points with very good use of concepts and theory/research evidence.</li> </ul>	9–10
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good knowledge and understanding of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>The response contains a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory/research evidence.</li> </ul>	7–8
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>The response contains a narrow range of detailed points or a wider range of underdeveloped points, with some use of concepts or theory or research evidence.</li> </ul>	5–6
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic knowledge and understanding of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>The response contains a narrow range of underdeveloped points and may include basic references to concepts or theories or research evidence.</li> </ul>	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>The response contains only assertive points or common sense observations.</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No knowledge and understanding worthy of credit.</li> </ul>	0

Level	AO2: Interpretation and Application	Marks
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The material selected will be accurately interpreted, well developed and consistently applied to answering the question.</li> </ul>	5–6
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The material selected will be accurate and relevant but lacks either some development or clear application to the question.</li> </ul>	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some attempt to apply sociological material but this lacks focus on or relevance to the specific question.</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No interpretation and application worthy of credit.</li> </ul>	0

Level	AO3: Analysis and Evaluation	Marks
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good analysis/evaluation of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>There is clear and sustained analysis.</li> <li>There is detailed and explicit evaluation of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> </ul>	9–10
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good analysis/evaluation of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>The evaluation is explicit and direct but not sustained or relies on a good account of evidence and arguments suggesting that education makes it difficult for working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> </ul>	7–8
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some analysis/evaluation of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>There is either one point explicitly used to argue for or against the view that education makes it difficult for working class children to achieve social mobility, or a simple descriptive account of evidence and arguments suggesting that education makes it difficult for working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> </ul>	5–6
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic analysis/evaluation of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>There is an attempt to consider more than one side of the debate or one point suggesting that education makes it difficult for working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> </ul>	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited analysis/evaluation of the view that education enables working class children to achieve social mobility.</li> <li>Any analysis or evaluation is incidental, confused or simply assertive.</li> </ul>	1–2
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No analysis and evaluation worthy of credit.</li> </ul>	0