

---

**SOCIOLOGY**

**9699/22**

Paper 2

**October/November 2019**

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 October/November 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **14** 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 descriptors 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>What is meant by the term <i>primary data</i>?</b></p> <p>1 mark for a partial definition such as ‘interviews or questionnaires’, or ‘their own research’</p> <p>2 marks for a clear and accurate definition: Primary data is information collected by sociologists themselves.</p>	<b>2</b>
1(b)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> reasons why official statistics may lack validity.</b></p> <p>Points that can be included with possible developments:</p> <p>Survey design is not by researcher – hence, they may not be precisely the questions they would choose to ask. Concepts used not operationalised by the researcher – e.g. poverty. Official statistics may be prone to government manipulation – especially in areas such as crime or employment. Partial picture because they only provide data on recorded events – i.e. they don’t show unrecorded crime. Interpretivist critique of validity – don’t reveal much of the reasons why behaviour takes place. Researchers have to decide what the data means – it may be subjective. The statistics are socially constructed (shaped by decisions/interpretations) rather than being objective facts. Outdated – e.g. census returns relating to years previous. Recognition that official statistics are generated from a primary source – e.g. questionnaire that may have faults.</p> <p>One mark for the point plus one mark for development (2 · 2 marks). Development points should link to the concept of validity.</p>	<b>4</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p><b>Explain why positivists think official statistics are a useful source of data.</b></p> <p><b>0–4</b> Lower in the band (1–2), a few simple remarks which might put forward some vague points of what official statistics are but with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>Higher in the band (3–4), a basic account of official statistics with at least one accurate point made about why they might be useful. At this level the focus may be marginal or list identifying things such as their minimal cost and ready availability to the researcher.</p> <p><b>5–8</b> Lower in the band (5–6), a sound account that is clearly focused on the utility of official statistics from a positivist angle. There are likely to be two or more points made but these may not be fully accurate or not well developed. The use of key concepts will be patchy and references to examples not necessarily directed at the question.</p> <p>Higher in the band (7–8), there is likely to be a clear and accurate explanation with links to positivism and relevant key concepts. A range of points will be covered or fewer points in detail. There may be good use of examples to illustrate points made or pertinent references to key thinkers such as Durkheim.</p> <p>Supporting reasons might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Product of a reliable method that is objective and value-free.</li> <li>Large scale nature of the surveys leads to representative, generalisable data.</li> <li>Tend to be comparable as they are typically conducted on a regular basis – enables patterns and trends to be identified.</li> <li>Can be used to identify patterns between variables/test hypotheses [Durkheim].</li> <li>Can be used to study groups that otherwise might be inaccessible.</li> </ul> <p>All points are likely to be linked to key concepts, e.g. validity, reliability, representativeness <i>A good list of undeveloped points may gain up to 6 marks. To go higher, some of the points should be developed.</i> <i>This question asks candidates to ‘explain’, therefore there is no requirement for assessment.</i></p>	<b>8</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<p><b>Assess the strengths of using qualitative secondary sources in sociological research.</b></p> <p><b>0–4</b> Answers at this level are likely to show only limited knowledge of the issues raised in the question.</p> <p>Lower in the level (1–2 marks), a simple answer may describe a few features of secondary sources or qualitative data.</p> <p>Higher in the level (3–4 marks), one relevant developed or two undeveloped strengths. These may highlight differences between quantitative and qualitative secondary sources.</p> <p>Other top of the level answers may direct their focus on aspects of one or two qualitative secondary sources but make little or no reference to the question. A discussion of the advantages of qualitative research with no specific reference to secondary sources could get a maximum of four marks.</p> <p>Answers which offer weak, undeveloped points even if on both sides should be placed within this level. Use of sociological references in this level may be misplaced or inaccurate.</p> <p><b>5–8</b> Answers at this level show some sociological knowledge and understanding of the question.</p> <p>Lower in the level (5–6 marks), a basic description of general strengths highlighting two relevant points with some development, e.g. making a relevant contrast with quantitative sources. For example, there may be a focus on practical advantages [time, effort, money] or perhaps the in-depth nature of such an approach although the theoretical links are likely to be tacit. A particular source, e.g. letters, diaries or life histories may be used to illustrate strengths. At this level answers are likely to be lacking in breadth or depth.</p>	<b>11</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<p>Higher in the level (7–8 marks), there will be a sound attempt to explain that qualitative secondary sources provide highly valid data. A range of qualitative sources may be used to illustrate this but these do not need to be exhaustive. There is likely to be either greater depth or breadth of knowledge and understanding. There may also be some empirical support given. At this level there may be links made to key concepts associated with the interpretivist perspective but these will be somewhat limited in scope or depth.</p> <p><i>Answers in this level should address both sides of the debate but a one-sided answer that is done very well, could also gain up to 8 marks.</i> <i>A descriptive answer cannot gain more than 8 marks.</i></p> <p><b>9–11</b> Answers at this level will demonstrate good sociological knowledge and understanding applied to the question. There will also be an assessment of the strengths of qualitative secondary data.</p> <p>Lower in the level (9–10 marks), the assessment may be limited in range or depth for example, there may be a practical critique of the validity of the use of secondary sources – e.g. the difficulties in verifying their authenticity. Alternatively, the assessment may be based on a simple juxtaposition of validity v reliability, or may be confined to just one or two evaluative points.</p> <p>At the top of the level (11 marks), the assessment will have more range or depth. For example, the subjective interpretation made of secondary sources may be explored. At this level, evaluation is likely to involve reference to key concepts such as reliability, validity, objectivity and representativeness; and/or theoretical positions [positivist vs. interpretivist].</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Practical – access to material that would otherwise involve great cost, time and effort.</li> <li>Practical – obtain material otherwise not available, e.g. historical records.</li> <li>Documentary evidence can be in great depth and detail, hence high in validity (e.g. diaries such as Frank/Pepys).</li> <li>Of interest to interpretivists in particular.</li> <li>Facilitate comparison between past and present (e.g. Pearson on hooligan behaviour).</li> <li>Facilitate semiological analysis.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(d)	Limitations:  Practical – hard to know if the sources is credible/authentic. Potentially lacking validity they may be incomplete, inaccurate or unrepresentative/ungeneralizable. Reliability – do the documents mean the same now as then; rely on the subjective view of those interpreting them.	



Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>‘The topics sociologists choose to study should reflect the values they hold and the people they want to help.’ Explain and assess this view.</b></p> <p><b>0–6</b> Answers at this level are likely to be <b>assertive</b> and focus on a few common sense observations.</p> <p>Lower in the level (1–3 marks), one or two vague remarks based on assertion or common sense with few or no links to the question.</p> <p>Higher in the level (4–6 marks), a few simple points but with very little detail or development that is relevant to the question as set, e.g. an answer simply stating that values might influence sociological research.</p> <p><b>7–12</b> Answers at this level will show <b>some sociological knowledge and understanding</b> of the question.</p> <p>Lower in the level (7–9 marks), a narrow range of underdeveloped points, possibly with some inaccuracies, e.g. outlining the strengths and/or limitations of different research methods. Answers may be rather list-like and are likely to focus on a basic account of why sociologists choose certain research topics but with little reference to values; alternatively they might be focused on how values generally affect the research process.</p> <p>Higher in the level (10–12 marks), answers may either cover a narrow range of points in reasonable detail or cover a wider range of points in limited detail. However, at this level answers will be largely descriptive.</p> <p><b>13–18</b> Answers at this level will show <b>good sociological knowledge and understanding</b>. The material used will be interpreted accurately and applied effectively to answering the question.</p> <p>Lower in the band (13–15 marks), answers are likely to make use of concepts/theory but the range of knowledge demonstrated may be limited and the points covered may lack development. There is likely to be some attempt to explain the view in the question and to engage with the idea that research studies are likely to be affected by the sociologist’s values. Theoretical angles are likely to be noted.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Higher in the level (16–18 marks), answers will use a wider range of relevant knowledge, including concepts and/or theory, and include some well-developed points. At this level, answers are likely to identify how the values of the researcher might affect their choice of research topic. A range of key concepts may be outlined such as value-freedom, value-neutral, objectivity, etc. A broader range of thinkers who may agree with the view may be cited, e.g. Becker, Goffman, and many Marxists and feminists. At the top of the level, candidates will begin to address the specific wording of the question, though the analysis of the view may not be fully convincing.</p> <p><b>19–25</b> Answers at this level must achieve three things:</p> <p><u>First</u>, there will be good sociological knowledge and understanding. <u>Second</u>, the material used will be interpreted accurately and applied effectively to answering the question. <u>Third</u>, there must also be some evidence of assessment.</p> <p>Lower in the level (19–21 marks), the assessment may be largely delivered through juxtaposition of contrasting arguments and theories, e.g. an outline of the views of those who claim sociology can be value free. Alternatively, the assessment may be limited to just one or two evaluative points that are explicitly stated. This may include discussing how far the selection of an area of study and who is studied may be subject to influence by the values of the researcher.</p> <p>However, the assessment at this level may lack depth and possibly contain some over-generalisation.</p> <p>Higher in the level (22–25 marks), there will be sustained assessment and the points offered will be explicit and well-directed towards the question. Assessment here is more likely to be demonstrated by responses that show a good understanding of how sociologists from different theoretical perspectives view the role of values in sociology. Very good responses will directly address the wording of the question and may discuss the social policy angle; others may distinguish between value freedom and value neutrality or the desirability of value free sociology. At the top of this level, answers are likely to offer a sustained deliberation about whether it is inevitable that values affect the research process.</p> <p>There likely to be a well-formulated conclusion.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>For:</p> <p>Partisan sociologists (e.g. Becker) or some Marxists and feminists believe that researchers should be ‘committed’ and open in their sympathies. It is impossible to fully separate values from research so researchers should be open about their views. These sociologists (e.g. Gouldner) are critical of those they regard as ‘pretending’ they are scientific, value free and neutral, e.g. Parsons, Merton confusing value-freedom and objectivity. The interpretivist position on the nature of objectivity and how values affect the selection of topics and execution of research Weber’s view that sociologists cannot be value free in selecting topics, and that their choice of topic (and methods) will reflect this but that they <i>can</i> be objective in their research.</p> <p>Against:</p> <p>Positivist argument that via the hypothetico-deductive method objectivity can be achieved – in choice of method, execution of research and interpretation of results can be achieved. It is important to resist the imposition of subjective elements like values that distort research. Popper’s view that value laden theories will eventually be falsified. A realist or postmodern position.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>'Interactionist accounts of the relationship between the individual and society have more strengths than limitations.'</b> <b>Explain and assess this view.</b></p> <p><b>0–6</b> Answers at this level are likely to be <b>assertive</b> and focus on a few common sense observations.</p> <p>Lower in the level (1–3 marks), one or two vague remarks based on assertion or common sense with few or no links to the question</p> <p>Higher in the level (4–6 marks), a few simple points but there will be very little detail or development that is relevant to the question as set, e.g. a few general statements about how society may influence the individual.</p> <p><b>7–12</b> Answers at this level will show some sociological knowledge and understanding of the question.</p> <p>Lower in the level (7–9 marks), a narrow range of underdeveloped points, possibly with some inaccuracies, e.g. some implicit references to the interactionist approach. Answers may be rather list-like and focus on a basic account of the relationship between the individual and society; there may be reference to the contribution of the agencies of socialisation and/or the stages of socialisation.</p> <p>Higher in the level (10–12 marks), answers may either cover a narrow range of points in reasonable detail or cover a wider range of points in limited detail. Answers at this level may provide a basic outline of social action theory to understanding the relationship between individuals and society. However, answers will be largely descriptive at this level.</p> <p><b>13–18</b> Answers at this level will show good sociological knowledge and understanding. The material used will be interpreted accurately and applied well to answering the question.</p> <p>Lower in the band (13–15 marks), answers are likely to make use of concepts/theory but the range of knowledge demonstrated may be limited and the points covered may lack development. There is likely to be some attempt to explain the view in the question, most likely with a sound account of the interactionist perspective on socialisation. At this level, some key concepts may be outlined, e.g. the social self, looking glass self, determinism, oversocialised model.</p>	<b>25</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Higher in the level (16–18 marks), answers will use a wider range of relevant knowledge, including concepts and/or theory, and include some well-developed points. At this level, answers are likely to highlight the over deterministic nature of structural accounts of socialisation, or perhaps reference a sociological critique of biological accounts of human behaviour. A broader range of thinkers may be cited such as Mead, Cooley, Goffman, Marx, Durkheim, and Wrong. At the top of the level, candidates will begin to address the specific wording of the question, though the analysis of the view may not be fully convincing.</p> <p><b>19–25</b> Answers at this level must achieve three things:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">First, there will be good sociological knowledge and understanding of the underlying debate about the relationship between the individual and society and a reflection on the strengths and weakness of the interactionist view. Second, the material used will be interpreted accurately and applied effectively to answering the question. Third, there must also be some evidence of assessment. At this level expect an accurate and detailed account.</p> <p>Lower in the band (19–21 marks), the assessment may be largely delivered through juxtaposition of contrasting arguments/theories. Alternatively, the assessment may be limited to just one or two evaluative points that are explicitly stated. There is likely to be more detailed treatment of relevant theoretical issues, for example, a critique of the interactionist account of the relationship between the individual and society. Durkheim's notion that society is an external reality shaping the individual or other key functionalist thinkers may be cited.</p> <p>However, the assessment at this level may lack depth and possibly contain some over-generalisation.</p> <p>Higher in the band (22–25 marks), there will be sustained assessment and the points offered will be explicit and well-directed towards the question. Although some of the assessment may be in the form of juxtaposing different sociological perspectives, there is also likely to be some direct engagement with the issues raised by the interactionist position and of the structuralist view of society acting as an external force. At the top of this level, this might include reflections on different strands of determinism in sociological theory, e.g. Durkheim and Parsons from a functionalist perspective, Marxism, and structuralism. High quality responses may introduce a discussion of structuration. Postmodernist views may also feature.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Arguments for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Mead's concept of the 'social self' as created through social interaction.</li><li>Empirical examples illustrating the application of concepts like labelling from areas such as education or deviance.</li><li>Structuration [Giddens].</li><li>Weberian or neo-Marxists who combine elements of both approaches.</li><li>Postmodern thinking.</li></ul> <p>Arguments against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Studies that demonstrate the impact of social forces on human behaviour, e.g. Durkheim on suicide, or cross-cultural variations in gender roles.</li><li>Marxist and feminist approaches.</li><li>Applications of how social constructions constrain, e.g. empirical knowledge of inequality.</li></ul>	