



Cambridge International AS & A Level

SOCIOLOGY

9699/22

Paper 22

March 2020

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 March 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **10** 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)	What is meant by the term unstructured interview? Unstructured interviews are informal and conversational. The interviewer has topics in mind to cover but few if any pre-set questions. One mark for a partial answer such as such as ‘like a conversation’ or ‘interviews with no questions’. Two marks for a clear and accurate definition.	2
1(b)	Describe two advantages of using secondary data in sociological research. Examples could include: • Practical: cost and/or time effective. • Access to information from the past. • Sometimes the only available source of data in a particular area. • Adds depth and support to primary data. • In the case of official statistics they are often comprehensive and therefore more likely to be representative. • Can be used to examine trends over time. • Can be used as a source of investigation e.g. content analysis. • Other reasonable response. One mark for the example plus one mark for development (2 × 2 marks).	4

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	Explain why positivists favour the use of experiments in sociological research. 0–4 Lower in the band (1–2), a few simple remarks which might put forward some vague points about sociological research in general or about the positivist perspective, without linking the material to experiments specifically. Higher in the band (3–4), a basic account of the use of experiments with at least one accurate point made about why they might be used in sociological research. 5–8 Lower in the band (5–6), a sound account that is largely-focused on reasons why positivists specifically might approve of the use of experiments in sociological research. There are likely to be two or more points made but these may not be fully accurate or not well developed and the links to positivism are restricted or implicit. 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. The analysis here needs to be explicit and well informed. Reasons might include: • Ease of controlling and manipulating variables • Ability to identify causation • Reliability • Scientific status of the research method • Results can be quantified and correlations and comparisons drawn. • Other reasonable response. A good list of undeveloped points may gain up to 6 marks. To go higher, some of the points should be developed.	8

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Assess the interpretivist view that qualitative methods produce data that is high in validity. 0–4 Answers at this level are likely to show only limited appreciation of the issues raised by the question. Lower in the band (1–2), a simple answer may describe a few features of qualitative methods in general or about a specific qualitative method but with no link to any validity. Higher in the band (3–4), one relevant developed or two undeveloped points. These may be an attempt to explain what is meant by validity but with little further development. 5–8 Answers at this level show some sociological knowledge and understanding of the question. Lower in the level (5–6 marks), a basic description highlighting two relevant points with some development e.g. a basic description of qualitative research with only tacit links to the concept of validity. Higher in the level (7–8 marks), there will be a sound attempt to explain the idea that qualitative methods produce data that is high in validity. A range of qualitative methods may be used to illustrate this but these do not need to be exhaustive. At this level there is likely to be useful reference to interpretivism made. There may also be some empirical support given. A one-sided answer that is done very well, could also gain up to 8 marks. 9–11 Answers at this level will demonstrate good sociological knowledge and understanding applied to the question. There will also be an assessment of the interpretivist view that qualitative methods produce highly valid data. Lower in the level (9–10 marks), the assessment may be limited in range or depth for example. This is likely to be achieved by questioning the assumption that data produced using qualitative methods is always high in validity. At the top of the level (11 marks), the assessment will have more range or depth. Informed and explicit links to theory are likely. This may include some questioning of the assumption that the data produced using such methods is always high in validity. For example, candidates might note the problems of maintaining objectivity when using unstructured interviews or participant observation, and reflect on how this impacts on the validity of the data generated.	11

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Points for: • They produce highly valid data that explores the subjective meanings actors hold from their point of view (interpretivist). • Depth and detail . • Reduces researcher imposition. • Opportunity to build relationships based on trust [rapport] affording more valid data. • Range of methods that enable verstehen (an understanding of how the respondent really thinks and feels). • Qualitative interviews may be particularly apt when the subject matter is personal. • Flexibility: can probe, clarify and change direction. Points against: • The data from qualitative methods lack objectivity are value laden and subjective. • Qualitative data lacks reliability and cannot be easily replicated. • Respondents in qualitative research are likely to be influenced by the presence of the researcher. • There are sometimes ethical problems linked to qualitative methods. • Potential for researcher bias. • The small numbers involved often leads to unrepresentative samples. • Practical considerations – time, money etc.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Explain and assess the view that an individual's identity is shaped by social forces beyond their control. 0–6 Answers at this level are likely to be assertive and focus on a few common sense observations. Lower in the band (1–3), answers may be confined to a few vague remarks based on assertion or common sense about individual freedom and the influences on human behaviour with little or no linkage to the question. 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. There may be an attempt to explain the concept of socialisation, but there will be very little detail or development that is relevant to the question as set. 7–12 Answers at this level will show some sociological knowledge and understanding of the question. Lower in the band (7–9 marks), the answer may be confined to a narrow range of underdeveloped points, lacking detail and possibly with some inaccuracies. Answers will be rather list-like and may include descriptive accounts of the processes of socialisation, with no clear references theoretical perspectives. 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. For example, a simple functionalist account of the constraining influences of social forces or some undeveloped links to other structural theories (e.g. Marxist) or vice versa. 13–18 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. There is no requirement for assessment at this level although it may be present. 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 informs the view expressed in the question and the sociological reasoning that underpins it (structuralist perspective). Higher in the band (16–18 marks), answers will use a wider range of relevant knowledge, supported by the use of concepts and/or theory where relevant and include some well-developed points with a more balanced discussion of structural approaches, typically functionalist [e.g. Durkheim and Parsons] and Marxist. There is no requirement for assessment at this level.	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2	19–25 Lower in the band (19–21 marks), the assessment may be largely delivered through juxtaposition of contrasting arguments/theories – structuralist and interactionist. Alternatively, the assessment may be limited to just one or two evaluative points that are explicitly stated. This may be through consideration of relevant empirical evidence, for example from studies of education or deviance. However, the assessment at this level may lack depth and possibly contain some over-generalisation. 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. Arguments may be advanced both for and against the emphasis on social constraint that characterises structural theories, though the two sides do not need to be treated with equal consideration or respect. Determinism versus voluntarism, or Wrong’s ‘oversocialised’ argument may feature; postmodernist views highlighting the limitations of the structuralist viewpoint. Other answers may explore Giddens’ concept of structuration. There is likely to be a well-formulated conclusion. Answers at this level must achieve three things: • First, there will be good sociological knowledge and understanding of the debate between structural and interactionist perspectives. • 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 analysis of the arguments revolving around determinism and voluntarism. Arguments for: • Studies that demonstrate the impact of social forces on human behaviour e.g. Durkheim on suicide, or cross-cultural variations in gender roles. • Conflict and consensus structuralism. Arguments • Structuration [Giddens]. • Weberian or neo-Marxists who combine elements of both approaches. • Postmodern thinking. • Mead’s concept of the ‘social self’ as created through social interaction.	

3	‘Data produced using participant observation is of little value in sociological research.’ Explain and assess this view. 0–6 Answers at this level are likely to be assertive and focus on a few common sense observations. Lower in the band (1–3), answers may be confined to one or two vague remarks based on assertion/common sense understanding about research methods in general. 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. For example, a few limited points broadly demonstrating an understanding of what participant observation involves but offering very little detail or development that is relevant to the question as set. 7–12 Answers at this level will show some sociological knowledge and understanding of the question. Lower in the band (7–9 marks), the answer will be rather list-like and be confined to a narrow range of underdeveloped points about participant observation but these will be lacking detail and possibly with some inaccuracies. Higher in the band (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. These may include some attempt to briefly address the idea of ‘little value’ though the coverage of this theme is likely to be implicit. At this level answers will be largely descriptive. 13–18 Answers at this level will show good sociological knowledge and understanding of both the features of participant observation and the idea that the method has little value in sociological research. The material used will be interpreted accurately and applied effectively to answering the question. 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 claim that participant observation is of ‘little value’. For example, responses may discuss the concept of subjectivity. Empirical examples may be used to illustrate the method but these are likely to be highly descriptive. Higher in the band (16–18 marks), answers will use a wider range of relevant knowledge, supported by the use of concepts/theory where relevant and include some well-developed points. Answers may distinguish between covert and overt in relation to the question and ethical considerations may be introduced. Candidates will begin to address the specific wording of the question, though the analysis may not be fully developed or convincing. There is no requirement for assessment at this level.	25
---	--	----

Question	Answer	Marks
3	19–25 Lower in the band (19–21 marks), the assessment may be largely delivered through juxtaposition of contrasting arguments/theories on the merits of using participant observation. At this level, the ranges of analytical points may be confined to the issues linked to qualitative v quantitative distinction. Alternatively, the assessment may be limited to just one or two evaluative points that are explicitly stated, for example by focusing on the validity of data produced. However, the assessment at this level may lack depth and possibly contain some over-generalisation. 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 e.g. responses may demonstrate the relevance of the distinction between covert and overt participant observation for the question. Alternatively, some candidates may argue that apparent limitations may be more a strength than a weakness (e.g. subjectivity). At this level there is likely to reference to positivism and interpretivism. There is likely to be a well-formulated conclusion. Answers at this level must achieve three things: • First, there will be good sociological knowledge and understanding of the use and value of participant observation as a method. • 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 there is likely to be an accurate and detailed account of merits of the use of participant observation.. For • Valid data collected – high in ecological validity. • Detailed, in depth research of groups and of the meaning they attach to their actions (verstehen). • Research carried out in a ‘natural environment’. • Ability to study groups that are difficult to access e.g. deviant groups. • Distinctions between covert and overt variations (validity and ethics). Against • Unscientific approach typically collecting qualitative data. • Lacks objectivity – personal involvement [‘going native’] can lead to invalid data. • Unreliable – cannot be replicated. • Practical issues – time, money, access, recording data, selective memory etc. • Unrepresentative samples. • Bias – covert PO leads to respondent behaviour being affected by researcher’s presence or actions. Overt PO could lead to the Hawthorne effect. • Potentially unethical.	