

---

**SOCIOLOGY**

**9699/22**

Paper 2 Theory and Methods

**May/June 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 May/June 2019 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 **13** printed pages.

**PUBLISHED****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.

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(a)	<p><b>What is meant by the term <i>content analysis</i>?</b></p> <p>1 mark for a partial definition such as ‘analysing the media’ or ‘analysing qualitative sources’.</p> <p>2 marks for a clear and accurate definition:</p> <p>A research method used to analyse the meaning/content of qualitative material (e.g. in the media) by measuring patterns in the way the data is presented.</p>	<b>2</b>
1(b)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> advantages of using a structured interview.</b></p> <p>Points that can be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good response rate.</li> <li>• Ease of coding answers/creating statistical data.</li> <li>• High in reliability.</li> <li>• No requirement for highly trained/skilled interviewers.</li> <li>• Cost and time efficient compared with other methods.</li> <li>• Overcomes problems with illiteracy.</li> <li>• Clarification role.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark for the point plus 1 mark for development (2 × 2 marks). Development points may also be linked to key concepts, e.g. validity, reliability and representativeness.</p>	<b>4</b>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(c)	<p><b>Explain why questionnaires are considered to be high in reliability.</b></p> <p><b>0–4</b> Lower in the band, a few simple remarks which might identify features of a questionnaire but with little or no focus on the issue of reliability.</p> <p>Higher in the band, a basic outline of questionnaire research with at least one accurate point made about why a questionnaire may be considered a reliable method. However, the link to reliability may be implicit.</p> <p><b>5–8</b> Lower in the band a sound account that is clearly focused on the reliability of questionnaires. There are likely to be two or more points made but not all of these may be fully accurate/well developed. For example, the use of key concepts may be inconsistent.</p> <p>Higher in the band, there is likely to be a clear and accurate explanation with links to relevant key concepts. A range of points will be covered or fewer points in detail. There may be good use of empirical examples to illustrate points made.</p> <p>Supporting reasons might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easy to replicate – it is likely that the same or similar results will be obtained by other researchers.</li> <li>• All respondents asked same questions in same order.</li> <li>• Minimal/no involvement of the researcher – avoids researcher effect.</li> <li>• Facilitates comparability – patterns/trends to be identified.</li> </ul> <p><i>A good list of undeveloped points may gain up to 6 marks. To go higher, some of the points should be developed This question asks candidates to ‘explain’, therefore there is no requirement for assessment.</i></p>	<b>8</b>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(d)	<p><b>Assess interpretivist arguments in favour of unstructured interviews in sociological research.</b></p> <p><b>0–4</b>            Answers at this level are likely to show only limited appreciation of the issues raised in the question.</p> <p>Lower in the level (1–2 marks), a simple answer may describe a few vague features of interviews rather than unstructured interviews.</p> <p>Higher in the level (3–4 marks), a general description of an unstructured interview perhaps indicating a strength of the method. Other answers may focus attention on interpretivism but make little or no reference to the question.</p> <p>Answers which offer weak, possibly non-sociological points even if on both sides should be placed within this level. There may be over-reliance on the stem.</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 account of some arguments in favour of using unstructured interviews perhaps highlighting one or two relevant points with some development e.g. there may be some content focusing on the claim that unstructured interviews generate valid data but with only tacit links to interpretivism. At this level answers are likely to be lacking in breadth or depth.</p> <p>Higher in the level (7–8 marks), a sound attempt to explain interpretivist arguments in favour of unstructured interviews. There may be references to relevant empirical studies. There is likely to be either greater depth or breadth of knowledge and understanding.</p> <p><b>A descriptive answer cannot gain more than 8 marks.</b></p>	<b>11</b>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(d)	<p><b>9–11</b></p> <p>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 unstructured interviews. This could take various forms.</p> <p>Lower in the level (9–10 marks), the assessment may be limited in range or depth. For example, the assessment may be based on a juxtaposition of arguments in favour of unstructured and structured interviews or there may be a general evaluative point not well linked to interpretivism.</p> <p>Higher in the level (11 marks), the assessment will have more range or depth. Unstructured interviews will be evaluated probably via reference to key concepts such as reliability, validity, objectivity and representativeness, and/or theoretical positions [interpretivist/positivist].</p> <p>Interpretivist arguments in favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to build relationships based on trust [rapport] affording more valid data.</li> <li>• Unstructured interviews are a method that enables verstehen (an understanding of how the respondent really thinks and feels).</li> <li>• Unstructured interviews may be particularly apt when the subject matter is personal.</li> <li>• Flexibility: can probe, clarify and change direction.</li> <li>• Depth and detail.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their lack of reliability/replicability.</li> <li>• Sample size, lack of representativeness/generalisability.</li> <li>• The interviewer effect.</li> <li>• Social desirability bias.</li> <li>• Researcher imposition/researcher values.</li> <li>• Non-scientific characteristics.</li> <li>• Practical issues.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
2	<p data-bbox="365 217 1756 245"><b>‘Only the rich and powerful benefit from the existence of social order.’ Explain and assess this view.</b></p> <p data-bbox="365 288 416 317"><b>0–6</b></p> <p data-bbox="365 320 1592 349">Answers at this level are likely to be assertive and focus on a few common sense observations.</p> <p data-bbox="365 389 1910 451">Lower in the band (1–3 marks), answers may make one or two vague points about what social order means with little or no links to the question.</p> <p data-bbox="365 491 1910 587">Higher in the level (4–6 marks), there may be few simple points based on assertion or common sense but with very little detail or development that is relevant to the question as set. For example, a couple of remarks showing only a simple understanding of what is meant by social order or of the rich and powerful.</p> <p data-bbox="365 627 432 655"><b>7–12</b></p> <p data-bbox="365 659 1599 687">Answers at this level will show some sociological knowledge and understanding of the question.</p> <p data-bbox="365 727 1868 823">Lower in the level (7–9 marks), a narrow range of underdeveloped points, possibly with some inaccuracies. Answers may be rather list-like and are likely to focus on a basic account of Marxist theory and perhaps an implicit understanding of how this may be linked to social order.</p> <p data-bbox="365 863 1868 994">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. For example, candidates who provide a general summary of the Marxist perspective may introduce the idea of coercion and how it may be linked to social order. However, answers will be largely descriptive at this level.</p> <p data-bbox="365 1034 448 1062"><b>13–18</b></p> <p data-bbox="365 1066 1874 1128">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 data-bbox="365 1168 1888 1299">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. For example, an outline of what is meant by ideology or hegemony may be present. A broad distinction between consensus and conflict theories of social order is likely to feature. Thinkers such as Marx, Durkheim, Hobbes may be cited.</p>	25



**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
2	<p>Higher in the band (16–18 marks) answers will use a wider range of knowledge, some well-developed points and perhaps be supported by the use of studies, concepts and/or theory. There is likely to be some attempt to explain the view in the question, most likely by reflecting on how rich and powerful groups dominate ideas and other controlling mechanisms to achieve social order. The treatment of relevant theoretical issues is likely to be more detailed. 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>There is no requirement for assessment at this level</b></p> <p><b>19–25</b> Answers at this level must achieve three things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>First</u>, there will be good sociological knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• <u>Second</u>, the material used will be interpreted accurately and applied effectively to answering the question.</li> <li>• <u>Third</u>, there must also be some evidence of assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Lower in the level (19–21 marks), the assessment may be largely delivered through juxtaposition of contrasting arguments and theories. Alternatively, the assessment may be limited to just one or two evaluative points that are explicitly stated. At this level, assessment is likely to be reliant on contrasting the Marxist position with one other theory, probably functionalism although the interactionist view may also feature. Feminist theory may be brought in to offer an alternative approach to the role of powerful groups in effecting social order.</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. An accurate and detailed evaluative account of different theories of social order might feature at this level. Very good responses may distinguish between different strands of Marxist theory (cultural versus structural Marxist views about ideology, for example.)</p> <p>There is likely to be a well-formulated conclusion.</p>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
2	<p>Arguments for the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social order is linked to economic factors (determinism).</li> <li>• Role of ideology, hegemony and coercion in securing social order.</li> <li>• Monopoly of power leads to dominant ideas that reflect 'rich and powerful' interests.</li> <li>• Social world characterised by conflict.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments against the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functionalist (consensus) rejection of this analysis – Marxists overestimate conflict; values and interests are mainly common.</li> <li>• The distinction between organic and mechanical solidarity.</li> <li>• Interactionist rejection – rejects the over-socialised model of human behaviour implicit in the Marxist approach.</li> <li>• Feminist rejection – conflict, ideology and coercion based on gender not class.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<p><b>'Both structuralist and interactionist theories fail to adequately explain the relationship between the individual and society.'</b> Explain and assess this view.</p> <p><b>0–6</b> Answers at this level are likely to be assertive and focus on a few common sense observations.</p> <p>Lower in the level (1–3 marks), one or two vague points about how society influences the individual with few or no links to the question.</p> <p>Higher in the level (4–6 marks), a few simple points based on assertion or common sense but with very little detail or development that is relevant to the question as set. For example, a couple of remarks about socialisation, or the individual and society.</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. For example, the response may be confined to an account of socialisation, probably functionalist. Answers may be rather list-like with only partial relevance to the question.</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. There may be a basic attempt to explain the idea that individuals are shaped by structural forces Alternatively, the focus may be on an interactionist account with a basic outline of social action theory. It is not necessary for both theories to feature to achieve this level. However, answers will be largely descriptive at this level.</p>	25

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<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. For example, through a discussion of Durkheim’s notion that society is an external reality shaping the individual. There may be a lack of balance in terms of the coverage of theories discussed.</p> <p>Higher in the level (16–18 marks), answers will use a wide range of relevant knowledge, including concepts and/or theory, and include some well-developed points. There is likely to be some attempt to explain the view in the question, perhaps via key concepts such as social facts, macro and micro, determinism, voluntarism and labelling, etc. Thinkers such as Durkheim, Marx, Wrong and Shutz are likely to feature. The treatment of relevant theoretical issues is likely to be more detailed.</p> <p>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>There is no requirement for assessment at this level</b></p> <p><b>19–25</b> Answers at this level must achieve three things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>First</u>, there will be good sociological knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• <u>Second</u>, the material used will be interpreted accurately and applied effectively to answering the question.</li> <li>• <u>Third</u>, there must also be some evidence of assessment.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<p>Lower in the level (19–21 marks), the assessment may be largely delivered through juxtaposition of contrasting arguments and theories. Alternatively, the assessment may be limited to just one or two evaluative points that are explicitly stated. At this level, assessment is likely to be reliant on reviewing the limitations of one of the perspectives, for example, a critique of structural approach via the concept of determinism (Wrong's concept of oversocialisation may be cited). However, the assessment at this level may lack depth and possibly contain some over-generalisation. Postmodern ideas may be used as a tool of analysis.</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 some direct engagement with the issues raised by the structuralist and interactionist views of the individual in relation to society, and the degree to which behaviour may be subject to constraining forces. Very good responses are likely to introduce a discussion of structuration [Giddens] as a way of formulating some conclusions, or possibly reference to Weber or neo-Marxists who combine elements of both approaches.</p> <p>There is likely to be a well-formulated conclusion.</p> <p>Arguments for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structuration [Giddens].</li> <li>• Weberian or neo-Marxists who combine elements of both approaches.</li> <li>• Postmodern thinking.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments</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>• Mead's concept of the 'social self' as created through social interaction.</li> </ul>	