



# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**SOCIOLOGY**

**9699/01**

Paper 1 Socialisation, Identity and Methods of Research

**For examination from 2021**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Specimen**

---

This document has **12** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

**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.

**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 holistically using levels of response mark schemes. When marking holistically, the marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response.

For holistic marking, inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases, candidates may make some responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Describe two types of interview.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structured interview – set questions that are answered by all interviewees.</li> <li>• Unstructured interview – conversational interview with no set questions.</li> <li>• Semi-structured interview – some set questions but with freedom to probe for additional information.</li> <li>• Group interview – respondents answer questions in a group setting.</li> <li>• Focus group – group interview, focused on a particular topic.</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of two types of interview. For each type of interview, up to 2 marks are available:</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a type of interview. 1 mark for describing a key feature of the type of interview.</p> <p>(2 × 2 marks)</p>	4

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Explain two reasons why some social groups may be more difficult to research than others.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some groups may not want to be studied, e.g. those engaged in criminal activities.</li> <li>• Difficulties making contact with a suitable sample, e.g. because a sample frame does not exist.</li> <li>• Age, gender, class, ethnicity and/or status differences between the researcher and group.</li> <li>• Legal/ethical constraints may limit research with some groups, e.g. young children.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate point.</li> </ul> <p>For this question, use of sociological material is likely to be demonstrated through reference to methodological concepts or use of examples related to specific research methods.</p> <p>Reward a maximum of two reasons. Up to 4 marks are available for each reason:</p> <p>1 mark for making a point / giving a reason (e.g. people engaged in criminal activity may be difficult to study).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining that point (e.g. because they may be reluctant to reveal their criminal activity to people they don't trust).</p> <p>1 mark for selecting relevant sociological material (e.g. this means a researcher may need a someone to act as a gatekeeper to introduce them to the group).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining how the material supports the point (e.g. to help gain their trust so that they open up to the researcher).</p> <p>(2 × 4 marks)</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Explain one strength and one limitation of overt participant observation as a research method.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Able to gain informed consent.</li> <li>• Able to openly ask people questions about what they are doing.</li> <li>• Able to record data / make notes while observing.</li> <li>• Able to collect rich, detailed data.</li> <li>• Can gain insight from participating in the group activities.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate strength.</li> </ul> <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The researcher may influence the behaviour of group members (Hawthorne effect).</li> <li>• Lack of objectivity.</li> <li>• The potential for faulty recall of events / difficult to record notes while participating.</li> <li>• Data overload and the potential for researcher imposition.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate limitation.</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>one strength</b>. For this strength, up to 3 marks are available:</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a strength of overt participant observation (e.g. it is possible to get informed consent from the group).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why the method has this strength (e.g. because participants are aware that you are studying them, you can be open and check that they are agree to participate).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why it is a strength (e.g. gaining informed consent makes the research more ethical).</p> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>one limitation</b>. For this limitation, up to 3 marks are available:</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a limitation of overt participant observation (e.g. participants may not act naturally).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why the method has this limitation (e.g. because the participants are aware they are being observed they may act differently).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why it is a limitation (e.g. this means that the researcher will not gain true insight into the behaviour of the group, so it reduces the validity of the research).</p> <p>(2 × 3 marks)</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>‘Peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity.’</b></p> <p><b>Explain this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of ‘peer pressure’ with suitable examples and/or references to subcultures.</li> <li>• Examples of informal social sanctions in respect of style, taste, attitude (e.g. towards education) and appearance.</li> <li>• Individuals may downplay identities (such as ethnicity) to fit in with a peer group.</li> <li>• Evidence that peer groups may reinforce particular identities (such as gender, ethnicity and class), supported by reference to studies such as Willis, Lees, Hughes, Sewell, etc.</li> <li>• Any other relevant point.</li> </ul> <p><b>Levels of response</b></p> <p><b>Level 3: 8–10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge and understanding of the view that peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity. The response contains two clear and developed points.</li> <li>• Sociological materials such as concepts, theories and evidence, will be used to support both points. The material selected is appropriate and focused on the question with its relevance made clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2: 4–7 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge and understanding of the view that peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity. The response contains one clear and developed point and one relevant but undeveloped point.</li> <li>• Sociological material is used to support at least one point. The material selected is appropriate but not fully focused on the question or its relevance may not be made clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1: 1–3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the view that peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity. The response contains one relevant but undeveloped point and one (or more) points related to the general topic rather than the specific question.</li> <li>• Any supporting material 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>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>‘Peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity.’</b></p> <p><b>Using sociological material, give one argument against this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of the peer group in influencing identity is stronger for some age groups (e.g. youth) than it is for others.</li> <li>• The influence of the peer group may be exaggerated, e.g. many individuals do not necessarily conform.</li> <li>• The role of other agents of socialisation relative to the influence of the peer group, e.g. others may be more or less influential or that it is too simplistic to isolate the power of one agent as the most significant.</li> <li>• Any other relevant argument.</li> </ul> <p><b>Levels of response</b></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 peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity.</li> <li>• Sociological material, such as concepts, theories and evidence, is used to support the argument. 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 peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity.</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 peers are the most important influence in shaping an individual’s identity, 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>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks												
4	<p data-bbox="308 230 1010 264"><b>Evaluate the view that female identity is changing.</b></p> <p data-bbox="308 297 563 331"><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 365 1324 1339"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 376 475 421"></th> <th data-bbox="475 376 901 421">In support</th> <th data-bbox="901 376 1324 421">In evaluation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 421 475 1104">Points</td> <td data-bbox="475 421 901 1104"> <ul data-bbox="491 432 885 645" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of new female identities.</li> <li>• Changes in women's priorities.</li> <li>• Evidence that women are more career-focused.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="901 421 1324 1104"> <ul data-bbox="917 432 1316 1093" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of traditional female identities.</li> <li>• Evidence of socialisation into traditional female roles/identities.</li> <li>• Functionalism and the 'expressive' role of women.</li> <li>• Evidence of gender inequality in the workplace.</li> <li>• Evidence that 'new' female identities are less common in some parts of the world.</li> <li>• Discussion of how female identity is not uniform and can be modified by age, ethnicity and class.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1104 475 1182">Research evidence</td> <td data-bbox="475 1104 901 1182">Jackson, Sharpe, Wilkinson</td> <td data-bbox="901 1104 1324 1182">Oakley, Parsons, Hakim, Adkins</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1182 475 1339">Additional concepts</td> <td data-bbox="475 1182 901 1339">Laddettes, genderquake</td> <td data-bbox="901 1182 1324 1339">Patriarchy, determinism, conformity, social control, normative femininity, passive femininity.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="308 1373 1324 1440">The above content is indicative and other relevant approaches to the question should be rewarded appropriately.</p> <p data-bbox="308 1473 1316 1541"><i>References to sociological theories such as feminism may be present but are not necessary even for full marks.</i></p> <p data-bbox="308 1574 579 1608"><b>Levels of response</b></p> <p data-bbox="308 1641 611 1675"><b>Level 5: 22–26 marks</b></p> <ul data-bbox="308 1686 1316 1921" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good knowledge and understanding of the view that female identity is changing. The response contains a wide range of detailed points with very good use of concepts and theory/research evidence.</li> <li>• The material selected will be accurately interpreted, well developed and consistently applied to answering the question.</li> <li>• Clear, explicit and sustained analysis/evaluation of the view that feminine identity is changing.</li> </ul>		In support	In evaluation	Points	<ul data-bbox="491 432 885 645" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of new female identities.</li> <li>• Changes in women's priorities.</li> <li>• Evidence that women are more career-focused.</li> </ul>	<ul data-bbox="917 432 1316 1093" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of traditional female identities.</li> <li>• Evidence of socialisation into traditional female roles/identities.</li> <li>• Functionalism and the 'expressive' role of women.</li> <li>• Evidence of gender inequality in the workplace.</li> <li>• Evidence that 'new' female identities are less common in some parts of the world.</li> <li>• Discussion of how female identity is not uniform and can be modified by age, ethnicity and class.</li> </ul>	Research evidence	Jackson, Sharpe, Wilkinson	Oakley, Parsons, Hakim, Adkins	Additional concepts	Laddettes, genderquake	Patriarchy, determinism, conformity, social control, normative femininity, passive femininity.	26
	In support	In evaluation												
Points	<ul data-bbox="491 432 885 645" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of new female identities.</li> <li>• Changes in women's priorities.</li> <li>• Evidence that women are more career-focused.</li> </ul>	<ul data-bbox="917 432 1316 1093" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of traditional female identities.</li> <li>• Evidence of socialisation into traditional female roles/identities.</li> <li>• Functionalism and the 'expressive' role of women.</li> <li>• Evidence of gender inequality in the workplace.</li> <li>• Evidence that 'new' female identities are less common in some parts of the world.</li> <li>• Discussion of how female identity is not uniform and can be modified by age, ethnicity and class.</li> </ul>												
Research evidence	Jackson, Sharpe, Wilkinson	Oakley, Parsons, Hakim, Adkins												
Additional concepts	Laddettes, genderquake	Patriarchy, determinism, conformity, social control, normative femininity, passive femininity.												

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>Level 4: 17–21 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge and understanding of the view that female identities are changing. The response contains a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory/research evidence.</li> <li>• The material selected will be accurate and relevant but not always consistently applied to answering the question.</li> <li>• Good analysis/evaluation of the view that feminine identity is changing. The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained or a more descriptive account of evidence and arguments suggesting that female identity is not changing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3: 11–16 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the view that female identities are changing. 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> <li>• The material selected will be largely appropriate but its relevance to the question may be unclear or confused at times.</li> <li>• Some analysis/evaluation of the view that feminine identity is changing. The evaluation may be a simple juxtaposition of different arguments and theories which are not clearly focused on the question or a few simple points suggesting that female identity is not changing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2: 6–10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic knowledge and understanding of the view that female identities are changing. The response contains a narrow range of underdeveloped points and may include basic references to concepts or theories or research evidence.</li> <li>• The material selected is relevant to the topic but lacks focus on or relevance to the specific question.</li> <li>• Any analysis or evaluation is likely to be incidental, confused or simply assertive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1: 1–5 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the view that female identities are changing. The response contains only assertive points or common sense observations.</li> <li>• There is little or no application of sociological material.</li> <li>• Little or no relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 0: 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response worthy of credit.</li> </ul>	

Question	Answer	Marks												
5	<p data-bbox="304 232 1198 266"><b>Evaluate the use of scientific methods in sociological research.</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 304 560 338"><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 376 1326 994"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 376 475 421"></th> <th data-bbox="475 376 903 421">In support</th> <th data-bbox="903 376 1326 421">In evaluation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 421 475 752">Points</td> <td data-bbox="475 421 903 752"> <ul data-bbox="491 434 887 743" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline of positivist view on the benefit of a scientific approach to research.</li> <li>• Discussion of positivist methods highlighting their reliability and objectivity, e.g. experiments, surveys.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="903 421 1326 752"> <ul data-bbox="919 434 1315 743" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critique of the positivist approach from an interpretivist perspective.</li> <li>• Critique of the notion of objectivity.</li> <li>• Discussion of whether sociology should seek to mimic scientific approaches.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 752 475 875">Research evidence</td> <td data-bbox="475 752 903 875"></td> <td data-bbox="903 752 1326 875">Popper, Kuhn, Lynch may be used to challenge the notion of objectivity.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 875 475 994">Additional concepts</td> <td data-bbox="475 875 903 994">Hypothetico-deductive, objective, quantitative, reliable, representative.</td> <td data-bbox="903 875 1326 994"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="304 1028 1326 1095">The above content is indicative and other relevant approaches to the question should be rewarded appropriately.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1133 1286 1200"><i>References to sociological theories other than positivism and interpretivism may be present but are not necessary even for full marks.</i></p> <p data-bbox="304 1238 576 1272"><b>Levels of response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1310 603 1344"><b>Level 5: 22–26 marks</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 1344 1318 1581" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good knowledge and understanding of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. The response contains a wide range of detailed points with very good use of concepts and theory/research evidence.</li> <li>• The material selected will be accurately interpreted, well developed and consistently applied to answering the question.</li> <li>• Clear, explicit and sustained analysis/evaluation of the use of scientific methods in sociological research.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1619 603 1653"><b>Level 4: 17–21 marks</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 1653 1305 1962" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge and understanding of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. The response contains a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory/research evidence.</li> <li>• The material selected will be accurate and relevant but not always consistently applied to answering the question.</li> <li>• Good analysis/evaluation of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained or a more descriptive account of evidence and arguments suggesting that interpretivist/qualitative methods are better for sociological research.</li> </ul>		In support	In evaluation	Points	<ul data-bbox="491 434 887 743" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline of positivist view on the benefit of a scientific approach to research.</li> <li>• Discussion of positivist methods highlighting their reliability and objectivity, e.g. experiments, surveys.</li> </ul>	<ul data-bbox="919 434 1315 743" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critique of the positivist approach from an interpretivist perspective.</li> <li>• Critique of the notion of objectivity.</li> <li>• Discussion of whether sociology should seek to mimic scientific approaches.</li> </ul>	Research evidence		Popper, Kuhn, Lynch may be used to challenge the notion of objectivity.	Additional concepts	Hypothetico-deductive, objective, quantitative, reliable, representative.		26
	In support	In evaluation												
Points	<ul data-bbox="491 434 887 743" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline of positivist view on the benefit of a scientific approach to research.</li> <li>• Discussion of positivist methods highlighting their reliability and objectivity, e.g. experiments, surveys.</li> </ul>	<ul data-bbox="919 434 1315 743" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critique of the positivist approach from an interpretivist perspective.</li> <li>• Critique of the notion of objectivity.</li> <li>• Discussion of whether sociology should seek to mimic scientific approaches.</li> </ul>												
Research evidence		Popper, Kuhn, Lynch may be used to challenge the notion of objectivity.												
Additional concepts	Hypothetico-deductive, objective, quantitative, reliable, representative.													

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p><b>Level 3: 11–16 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. 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> <li>• The material selected will be largely appropriate but its relevance to the question may be unclear or confused at times.</li> <li>• Some analysis/evaluation of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. The evaluation may be a simple juxtaposition of the benefits and limitations of quantitative and qualitative methods which is not clearly focused on the question or a few simple points about the limitations of the positivist approach or the benefits of an interpretivist approach to research.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2: 6–10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic knowledge and understanding of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. The response contains a narrow range of underdeveloped points and may include basic references to concepts or theories or research evidence.</li> <li>• The material selected is relevant to the topic but lacks focus on or relevance to the specific question.</li> <li>• Any analysis or evaluation is likely to be incidental, confused or simply assertive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1: 1–5 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the use of scientific methods in sociological research. The response contains only assertive points or common sense observations.</li> <li>• There is little or no application of sociological material.</li> <li>• Little or no relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 0: 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response worthy of credit.</li> </ul>	

**BLANK PAGE**