



# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**SOCIOLOGY**

**9699/02**

Paper 2 The Family

**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 functions of the family.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socialisation/education – parents teach children the key rules of society.</li> <li>• Stabilisation of adult personalities / emotional support – family members give and receive emotional support.</li> <li>• Reproduction – the family reproduce the next generation which is necessary for society to continue.</li> <li>• Regulation of sexual relationships – in most societies there are rules forbidding sexual activity outside of marriage.</li> <li>• Work/production/economic – in some societies, families work together, with members specialising in certain tasks.</li> <li>• Consumption – families purchase and consume goods together which benefits the economy.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate response.</li> </ul> <p>For each function, up to 2 marks are available:<br/>1 mark for identifying a function.<br/>1 mark for describing how the family performs the function or how the function benefits society.</p> <p>(2 × 2 marks)</p> | <b>4</b> |

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2(a)     | <p><b>Explain two ways in which the family supports capitalism, according to Marxist theory.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing comfort from exploitation.</li> <li>• Teaching and reinforcing capitalist ideology.</li> <li>• Raising the next generation of workers.</li> <li>• Family as a unit of consumption.</li> <li>• Women as a reserve army of labour.</li> </ul> <p>For this question, use of sociological material is likely to be demonstrated through references to Marxist concepts, theories and studies.</p> <p>Reward a maximum of two ways. Up to 4 marks are available for each way:</p> <p>1 mark for making a point / giving a way (e.g. the family provide comfort and support).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining that point (e.g. through emotional care and love, the family soothes the frustration caused by being exploited at work).</p> <p>1 mark for selecting relevant sociological material (e.g. Zaretsky argues that the family is a refuge in a brutal society).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining how the material supports the point. (e.g. Zaretsky is arguing that the positive things provided by the family support capitalism by relieving the frustrations of workers so that they can continue going to work).</p> <p>(2 × 4 marks)</p> | 8     |

| Question | Answer   | Marks    |
|----------|--|----------|
| 2(b)     | <p><b>Explain two limitations of the Marxist view of the family.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overly focused on economic explanations.</li> <li>• Ignores how capitalism has improved the lives of families.</li> <li>• Marxist theory has difficulty explaining the growth in family diversity.</li> <li>• It assumes that all families teach capitalist ideology.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate limitation.</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>two limitations</b>. Up to 3 marks are available for each limitation:</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a limitation of Marxism (e.g. Marxism focuses on how capitalism is negative for family members).</p> <p>1 mark for describing why Marxism has this limitation (e.g. it assumes that the family exists simply to keep workers exploited and oppressed).</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why it is a limitation (e.g. many workers these days have more positive lives due to advances associated with capitalism and these benefits to the family are ignored by Marxism).</p> <p>(2 × 3 marks)</p> | <b>6</b> |

| Question | Answer   | Marks     |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3(a)     | <p><b>‘Family diversity is positive for society.’</b></p> <p><b>Explain this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Supporting reasons might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased tolerance in society.</li> <li>• Increased possibility for individuals to choose a family which meets their individual needs and circumstances.</li> <li>• May lead to a reduction in patriarchal society / abusive relationships.</li> <li>• Postmodernist views of choice and fluidity.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate 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 family diversity is positive for society. 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 family diversity is positive for society. 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 family diversity is positive for society. 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 selected will lack 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>‘Family diversity is positive for society.’</b></p> <p><b>Using sociological material, give one argument against this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Arguments might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Right perspectives on the consequences of family diversity (e.g. poor socialisation, increase in crime and welfare dependency).</li> <li>• Functionalist view of the benefits of the nuclear family.</li> <li>• Undermines value consensus in society.</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 family diversity is positive for society.</li> <li>• Sociological materials such as concepts, theories and evidence, will be used to support the argument. The material selected will be 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 family diversity is positive for society.</li> <li>• The material selected may be appropriate but not fully focused on the question. Sociological evidence will be used but its relevance to the argument may not be 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 family diversity is positive for society, which is undeveloped or lacking clarity.</li> <li>• Any material selected will lack 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><b>Evaluate the view that the nuclear family is universal.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 376 1321 1137"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>In support</th> <th>In evaluation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>Murdock's cross-cultural study<br/>Parsons and functional fit<br/>Structural convergence<br/>Dominance thesis</td> <td>Evidence of family diversity used to question the universality of the nuclear family.<br/><br/>Cross-cultural evidence against the universality of the nuclear family (e.g. the Nayar, the Lakker, the Ashanti).<br/><br/>Laslett and Anderson and/or other historical evidence to criticise Parsons.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research evidence</td> <td>Parsons, Murdock, Goode, Skolnick</td> <td>Stacey, Gough, Keesing, Herndon, Sheeran</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional concepts</td> <td>Geographic mobility, basic and irreducible functions</td> <td>Matrifocal families, female-carer core, same-sex families, new world black families, families of choice.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above content is indicative and other relevant approaches to the question should be rewarded appropriately.</p> <p>Or any other relevant point.</p> <p><b>Levels of response</b></p> <p><b>Level 5: 22–26 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good knowledge and understanding of the view that the nuclear family is universal. 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 the nuclear family is universal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4: 17–21 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good knowledge and understanding of the view that the nuclear family is universal. The response contains a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory or 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 the nuclear family is universal. The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained or a more descriptive account of evidence and arguments suggesting that the nuclear family is not universal.</li> </ul> |   | In support | In evaluation | Points | Murdock's cross-cultural study<br>Parsons and functional fit<br>Structural convergence<br>Dominance thesis | Evidence of family diversity used to question the universality of the nuclear family.<br><br>Cross-cultural evidence against the universality of the nuclear family (e.g. the Nayar, the Lakker, the Ashanti).<br><br>Laslett and Anderson and/or other historical evidence to criticise Parsons. | Research evidence | Parsons, Murdock, Goode, Skolnick | Stacey, Gough, Keesing, Herndon, Sheeran | Additional concepts | Geographic mobility, basic and irreducible functions | Matrifocal families, female-carer core, same-sex families, new world black families, families of choice. | 26 |
|                     | In support   | In evaluation   |            |               |        |  |   |                   |                                   |  |                     |  |  |    |
| Points              | Murdock's cross-cultural study<br>Parsons and functional fit<br>Structural convergence<br>Dominance thesis   | Evidence of family diversity used to question the universality of the nuclear family.<br><br>Cross-cultural evidence against the universality of the nuclear family (e.g. the Nayar, the Lakker, the Ashanti).<br><br>Laslett and Anderson and/or other historical evidence to criticise Parsons. |            |               |        |  |   |                   |                                   |  |                     |  |  |    |
| Research evidence   | Parsons, Murdock, Goode, Skolnick  | Stacey, Gough, Keesing, Herndon, Sheeran  |            |               |        |  |   |                   |                                   |  |                     |  |  |    |
| Additional concepts | Geographic mobility, basic and irreducible functions   | Matrifocal families, female-carer core, same-sex families, new world black families, families of choice.  |            |               |        |  |   |                   |                                   |  |                     |  |  |    |



| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 4        | <p><b>Level 3: 11–16 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the view that the nuclear family is universal. 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 the nuclear family is universal. 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 the nuclear family is not universal.</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 the nuclear family is universal. 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 the nuclear family is universal. 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 attempt at 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><b>Evaluate the contribution of different feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 409 1321 1514"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>In support</th> <th>In evaluation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td> <p>Liberal feminism and discrimination / equal rights / gender roles.</p> <p>Marxist feminism and ideological conditioning / reproduction of labour.</p> <p>Radical feminism and patriarchy.</p> </td> <td> <p>Evaluation may draw out key differences between the different feminist theories.</p> <p>Functionalist criticisms of Liberal and Marxist feminism.</p> <p>Black feminism as a criticism of Liberal feminism – e.g. focussed on the experiences and priorities of white women.</p> <p>Critique of radical feminism as focussing only on a negative view of family and relationships.</p> <p>Evidence of changing relationships between men and women, with men taking a more active and caring domestic role.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research evidence</td> <td>Somerville, Benston, Ansley, Cooper, Feeley, Delphy and Leonard, Greer</td> <td>Abbott, Bryson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional concepts</td> <td>The production of labour power, familiar exploitation, capitalism, ideology, inequality, division of labour.</td> <td>Stabilisation of adult personalities, expressive and instrumental role, new man.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Levels of response</b></p> <p><b>Level 5: 22–26 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good knowledge and understanding of the contribution of two or more different feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. 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 contribution of different feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family.</li> </ul> |  | In support | In evaluation | Points | <p>Liberal feminism and discrimination / equal rights / gender roles.</p> <p>Marxist feminism and ideological conditioning / reproduction of labour.</p> <p>Radical feminism and patriarchy.</p> | <p>Evaluation may draw out key differences between the different feminist theories.</p> <p>Functionalist criticisms of Liberal and Marxist feminism.</p> <p>Black feminism as a criticism of Liberal feminism – e.g. focussed on the experiences and priorities of white women.</p> <p>Critique of radical feminism as focussing only on a negative view of family and relationships.</p> <p>Evidence of changing relationships between men and women, with men taking a more active and caring domestic role.</p> | Research evidence | Somerville, Benston, Ansley, Cooper, Feeley, Delphy and Leonard, Greer | Abbott, Bryson | Additional concepts | The production of labour power, familiar exploitation, capitalism, ideology, inequality, division of labour. | Stabilisation of adult personalities, expressive and instrumental role, new man. | 26 |
|                     | In support   | In evaluation  |            |               |        |  |  |                   |  |                |                     |  |  |    |
| Points              | <p>Liberal feminism and discrimination / equal rights / gender roles.</p> <p>Marxist feminism and ideological conditioning / reproduction of labour.</p> <p>Radical feminism and patriarchy.</p>   | <p>Evaluation may draw out key differences between the different feminist theories.</p> <p>Functionalist criticisms of Liberal and Marxist feminism.</p> <p>Black feminism as a criticism of Liberal feminism – e.g. focussed on the experiences and priorities of white women.</p> <p>Critique of radical feminism as focussing only on a negative view of family and relationships.</p> <p>Evidence of changing relationships between men and women, with men taking a more active and caring domestic role.</p> |            |               |        |  |  |                   |  |                |                     |  |  |    |
| Research evidence   | Somerville, Benston, Ansley, Cooper, Feeley, Delphy and Leonard, Greer   | Abbott, Bryson   |            |               |        |  |  |                   |  |                |                     |  |  |    |
| Additional concepts | The production of labour power, familiar exploitation, capitalism, ideology, inequality, division of labour.   | Stabilisation of adult personalities, expressive and instrumental role, new man.   |            |               |        |  |  |                   |  |                |                     |  |  |    |

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 5        | <p><b>Level 4: 17–21 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge and understanding of the contribution of two or more different feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. 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 contribution of different feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained or a more descriptive account of evidence and arguments that contradict feminist perspectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3: 11–16 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the contribution of the one or more feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. 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 contribution of different feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. The evaluation may be a simple juxtaposition of alternative theoretical perspectives on the family which is not clearly focused on the question or a few simple points about the limitations of feminism generally.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2: 6–10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic knowledge and understanding of the contribution of one or more feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. 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 contribution of one or more feminist perspectives to our understanding of the family. 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**