



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**SOCIOLOGY**

**9699/12**

Paper 1

**October/November 2021**

**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 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **17** 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.

**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles  
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require  $n$  reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

**2 Presentation of mark scheme:**

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

**3 Calculation questions:**

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

**4 Annotation:**

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Question	Annotation	Meaning
1		Identification of a point
	DEV	Development / description of the point.
2a		Point that has been credited
	E1	Explanation of the point
	M	Material used to support the point
	E2	Explanation of how the material supports the point
2b		Strength / weakness that has been credited
	E1	Explanation of why the method has that strength/weakness
	E2	Explanation of why it is a strength/weakness
3a		Point that has been credited
	EXP	Some explanation but underdeveloped rather than developed
	DEV	Developed point
	M	Material used to support the point
	GEN	Point on the general topic area rather than specific question
3b		Point that has been credited
	EXP	Some explanation but underdeveloped rather than developed
	DEV	Developed point
	M	Material used to support the point

Question	Annotation	Meaning
4/5		Point that has been credited
	EXP	Some explanation but underdeveloped rather than developed
	DEV	Developed point
	M	Material used to support the point
	EVAL	Evaluation point
Other annotations	SEEN	This material receives no credit
	BOD	Benefit of the doubt given
	Vertical wavy line	Irrelevant material

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p data-bbox="304 248 759 282"><b>Describe <u>two</u> types of femininity</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 315 560 349"><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 383 1299 521" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="304 383 1299 450">• Normative / traditional / hegemonic / passive / emphasised / contingent / submissive / 'toxic'</li><li data-bbox="304 454 1299 488">• Assertive / modernised / independent / 'Laddette' / 'girl power'</li><li data-bbox="304 492 1299 521">• Autonomous</li></ul> <p data-bbox="304 555 1326 622">Reward a maximum of two femininities. For each femininity, up to 2 marks are available:</p> <p data-bbox="304 656 738 689">1 mark for identifying a femininity</p> <p data-bbox="304 694 890 728">1 mark for describing the identified femininity</p>	<b>4</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Explain <u>two</u> reasons why a researcher might use more than one method.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To overcome the limitations of one method by the strengths of other methods.</li> <li>• To provide a check on the accuracy of findings of different types of method/data.</li> <li>• The use of different methods or data to check the validity and reliability of the approach taken.</li> <li>• To generate hypotheses from one type of data that can be checked via the other.</li> <li>• Methods that produce the best fit (most suitable, practical) for the subject being studied whether they be quantitative or qualitative, i.e. methodological pluralism.</li> <li>• To build up a fuller picture of the study group, e.g. Barker’s study of the Moonies.</li> <li>• Theoretical position taken (e.g. realist).</li> <li>• Use one method to inform the application of a different method (e.g. unstructured interview to develop categories for a questionnaire).</li> <li>• Any other appropriate reason.</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 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. by overcoming the limitations of one method by the strengths of other methods.)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining that point (e.g. one method may produce valid results that are not necessarily reliable)</p> <p>1 mark for selecting relevant sociological material (e.g. using a questionnaire alongside an unstructured interview)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining how the material supports the point (e.g. gain both the reliability of the questionnaire and the validity of the unstructured interview)</p> <p>(2 × 4 marks)</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Explain <u>one</u> strength and <u>one</u> limitation of using a covert approach to participant observation.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids the Hawthorne effect to the extent that the researcher is incognito.</li> <li>• Ability to study groups that wouldn't otherwise give access to a researcher, e.g. some deviant groups.</li> <li>• Ability to participate in activities that may otherwise be denied to an overt researcher, e.g. dangerous activities.</li> <li>• Easier to gain trust and acceptance than if the researcher's identity is known.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate strength.</li> </ul> <p>Limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practical issues – hard to record data / have to rely on memory; have to devote a lot of time to gain access.</li> <li>• Lacks objectivity – deep personal involvement ['going native'] can lead to invalid data.</li> <li>• Can be dangerous – group members will not provide outsider protection to the researcher.</li> <li>• Can be hard to negotiate withdrawal from the group.</li> <li>• Potentially unethical – privacy, lack of informed consent.</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Any other appropriate limitation.</li> </ul> <p>Reward a maximum of <b>one strength</b> and <b>one limitation</b>. For each, up to 3 marks are available:</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a strength (e.g. avoids Hawthorne effect)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why this method has this strength (e.g. because the participants do not know you are researching them they are less likely to change their behaviour)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why it is a strength (e.g. this increases the validity of the data)</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a limitation (e.g. hard to record data)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why this method has this limitation (e.g. because you are pretending not to be a researcher you can't take notes openly)</p> <p>1 mark for explaining why it is a limitation (e.g. have to rely on memory which may not be accurate)</p> <p>(2 × 3 marks)</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>‘Cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways.’</b></p> <p><b>Explain this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural deprivation is the idea that some social groups experience inadequate socialisation which can negatively impact on their behaviour.</li> <li>• Failings in early socialisation and family background ill-equip individuals in terms of failings in pre-school learning, language skills and appropriate norms, values and attitudes (most often linked to social class.)</li> <li>• This explanation accounts for the likelihood of such groups/individuals to transgress and act in deviant ways.</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 cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways. 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 cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways. The response contains one clear and developed point and one relevant but underdeveloped point.</li> <li>• Sociological material is used to support at least one point. The material selected is appropriate but not clearly focused on the question or its relevance is not 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 cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways. The response contains one relevant but underdeveloped 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>‘Cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways.’</b></p> <p><b>Using sociological material, give <u>one</u> argument against this view.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critique of the explanation in terms of differences in culture rather than deprivation (subcultural)</li> <li>• social resistance</li> <li>• marginalisation – approaches that view the relationships between different groups as shaped by power leads to some marginalised/resistant groups (e.g. the young) being ‘labelled’ as deviant etc</li> <li>• biological / psychological explanations for deviant behaviour focusing on deficient personalities more prone to deviance</li> <li>• Evidence of the persistence of social pressure promoting conformity (social exchange theory)</li> <li>• Structural approaches that focus on socio-economic factors that give rise to deviant/ criminal behaviour</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 cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways.</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 cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways.</li> <li>• The material selected is appropriate but not clearly focused on the question or 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 cultural deprivation is the main reason that individuals act in deviant ways which is undeveloped or lacking clarity.</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>	6

Question	Answer	Marks												
4	<p><b>Evaluate the view that an individual’s identity is largely shaped by their social class.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 416 1326 1659"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 416 488 481"></th> <th data-bbox="488 416 930 481">In support of the view</th> <th data-bbox="930 416 1326 481">Against the view</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 481 488 1431">Points</td> <td data-bbox="488 481 930 1431"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of diverse social characteristics between class groups, which can be linked to different socialisation experiences for each.</li> <li>• Social class critical influence on attitudes and values, e.g. education, politics (voting), workplace, peer groups, cultural consumption etc</li> <li>• Survey evidence that people identify themselves in class terms.</li> <li>• Many sociologists point to objective differences between class groups linked to work and income</li> <li>• Structural differences persist i.e. life chances still class, based.</li> <li>• Even those rejecting class labels recognise that class is an important ‘structural’ force in theirs and other people’s lives (Savage).</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="930 481 1326 1431"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that (class) identity has fragmented if not disappeared.</li> <li>• Social changes especially in relation to work and migration, have led to a blurring of boundaries with identity much more individualistic – ‘we’re all middle class now.’</li> <li>• Class a dated and over-deterministic concept</li> <li>• Identity now linked to consumption, leisure and lifestyle choices</li> <li>• Subjective view.</li> <li>• Alternative approach would be to compare the relative importance of class to other sources of identity, e.g. gender, ethnicity, etc</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1431 488 1532">Research evidence</td> <td data-bbox="488 1431 930 1532">BSA, Savage</td> <td data-bbox="930 1431 1326 1532">Pakulski, Clarke and Saunders</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1532 488 1659">Additional concepts</td> <td data-bbox="488 1532 930 1659">Objective, subjective, life chances, centred identities</td> <td data-bbox="930 1532 1326 1659">Decentred identities; oversocialised, deterministic</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="304 1697 1326 1765">The above content is indicative and other relevant approaches to the question should be rewarded appropriately.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1800 1326 1868"><i>References to sociological theories such as functionalism, feminism, or interactionism may be present but are not necessary even for full marks.</i></p>		In support of the view	Against the view	Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of diverse social characteristics between class groups, which can be linked to different socialisation experiences for each.</li> <li>• Social class critical influence on attitudes and values, e.g. education, politics (voting), workplace, peer groups, cultural consumption etc</li> <li>• Survey evidence that people identify themselves in class terms.</li> <li>• Many sociologists point to objective differences between class groups linked to work and income</li> <li>• Structural differences persist i.e. life chances still class, based.</li> <li>• Even those rejecting class labels recognise that class is an important ‘structural’ force in theirs and other people’s lives (Savage).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that (class) identity has fragmented if not disappeared.</li> <li>• Social changes especially in relation to work and migration, have led to a blurring of boundaries with identity much more individualistic – ‘we’re all middle class now.’</li> <li>• Class a dated and over-deterministic concept</li> <li>• Identity now linked to consumption, leisure and lifestyle choices</li> <li>• Subjective view.</li> <li>• Alternative approach would be to compare the relative importance of class to other sources of identity, e.g. gender, ethnicity, etc</li> </ul>	Research evidence	BSA, Savage	Pakulski, Clarke and Saunders	Additional concepts	Objective, subjective, life chances, centred identities	Decentred identities; oversocialised, deterministic	26
	In support of the view	Against the view												
Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of diverse social characteristics between class groups, which can be linked to different socialisation experiences for each.</li> <li>• Social class critical influence on attitudes and values, e.g. education, politics (voting), workplace, peer groups, cultural consumption etc</li> <li>• Survey evidence that people identify themselves in class terms.</li> <li>• Many sociologists point to objective differences between class groups linked to work and income</li> <li>• Structural differences persist i.e. life chances still class, based.</li> <li>• Even those rejecting class labels recognise that class is an important ‘structural’ force in theirs and other people’s lives (Savage).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that (class) identity has fragmented if not disappeared.</li> <li>• Social changes especially in relation to work and migration, have led to a blurring of boundaries with identity much more individualistic – ‘we’re all middle class now.’</li> <li>• Class a dated and over-deterministic concept</li> <li>• Identity now linked to consumption, leisure and lifestyle choices</li> <li>• Subjective view.</li> <li>• Alternative approach would be to compare the relative importance of class to other sources of identity, e.g. gender, ethnicity, etc</li> </ul>												
Research evidence	BSA, Savage	Pakulski, Clarke and Saunders												
Additional concepts	Objective, subjective, life chances, centred identities	Decentred identities; oversocialised, deterministic												

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<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 an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class. 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 an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class.</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 an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class. 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 an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class. The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained or a more descriptive account of evidence and arguments suggesting that identity is shaped by factors other than class.</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 an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class. 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 quantitative research methods have more strengths than limitations. 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 identity is shaped by factors other than class</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 an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class. 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>	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>Level 1: 1–5 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the view that an individual's identity is largely shaped by their social class. 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> No response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks															
5	<p data-bbox="304 248 1153 282"><b>Evaluate the use of secondary data in sociological research.</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 309 560 342"><b>Indicative content</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 367 1326 1951"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 367 475 454"></th> <th data-bbox="475 367 890 454">In support of secondary data</th> <th data-bbox="890 367 1326 454">Against the use of secondary data</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 454 475 568">Points</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="475 454 1326 568">Distinctions between quantitative and qualitative secondary data may be used to shape and inform the argument presented.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="475 568 890 1783"> <p data-bbox="584 580 831 613"><u>Quantitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 618 866 1301" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost/time effective.</li> <li>• Access to information from the past.</li> <li>• Sometimes the only available source of data in a particular area.</li> <li>• Adds depth and support to primary data.</li> <li>• In the case of official statistics they are often comprehensive and therefore more likely to be representative.</li> <li>• Can be used to exam trends over time – historical.</li> <li>• Can be used as a source of investigation, e.g. content analysis.</li> <li>• Theoretical angle</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="488 1603 711 1637"><u>Qualitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 1641 810 1778" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authentic accounts providing detailed in-depth material</li> <li>• High in validity</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="890 568 1326 1783"> <p data-bbox="1011 580 1259 613"><u>Quantitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="906 618 1313 1570" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey design is not by researcher</li> <li>• Concepts used not operationalised by the researcher, e.g. poverty.</li> <li>• Researchers have to decide what the data means.</li> <li>• Official statistics may be prone to government manipulation, especially in areas such as crime or employment.</li> <li>• Partial picture because they only provided data on recorded events, i.e. they don't show unrecorded crime.</li> <li>• Interpretivist critique of validity – don't reveal much of the reasons why behaviour takes place</li> <li>• General point: as compared to primary data, research based on secondary sources may assessed from a range of angles</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="906 1603 1129 1637"><u>Qualitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="906 1641 1182 1778" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positivist critique: unreliable, unrepresentative</li> <li>• Highly subjective</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1783 475 1870">Research evidence</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="475 1783 1326 1870">Official statistics, e.g. Social Trends, examples of studies using forms of quantitative and qualitative secondary data.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1870 475 1951">Additional concepts</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="475 1870 1326 1951">Positivism, interpretivism</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="304 1984 1326 2051">The above content is indicative and other relevant approaches to the question should be rewarded appropriately.</p>		In support of secondary data	Against the use of secondary data	Points	Distinctions between quantitative and qualitative secondary data may be used to shape and inform the argument presented.			<p data-bbox="584 580 831 613"><u>Quantitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 618 866 1301" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost/time effective.</li> <li>• Access to information from the past.</li> <li>• Sometimes the only available source of data in a particular area.</li> <li>• Adds depth and support to primary data.</li> <li>• In the case of official statistics they are often comprehensive and therefore more likely to be representative.</li> <li>• Can be used to exam trends over time – historical.</li> <li>• Can be used as a source of investigation, e.g. content analysis.</li> <li>• Theoretical angle</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="488 1603 711 1637"><u>Qualitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 1641 810 1778" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authentic accounts providing detailed in-depth material</li> <li>• High in validity</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1011 580 1259 613"><u>Quantitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="906 618 1313 1570" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey design is not by researcher</li> <li>• Concepts used not operationalised by the researcher, e.g. poverty.</li> <li>• Researchers have to decide what the data means.</li> <li>• Official statistics may be prone to government manipulation, especially in areas such as crime or employment.</li> <li>• Partial picture because they only provided data on recorded events, i.e. they don't show unrecorded crime.</li> <li>• Interpretivist critique of validity – don't reveal much of the reasons why behaviour takes place</li> <li>• General point: as compared to primary data, research based on secondary sources may assessed from a range of angles</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="906 1603 1129 1637"><u>Qualitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="906 1641 1182 1778" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positivist critique: unreliable, unrepresentative</li> <li>• Highly subjective</li> </ul>	Research evidence	Official statistics, e.g. Social Trends, examples of studies using forms of quantitative and qualitative secondary data.		Additional concepts	Positivism, interpretivism		26
	In support of secondary data	Against the use of secondary data															
Points	Distinctions between quantitative and qualitative secondary data may be used to shape and inform the argument presented.																
	<p data-bbox="584 580 831 613"><u>Quantitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 618 866 1301" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost/time effective.</li> <li>• Access to information from the past.</li> <li>• Sometimes the only available source of data in a particular area.</li> <li>• Adds depth and support to primary data.</li> <li>• In the case of official statistics they are often comprehensive and therefore more likely to be representative.</li> <li>• Can be used to exam trends over time – historical.</li> <li>• Can be used as a source of investigation, e.g. content analysis.</li> <li>• Theoretical angle</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="488 1603 711 1637"><u>Qualitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 1641 810 1778" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authentic accounts providing detailed in-depth material</li> <li>• High in validity</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1011 580 1259 613"><u>Quantitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="906 618 1313 1570" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey design is not by researcher</li> <li>• Concepts used not operationalised by the researcher, e.g. poverty.</li> <li>• Researchers have to decide what the data means.</li> <li>• Official statistics may be prone to government manipulation, especially in areas such as crime or employment.</li> <li>• Partial picture because they only provided data on recorded events, i.e. they don't show unrecorded crime.</li> <li>• Interpretivist critique of validity – don't reveal much of the reasons why behaviour takes place</li> <li>• General point: as compared to primary data, research based on secondary sources may assessed from a range of angles</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="906 1603 1129 1637"><u>Qualitative forms</u></p> <ul data-bbox="906 1641 1182 1778" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positivist critique: unreliable, unrepresentative</li> <li>• Highly subjective</li> </ul>															
Research evidence	Official statistics, e.g. Social Trends, examples of studies using forms of quantitative and qualitative secondary data.																
Additional concepts	Positivism, interpretivism																

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<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 use of secondary data 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. Clear, explicit and sustained analysis/evaluation of the use of secondary data in sociological research</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4: 17–21 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge and understanding of the use of secondary data 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 secondary data in sociological research. The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained or a more descriptive account of evidence and arguments against the use of secondary data in sociological research.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3: 11–16 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the use of secondary data 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 secondary data in sociological research. The evaluation may be a simple juxtaposition of arguments/evidence about the use of different methods/types of data which are not clearly focused on the question or a few simple points arguing against the use of secondary data in sociological 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 secondary data 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>	

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p><b>Level 1: 1–5 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the use of secondary data 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> No response worthy of credit.</p>	