



Cambridge International AS & A Level

SOCIOLOGY

9699/42

Paper 4 Globalisation, Media and Religion

October/November 2023

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

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 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **19** 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.

Using the mark scheme

The questions are marked using a generic analytic mark scheme, which separates the marks for the different assessment objectives (AO). The work is marked for each AO using generic levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response for that AO, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Indicative content is provided as a guide. 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.

Annotations

| Annotation | Meaning |
|---|---|
| BOD | Benefit of the doubt given / the point is just about worthy of credit |
| DEV | Developed point |
| EXP | Some explanation but underdeveloped rather than developed |
| J | Juxtaposition of point |
| K | Knowledge |
| NAQ | Not answered question |
| REP | Repetition |
| SEEN | This material receives no credit, additional points not required |
| TV | Too vague |
|  | Identification of a point |
|  | Irrelevant material |
|  | Point that has been credited |
|  | Off page comment |
|  | On page comment |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1 | <p>‘Global inequality is best explained by the continuing impact of colonialism.’ Evaluate this view.</p> <p>Key focus of the question</p> <p>With this question, candidates have an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of different explanations of global inequality, with particular reference to the impact of colonialism. Good answers will be aware that Marxist theories of development view western colonialism as a key factor explaining the poverty and inequality experienced by developing societies. In this view, colonialism has been directly implicated in the creation of a range of structural constraints and asymmetrical power relations that allow rich countries to benefit from a system of global inequality that ensures less economically developed countries remain poor. Evaluation of this view is likely to be provided by considering alternative explanations of global inequality. Modernisation theory, for example, suggests that in order for poorer countries to develop economically they should adopt the values associated with democracy, private property, entrepreneurship, a rational approach to risk taking, and respect for human rights. Other sociologists have pointed to deficiencies with local elites (corruption, exploitation, ethnic divisions) as a key factor in explaining the poverty experienced by many developing countries.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marxist sociologists argue that Western colonialism has a destructive and exploitative impact on many poorer countries. Colonisation significantly undermined any opportunity poorer countries had to achieve rapid economic development and it has a lasting legacy in ensuring these countries remain dependent on rich Western countries after the end of the colonial regime (a situation referred to as neo-colonialism). Marxist sociologist Frank rejects the modernisation theory argument that global inequalities are caused by ‘deficient’ cultures of poorer nation-states. In contrast, Frank argues that global capitalism has systematically under-developed the economies of poorer countries in order to benefit the economies of the richer nations. This capitalist exploitation has left poorer countries unable to generate significant economic growth, no matter how hard they try or what value systems they adopt. Imperialism and colonialism are the main means through which capitalist exploitation of developing countries has been enacted, according to Frank. Colonies were primarily exploited for their cheap food, raw materials and labour. Local industries were either destroyed or undermined by cheap imported manufactured goods from the West. Immanuel Wallerstein argues that the capitalist economic system is becoming increasingly global in its search for profit. In turn, this is leading to rich countries increasingly focusing on higher skill, capital intensive production, and the rest of the world focusing on low-skill, labour-intensive production and extraction of raw materials. This constantly reinforces the dominance of the rich countries and condemns workers in poorer countries to a life of exploitative, insecure low wage employment. New forms of colonialism (referred to as ‘neo-colonialism’) are more subtle but equally destructive as colonisation. These new forms include TNCs, aid programmes, global debt, and terms of world trade. | 35 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 1 | <p>Against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be incorrect to assume that colonialism, TNCs and aid are simply exploitative and that they have brought no benefits to developing societies. • Modernisation theorists may have exaggerated the importance of Western neoliberal values for economic growth in the developing world, but a combination of Western ideas with some traditional values and religious influences has proved a potent mix in helping some poorer countries to advance, China, Singapore, and South Korea being particular examples. • Recognising the contribution of the cultural dimension in development is particularly important given that it is overlooked in many other theories; for example, Marxist sociologists focus almost entirely on economic factors in explaining the difficulties poorer countries face in escaping from global poverty. • Claims by Marxist sociologists that poorer countries find it almost impossible to escape the continuing impact of colonialism may be unjustified. There have been some improvements in the standard of living of the poor in many developing countries, whether through utilising capitalist mechanisms (South Korea, for example) or by establishing socialist regimes (Cuba, Tanzania). • Factors other than colonisation may be more important in explaining global inequality. For example, entrenched religious and military elites often operate in poorer countries and their interests are not necessarily aligned with efforts to eliminate poverty among their people or to modernise the economic base of the country. Likewise, wars and natural disasters can have a devastating effect in undermining the institutions in poorer countries that might otherwise be able to implement cultural and political reforms of the kind advocated by modernisation theory. • 'Dependency' is a difficult concept to operationalise and, therefore, test or measure empirically. | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 2 | <p>‘Global migration has entirely negative consequences for migrant groups.’ Evaluate this view.</p> <p>Key focus of the question</p> <p>The focus of this question is global migration and the opportunities it offers for people in less economically developed countries. A number of arguments have been advanced that support the view that global migration has only negative consequences for migrant groups. Marxist sociologists are sceptical that migrants from poor countries benefit in any way from working in rich countries; these workers are often exploited and socially isolated, living in poverty and with little protection for their human rights. Feminist sociologists are concerned that global migration may have some adverse consequences that fall on women particularly; female migrants are especially vulnerable to sex trafficking, for example. Good evaluative responses will also consider opposite views that suggest migrant groups derive some benefits from global migration. For example, neoliberals argue that global migration contributes to economic growth and benefits both the sending and the receiving countries. Assimilation theory sees cross-border migration as potentially a positive and beneficial experience for migrants who make a concerted effort to integrate in the culture and social practices of the receiving country.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxist sociologists claim that global migration provides low-cost, readily exploitable labour that enables the owners of capital to generate higher profits. In this view, very few global migrants derive any economic benefit from working in rich countries. • Other sociologists have highlighted negative social and cultural consequences of global migration. For example, migrants may endure long periods of separation from relatives and friends who remain in the sending country. Cultural ties with the home country may be broken and language barriers could make assimilation in the receiving country difficult to achieve. Migrant workers may encounter discrimination, abuse of human rights, and aggression from local people who feel threatened by the arrival of immigrants. • Global migrants are particularly vulnerable to exploitation, as the examples of slave labour and sex trafficking illustrate. Women and children may be particularly vulnerable. • Any chance of achieving a better standard of living as a migrant worker may be scuppered when taking into account the high costs of living and relatively low wages that migrants encounter in rich countries. Case studies of migrant workers often reveal a pitiful existence of poverty, exploitation, sub-standard housing, ill-health, and social isolation. • Hopes of returning home with a financial cushion after a few years working in a rich country often prove unrealistic, people for migrants who are subject to exploitative control by people traffickers and slave traders. | 35 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2 | <p>Against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wages and living conditions in rich countries are potentially much better than migrant workers from poor countries would find back home.• Workers with skills that are in high demand in Western countries, such as doctors and engineers, are particularly well placed to achieve a high standard of living and improve their life chances.• Migrants from areas where traditional values and religious beliefs dominate the local culture may find that life in Western countries offers greater freedom and more choice in lifestyle options, including the opportunity to combine aspects of traditional and modern culture.• Opportunities for upward social mobility may be higher in rich countries where there is a meritocratic ethos; there may also be more scope to set up successful businesses and become wealthy in time.• Functionalists argue that all could benefit from global migration if only cultural barriers to assimilation could be overcome. | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 3 | <p>‘Media content is controlled by the owners of the media.’ Evaluate this view.</p> <p>Key focus of the question</p> <p>The question invites consideration of which social actors or agencies control the media. Good answers will provide a clear account of the arguments supporting the view that media content is controlled by the owners of the media. Studies that illustrate the power of media owners may be cited and evidence about patterns of ownership across the global media might also be considered. High quality responses will also include an evaluation of the view on which the question is based. This is likely to be delivered through considering the role of other social actors and agencies that might have an influence on media content; for example, editors and journalists play a key role in media production and so are well placed to influence decisions affecting the media. Other social actors and agencies that might be able to influence media content include governments, media regulators, audiences, advertisers, and media pressure groups.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many global media companies are owned by wealthy individuals who appear to exercise close control over decisions that affect the content of the media they own. • Marxist sociologists argue that control of the media rests in the hands of owners of the media who ruthlessly use their property assets to generate maximum profit. • Editors and journalists are forced to align themselves with the commercial interests of the owners or they will lose their jobs. • Owners are forced to maintain close oversight of media content in order to ensure that the content satisfies the demands and interests of audiences and thereby helps to generate profit for the owners. • Owners of the traditional media have extended their power by acquiring control of many new media outlets in recent years. • The size and global reach of modern media conglomerates makes them difficult to control by national governments, thereby adding to the power of the owners of those media assets. <p>Against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editors and journalists have close control over the day-to-day running of the media and their specialist knowledge and managerial brief may provide an edge in terms of dominating the decision-making process with the media. • Editors and journalists in particular media outlets are bound by close work ties and this may help form a unity of purpose and mutual support that makes the group formidable in any battles to secure and maintain control of the media. Moreover, editors and journalists across all media outlets have an interest in supporting each other and protecting their professional status and employment position, again making this a powerful group with many levers to pull in terms of controlling the media. | 35 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Media production is an increasingly technical process, which may advantage individuals who have specialist skills and knowledge, such as editors and journalists.• Pluralist theory states that power in relation to the media is fragmented with different groups in society each having some influence. Audiences, for example, must have their interests taken into account by media organisations to some extent or sales of media products will be adversely affected. Advertisers have some influence too, as they provide vital funding for media producers. Government is another social agency competing to exercise control of the media.• The new media have handed some control over media production to individual citizens and this may have lessened the role of owners as gatekeepers of what is published and broadcast.• Most media content is now made by conglomerates which publish different stories across many different organisations and locations so a media owner could not possibly oversee and control all media produced. | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 4 | <p>'The new media is a powerful tool through which people are able to challenge government authority.' Evaluate this view.</p> <p>Key focus of the question</p> <p>The new media are seen as more interactive than the traditional media, giving individual citizens more opportunity to shape media content, network with a wide base of like-minded people, and organise protest and/or resistance to government actions with which they disagree. Good answers to the question will consider how far people have been empowered by the emergence of the new media and whether claims about greater power to challenge government authority can be substantiated (supported). Debates between digital optimists and digital pessimists may feature in well-informed responses. Digital optimists argue that digital activists have used the internet and social media to challenge power elites in a number of ways, including harnessing mass support for political campaigns, raising awareness of government malpractice and maladministration, and coordinating protests and activism. Digital pessimists argue that political protests organised through the new media have had relatively little success in achieving the aims of the activists. Authoritarian governments in particular have been ruthless in cracking down on internet use whenever opponents have any success in using the new media to advance their cause. Examples of particular political campaigns may be used in good answers as a way of debating the issues to which digital optimists and digital pessimists have drawn attention.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new media allow political activists to carry out the same activities as in the past, but more quickly, on a larger scale, and at lower cost. • The new media allow people to organise themselves without formalised bureaucracies and central leaders; protest groups emerge in a more spontaneous fashion and can quickly generate sufficient support to catch political opponents off-guard, as in the case of the Arab-Spring anti-government movements which spread across the Middle East and North Africa between 2010 and 2012. • The new media can be used to monitor the illegal or immoral activities of big businesses and governments. Hacktivist networks can infiltrate corporate and government websites, potentially gaining access to information that would expose wrongdoing and injustice. • The digital revolution has enabled citizen journalism with civilians having access to the technology to send instant messages and pictures around the globe (including to international media outlets) to report on events affecting citizen protests and government attempts to repress opposition. <p>Against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little evidence that use of the new media has helped protest movements achieve their objectives. For example, in relation to the Arab Spring, only the uprising in Tunisia has resulted in a transition to constitutional democracy, in other countries, authoritarianism still prevails, or civil wars continue. | 35 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Authoritarian governments increasingly seek to limit the liberating potential of the new media by deploying censorship, masked political control, and technology capture.• Outside the wealthy, established democracies, large numbers of people still lack access to digital technologies. They are therefore reliant on government controlled traditional media.• Technology providers are under increasing pressure to exercise closer control over how their technology is used and by whom. For example, Facebook has recently banned a number of account users who were seen by the company to be posting socially undesirable content. While some will see this as responsible monitoring of media usage, others will view it as a potentially troubling development that places restrictions on how individuals use the new media and who is judged suitable to post messages and organise protests.• Evidence that new media promotes ‘Slacktivism’ where people believe that they are engaging in activism by sharing a media post rather than taking effective or organised action (so does not successfully challenge government authority – often marches organised on Facebook are not well attended in real life). | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 5 | <p>‘Rather than uniting people in society, religion is a source of conflict.’ Evaluate this view.</p> <p>Key focus of the question</p> <p>The question requires candidates to question the functionalist view that religion serves to unite people in society (social solidarity) through participation in shared rituals and beliefs. Good answers will demonstrate a clear understanding of the arguments for and against the functionalist view. This will include awareness of the possible links between religion and social conflict. There are various contexts in which religion may be a source of conflict, including where religion is used to challenge the status quo, divisions within and between religious groups, and disputes between secular and religious authorities. Evaluative responses will question the extent to which religion is a source of social conflict as opposed to a unifying force in society. The ideological role of religion in helping to mask conflict (the Marxist view, for example) may be considered in this respect. Likewise, candidates might put forward arguments and evidence supporting the Durkheimian view that religion binds people together in society. The role of religion in helping to advance peaceful change (Weber’s explanation of the rise of capitalism, for example) as opposed to violent confrontation may also be advanced in arguing against the view on which the question is based.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The idea that religion unites people in society implies the existence of controls that prevent significant conflict and unrest breaking out in society. Yet there are numerous examples of bloody conflicts and extreme persecution and unrest in which religion appears to have played a part. Conflicts between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland and between Hindus and Muslims in India, are just two examples of this. • Functionalist theories that emphasise the supposed role of religion in promoting social solidarity appear to downplay the potential for conflicts to arise due to divisions within religious groups. For example, various splits and schisms within the Christian church over the centuries. • Conflicts based around religious divisions are rarely short-lived; they often run on in a society for decades and, in some cases, centuries. Hence, it is not as if religious conflicts can be written off as a minor exception to what functionalists see as the normal role of religion in helping to maintain social solidarity. • Whilst it is true that the values of peace and harmony are central to most religious teachings, it is not always the case that organised religions set out determinedly to avoid conflict or to help maintain the status quo. Liberation Theology, for example, is a concerted effort by a committed group of priests in Latin America to challenge oppressive political regimes and press for social changes that would help alleviate poverty and exploitation. | 35 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The idea that religion unites people in society may be a misnomer as religion may actually serve to mask underlying conflicts between people. For example, feminist theories claim that religion is patriarchal and works to keep females in a subordinate position and to legitimise gender inequality. Established religions have been closely associated with the rich and powerful in society, sometimes taking sides against the less privileged and can exacerbate or reinforce class divisions (Marxism). It is hard to see this as promoting social unity and, indeed, it may actually contribute to social conflict in the long run. <p>Against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In most conflict situations, including those where religious divisions are fuelling the unrest, organised religions are also usually trying to be part of the solution, seeking out ways of resolving differences and making overtures of reconciliation. Religious individuals are often able to be 'conscientious objectors' if they are asked to enlist in wars. The success of religion in helping promote social stability can sometimes be seen as contributing to conditions that later result in bloody conflicts breaking out. For example, long periods of order in a society may allow privileged groups to become more powerful at the expense of other groups who they exploit and take for granted. In this situation, support for other religions may build up among marginalised groups, challenging the power of the dominant religion and interests of privileged groups that it supports. In other words, there may be a dialectical relationship between the role of religion in promoting social stability/order and involvement of religions in triggering conflict; these two features of religion are not necessarily inconsistent. Successful capitalist economies (US, UK, Germany, Japan) have often enjoyed long periods of relative stability within their own borders where divisions such as those between employers and workers and managed harmoniously for the most part. Functionalists may be right in arguing that religion has made a significant contribution to achieving this level of integration and stability. This suggests that just as there is evidence to show that religion may sometimes help trigger social conflict, there is also a significant weight of evidence to support claims that religion promotes social stability. Max Weber rightly warned against making sweeping generalisations about the contribution that religion makes to society. He recognised that the role of religion can vary across time and between societies, and that not all religions have the same impact on people's thoughts and behaviour. In some situations, Weber said religion could be a source of social change, in others it may act as a conservative force helping to uphold the status quo. Weber also saw that religion can at times be a catalyst for division and confrontation. This is a more nuanced way of thinking about the role of religion than the one presented in traditional functionalist and Marxist theories of religion. New Age Religions do not have a history of conflict in a way that more established religions often do, so the view in the question is less applicable to them. Religion is used as a form of social control (e.g. Marxist and feminists theories) so in fact may help prevent conflict through ideological control (Marxism – keeping the poor in their place so they do not revolt). | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 6 | <p>‘Religious organisations have little influence in society today.’ Evaluate this view.</p> <p>Key focus of the question</p> <p>This question can be answered by considering the secularisation thesis which claims that support for religion has declined and religious organisations have accordingly lost much of their influence in society. Evidence that is used to support the view on which the question is based includes: declining membership of many established religions; decline in religiously blessed marriages and rise in divorce; growing support for alternative belief systems, including humanism and atheism; the challenges to spiritual belief posed by science. It is Western societies primarily where the decline in religiosity is most often cited. The extent of the decline can, however, be debated and arguments against the secularisation thesis are likely to feature in good evaluative responses to the question. Another line of analysis a candidate might take would be to consider whether the view expressed in the question is true of all religions today, as some may be more successful in attracting and retaining members than others. Difficulties of defining and measuring religiosity and/or religious influence would be another relevant area of debate to explore for this question.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced role of religion in public life. • Falling membership of religious organisations and competition from other belief systems would indicate a decline in religiosity. • Fewer people are participating in religious ceremonies. • People are more likely to challenge the authority of established religions to decide key issues of morality in society and reject attempts at religious organisations to assert authority in public life. • There is more profanity and possible greater acceptance of heresy and blasphemy today. • Some studies suggest people of faith devote less time to religious activities today than in the past and some have become more questioning of their faith. <p>Against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religion retains some influence in public life, and this is particularly so in the case of countries such as Italy and Spain. • In some societies and communities, there are strong pressures on people to participate in religious practice within organisations and maintain their faith, at least outwardly. • Some religious organisations appear to be attracting more followers (the Evangelical movement in the US, for example) • Claims that people are less religious than in the past can be questioned, not least because evidence about people’s religious beliefs in the past may be unreliable e.g. church attendance figures. | 35 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rather than becoming less religious, people may have changed the ways they practice religion, for example, an increase in privatised worship and the use of social media for engagement with their religious organisation.• Religiosity is difficult to measure so any empirical evidence about the strength of people's religious belief today has to be treated sceptically.• Religious organisations given preferential legal treatment in some countries – such as Sharia Law systems in the Middle East or tax exemptions in the USA. Lobbying religious groups advocate for law changes such as the overturning of Roe vs Wade.• Religious organisations still prominent in politics such as anti-war activism – Jewish groups/Muslim groups organising protests concerning Israel/Palestinian conflict or Christian groups supporting 'no war' marches in UK and USA. | |

Generic levels of response

| Level | AO1: Knowledge and Understanding | Marks |
|--------------|---|--------------|
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good knowledge and understanding of the view on which the question is based. The response contains a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory/research evidence. | 7–9 |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the view on which the question is based. The response contains either a narrow range of detailed points or a wider range of underdeveloped points, with some use of concepts and references to theory or research evidence | 4–6 |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic knowledge and understanding of the view on which the question is based. The response contains a narrow range of underdeveloped points with some references to concepts or theory or research evidence. | 1–3 |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No knowledge and understanding worthy of credit. | 0 |

| Level | AO2: Interpretation and Application | Marks |
|--------------|--|--------------|
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good interpretation and application of relevant sociological material. The material selected will be accurately interpreted and consistently applied to the question in a logical and well-informed way. | 10–11 |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good interpretation and application of sociological material. The material selected will be accurate and relevant but not always consistently applied to the question in a way that is logical and clear | 7–9 |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable interpretation and application of sociological material. The material selected will be mainly accurate but its relevance to the question may be confused or unclear at times. | 4–6 |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited interpretation and application of sociological material. The material selected is relevant to the topic but lacks focus on or relevance to the specific question. | 1–3 |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No interpretation and application worthy of credit. | 0 |

| Level | AO3: Analysis and Evaluation | Marks |
|-------|--|-------|
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good analysis and evaluation. • Clear and sustained analysis of the view on which the question is based, with detailed and explicit evaluation. • There is also likely to be a range of contrasting views and/or evidence discussed, demonstrating good understanding of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 12–15 |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good analysis and evaluation. • The evaluation may be explicit and direct but not sustained, or it will rely on a good outline of contrasting views and/or evidence, clearly focussed on evaluating the view in the question. • The response demonstrates some understanding of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 8–11 |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable analysis and evaluation. • There is a description of some relevant contrasting views and/or evidence but these are only implicitly focussed on evaluating the view in the question. • The response demonstrates some awareness of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 4–7 |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited analysis and evaluation. • There are a few simple points of implicit or tangential evaluation. • The response demonstrates little awareness of the complexity of the issues raised by the question. | 1–3 |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No analysis and evaluation worthy of credit. | 0 |