

# ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report  
June 2011

GCE General Studies 6GS04 01

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.



## Get more from your exam results

### ...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).  
To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code UA027982

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## Introduction

This is the second occasion on which this paper has been examined. The paper uses an established format which is common to both Unit 3 and Unit 4, so that candidates should be familiar with the type of questions to be asked.

The paper gave a broad coverage of Specification content. Section A concerned section 4:3 'Do we need religious beliefs' and Section B tested sections 4:5 'How do we decide what is right and wrong?' and Section 4:6 'Why do people do what they do?'. The essays offered a choice between Section 4:7 'How should art be valued?' and 4:5 'How do we decide what is right and wrong?'. Because this is a synoptic paper questions were framed in such a way as to allow candidates to introduce material from other sections of the A2 and AS General Studies Specification.

Most candidates appeared to have sufficient time to complete the paper adequately. There seemed to be fewer unanswered questions than last year. A small number of candidates claimed to have 'run out of time' but often the length and quality of answers suggested that they had spent rather longer in profitless consideration than in constructive writing.

It seems almost inevitable that every year there will be a number of candidates who feel it is necessary to provide facetious answers. This is a sad waste of time and effort. Time would be better spent showing what they can do rather than explaining what they can't. A number seem to feel it is necessary to provide offensive and sometimes obscene comments. These do not help examiners or reflect credit on the candidates. It is unnecessary and should be curtailed.

Examiners have commented that handwriting this year was often very poor and at times virtually impossible to read. Candidates should recognise that however excellent their ideas it is not possible to give them credit if their work is unintelligible.

It is a matter of considerable concern that the majority of candidates do not appear to be adequately prepared to meet the demands of AO3. This is an important part of the Specification 20% of the A2 mark. Candidates who have not learnt these necessary skills are disadvantaged and effectively restricted to a mark out of 70 rather than one out of 90. It is absolutely essential that candidates are able to name, identify and describe the characteristics of different types of knowledge (fact, opinion, belief, assertion, bias) and the five types of argument (analogy, authority, cause, deduction, induction). It is essential that they are aware of the requirements of questions such as question 3 and question 7 and of the AO3 element in Section C.

A perennial concern is the inability of some candidates to read and deconstruct questions properly. Many fail to achieve the marks of which they are capable because they answer a different question to the one set or miss out essential parts of questions in their answers. This was particularly true of Q11, Q2, Q3, Q7 and Q10. Careless reading often leads to the misinterpretation of key terms.

## Question 1 (a)

This question proved demanding for many candidates who clearly did not understand the meaning of the term secular even though it is defined in very simple terms in the AS text book. The best answers were able to show that a secular country was one in which there was separation between the state and religion and in which religion played no part in the formulation or enforcement of laws. Some used effective illustrations such as the French ban on wearing religious symbols, but many simply named countries without a clear explanation of relevance. Many thought the term referred to multi-religious states and others felt they were emerging or 'secluded' states.

1 (a) Explain the meaning of the term 'secular countries' (line 10).

(2)

Secular countries are those which do not have a set religion and are largely unreligious in the sense that religion does not effect policy making etc. Though religion is practiced it is not widely practiced and is normally restricted by the fact that it is not publicised or encouraged.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Credit is given for the phrase 'no set religion' and 'religion does not effect [sic] policy. Both of these phrases can be linked to marking points in the mark scheme and so gain credit. It is not a perfect answer but does sufficient to gain both marks. The final sentence could apply to either secular or some non-secular countries and would not of itself earn a mark.

1 (a) Explain the meaning of the term 'secular countries' (line 10).

(2)

The term "secular countries" refer to those with no one predominant religion & instead have a diverse range of beliefs. The UK, for example, although having the Queen as head of the Church of England, could be described as secular due to having ~~other~~ a sizeable number following other religions such as Islam & Judaism.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer is based in a misunderstanding of the term. The number of different religions in a country is irrelevant. There may be many or few religions in both secular and non-secular countries. The key criteria must be the relationship between state/government and religion. The use of the queen as head of the Church (and also head of state) shows weak understanding.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

It is always sensible to use a good example when asked to define a term even if it is not asked for. An example can illustrate or clarify meaning and so provide support. However, as in this case a poorly chosen example can have the reverse effect.

## Question 1(b)

This question proved to be quite demanding. Many candidates seemed to be influenced by recent media casual use of the term and thought it referred either to extremists of one sort or another or even to terrorists. Of those who recognised it as mainly associated with religion a considerable number simply felt that it reflected strong beliefs and others interpreted it to mean a willingness to seek change or adapt beliefs to modern circumstances. The better answers were those which focussed on the literality of belief in (sacred) texts or the reduction of belief to basic principles. Inevitably some candidates tried to define the term by using the term being defined (eg: 'Fundamentalists belief in the fundamentals'). Such answers cannot gain marks.

(b) What is meant by 'fundamentalist' (line 26)?

(1)

A ~~for~~ The term 'fundamentalist' is used to describe a person or group which aim to ~~push their views~~ provide alternative and in their opinion more realistic or suitable approaches to certain ideas.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer was fairly typical of a number of responses. There is no recognition that fundamentalism is to do with belief or that it refers to the acceptance of basic or core beliefs to the exclusion of any later additions. The suggestion that fundamentalists are prepared to modify belief to meet changing circumstances is the reverse of the true meaning of the term.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The AS student book contains clear definitions of many significant terms. Candidates will benefit from familiarity with them.

## **Question 1 (c)**

Question 1c was a straightforward question which simply required a one word answer. Some candidates wasted time by writing quite lengthy descriptive sentences about what an Imam was. These could not earn additional credit. Time pressures on candidates suggest that they should take appropriate opportunities to be brief and succinct, judging the amount they write by the number of marks available. The majority of candidates gave the correct answer but a significant number offered other religions, most notably Judaism and Hinduism. Perhaps inevitably there was the usual scattering of 'joke' religions such as 'Jedi'.

## **Question 2**

This is a question which requires to be read carefully. The focus is on the 'claims of religion' and not about the nature or organisation of religion. Similarly the phrase 'from every angle' is an indication that candidates should be able to justify the adoption of different perspectives. The question encourages the idea of 'scrutiny' or in depth examination; it allows and encourages a positive as well as a negative approach. The one approach that is not asked for is an all out attack on religion. The choice of the term 'religion' has significance. Candidates are not asked to deal with any specific religion but are encouraged to consider 'religion' more broadly, in its various manifestations.

In order to answer this question candidates were required to identify specific claims of religion. Sometimes these claims were implicit rather than explicit, but were, where possible credited. The passage indicated history, philosophy and science as possible perspectives but better answers were those which latched on to 'every angle' and considered other perspectives as well.

Answers which simply criticised religion without consideration of claims did not score well. Those which showed that some aspects of religion did not lend themselves to scrutiny usually scored well. Perhaps inevitably many answers focussed on conflict between religious claims about the origin of life and the universe with scientific theories and with biblical claims about miracle and attempts to provide rational explanations for them. The weakest answers were generally those which demonstrated prejudice (both for and against religion) and made broad unsupported assertions. It was sad to note that a number of candidates seemed to be totally unaware of the meaning of 'scrutiny' and very few took any note of the use of 'merit' in the question. Potentially this could have been a high scoring question but very often marks were at the lower end of the scale.

This answer only adopted a single perspective and was awarded 3 marks.

2 To what extent do 'the claims of religion merit scrutiny from every angle' (lines 4–5)?  
Explain your answer.

To an extent the unwritten laws within a religion, for example the 10 commandments in the Bible, offer the lives of their followers to be scrutinised as fellow followers will want these teachings to infiltrate everyday life and so monitor the actions of others. However, such close observation is not only a factor for religious people but also that of the rest of the population as believers may look to convert others. Not only this but teachings from the 10 commandments have converged into mainstream law thus enforcing it upon everyone.

To a member of a religion however, it may not appear to be scrutiny as they are also doing it of their own free will.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer has clearly not understood the meaning of 'scrutiny' in the sense of examination nor has it a clear understanding of the claims of religion. However there is sufficient to justify three marks. The Ten Commandments counts as part of the organisation of religion rather than a claim of religion but is awarded 1 of the two marks available for 'organisation' as shown in the mark scheme. It could easily have been converted into a claim with a suggestion that it 'defined the moral standards by which believers should live their lives. A second mark is credited for 'teachings infiltrating daily life' as a comment about the purpose of religion (see mark scheme). The third mark is awarded to the reference to the Ten Commandments influencing laws. The comment about religious people seeking to convert others would normally gain a mark for purpose of religion, but this has already been awarded.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

It is sometimes helpful to define key words such as 'scrutiny' to show that you understand them since they usually define the important parameters of a question.



This answer achieved 5 of the six marks and almost did sufficient to gain full marks.

2 To what extent do 'the claims of religion merit scrutiny from every angle' (lines 4–5)?  
Explain your answer.

Religion and religious texts preach about certain things happening because of a 'higher being' and this higher being should be worshipped because of them.

However the things they claim to have happened because this higher being has willed it, are so unbelievable that the claims are very easily criticised by non-believers. Eg God made the world in 7 days, Jesus healing the sick, Noah and his Ark.

So pretty much every 'miracle' that ~~is~~ religious texts and leaders claim to have happened are so unlikely that they are constantly scrutinised by people wanting to know how. Believers say that faith will fill this gap but non-believers still need more evidence, and scientific discoveries tend to ~~be~~ show this evidence and bridge the gap, and religious scrutiny is the reason behind many scientific discoveries, as people wanted to prove religion right or wrong.

So religious claims do deserve scrutiny from every angle because it is a driving force of humanities discoveries.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A number of claims are indicated including the existence of a higher being as cause, the requirement that he should be worshipped and the existence of miracle. Each of these is included in the mark scheme. The candidate has achieved all of the marks available for 'claims'. Evaluation of these claims include: "happenings claimed are unbelievable and therefore should be scrutinised" and 'faith' alone will not satisfy non-believers. The statement that religious claims have stimulated scientific discovery to test their reliability/accuracy could have been credited but the mark available in the mark scheme has already been awarded and so cannot be credited again. This answer contains different perspectives to meet the requirement for scrutiny 'from every angle'.

### **Question 3**

This type of question has been asked on all General Studies papers on many occasions. Candidates ought to be familiar with its requirements but sadly the majority do not appear to be aware of what is required of them. The main differences shown in this question are that 6 marks rather than 4 are allocated and candidates are specifically asked to examine strengths and weaknesses. The key to the question is the reference to 'evidence and arguments used by the author'. This is a clear indication that the question is testing AO3 and therefore candidates must be able to identify evidence and arguments used in order to analyse the extent to which support is given to the conclusion. Candidates are not asked to discuss the issue raised by the author, nor are they asked to express their own opinions about the issue. The only issue that needs to be addressed is whether the conclusion stated in the question is adequately supported or justified **in the passage through the evidence and arguments provided by the author**. Too many candidates appeared to take the statement literally and argued about the disadvantages of nudity rather recognise it for the analogy that it was. Many candidates who attempted to analyse the passage recognised the presence of bias and lack of balance but few analysed the type(s) of argument used by the author.

The mark scheme indicates a number of marking points for which credit may be given. They are expressed as questions to guide examiners, but these can also provide valuable teaching points when candidates are preparing for the exam. If properly understood they can be used to structure answers which will then attract high marks.

Comments made for this question also apply to the very similar question 7.

This was one of the better answers and achieved 5 of the 6 available marks. The candidate clearly possessed the necessary skills to address the task and an understanding of what the question required.

- 3 Critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and arguments used by the authors to support the claim that 'These spiritual emperors have no clothes, and we should not be afraid to say so' (lines 34–35).

The fundamental flaw running throughout the argument is that it accuses religions of not having sufficient evidence to support their claims and yet the writer themselves provides little to substantiate opinions. For example, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph when discussing the effects of religion on policy making, it is claimed that, 'Even relatively secular countries pander to Christian moral concerns', however, none of these 'relatively secular countries' are named. It is difficult therefore to ascertain the factual basis of this claim. Furthermore, purely referring to 'Christian moral concerns' does not discuss the effects of other religions.

Moreover, when mentioning the 'sceptics' who question the source of religious authority, no names or ~~person~~ numbers are given and we are therefore unable to assess the validity of the claim. Any 'sceptic' is likely to be misbrusing of religion, otherwise they would not be classed as a 'sceptic' so the statement is slightly biased.

Overall, the evidence used predominantly comprises of opinions backed up by little, if any, factual data.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Credit is awarded for showing 'fundamental flaws' in the argument in the opening sentence and for identifying from the passage specific evidence related to the issue. The answer recognises the difference/relationship between unsupported opinion and 'evidence' and also acknowledges the bias of the author. (This could not be credited since the marking point has already been allocated). The answer highlights parts of the argument where supporting evidence is lacking. The final sentence is a simple but objective assessment showing that the source consists primarily of opinion rather than fact and so gains an additional mark. This answer meets the requirement of 5 of the marking points/questions in the mark scheme.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is important to recognise the relationship between fact and opinion in supporting arguments and weaknesses created by evident bias.

This answer failed to address the question as set and consequently only achieved 1 mark. It illustrates the way in which some candidates feel they should express their own opinions on the issue raised in the passage rather than attempt to analyse the quality of evidence and argument used.

- 3 Critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and arguments used by the authors to support the claim that 'These spiritual emperors have no clothes, and we should not be afraid to say so' (lines 34–35).

FIRSTLY WE NEED TO EXAMINE WHAT IS MEANT BY 'THESE SPIRITUAL EMPERORS HAVE NO CLOTHES', & COULD THESE MEAN THEY HAVE NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THEIR VIEWS AND THAT WE SHOULD TELL THEM THIS? BUT THEN WE SHOULD REALLY ASK THE QUESTION, IS IT REALLY OUR PLACE? EVERYONE IS ALLOWED THEIR OWN VIEWPOINT, AND EVERYONE FELT THE SAME IN SOCIETY, THERE WOULD BE NO DEMOCRACY. IS RELIGION REALLY EFFECTING US? SOME WILL SAY YES BECAUSE IT IS CAUSING MANY ARGUMENTS IN SOCIETY, BUT WOULD WE NOT FIND OURSELVES IN A SIMILAR SITUATION WITHOUT RELIGION. YES THE ARGUMENT IS VALID THAT RELIGION HAS NO EVIDENCE OR FACTS BUT DO WE ALWAYS NEEDS THESE FACTS. DO THEY NOT OFTEN LEAD US DOWN THE WRONG PATH?

(Total for Question 3 = 6 marks)



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Credit is given for the explanation of what the statement means and for explaining that 'religion has no evidence or facts' has already been credited. No further marks are awarded since the answer examines the candidate's own views on the issue rather than analyzing the strengths/weaknesses of the author's argument. The candidate does not identify specific evidence used or suggest evidence that has been omitted. There is no reference to the role of the author in presenting an argument. In effect the passage is virtually ignored and the candidate simply tries to present a personal argument against the proposition in the question.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

In this type of question it is important to identify specific evidence used by the author and to examine whether the passage relies on fact or opinion and whether there is evidence of bias or balance in the arguments that are presented.

## **Question 4**

The use of the term 'issues we face in the modern world' was deliberately designed to create an open ended question. In the event a number of candidates ignored it altogether and a significant number interpreted it in a very narrow way; concentrating most frequently on abortion, euthanasia and various forms of genetics. Some simply interpreted the question as an opportunity to attack religion as irrelevant in the modern world. Insufficient attention was paid to the basis of morality, which was the central feature of the question.

A number of candidates mis-read 'morality' as 'mortality' and consequently answered the wrong question. Some candidates adopted a single viewpoint to argue that since religion had been established in the distant past it could not have anything useful to say about modern issues. Others were able to point out that there are many different religions and therefore different moral codes. This might have served in a mono-cultural and mono-religious society but could be a source of conflict in a multicultural and multi-religious world. The better answers were able to point out that religions often had certain core views that were common to most (sanctity of life and property) which could form a sound basis. Some pointed out that, if religion was a human construct, then moral principles pre-ceded religion and could be perfectly valid in the modern world. The best answers showed that ancient religious principles which had no obvious direct link to modern issues could nevertheless be applied to offer guidance. Few candidates really examined alternatives to religion as a basis for contemporary moral values although some asserted that we must develop our own morality, without specifying how this might be achieved.

This answer, which largely missed the point of the question, was awarded 4 marks for AO1/2 and 3 marks for communication. It is not about whether religion is still relevant to today but whether it provides a sound basis for morality.

- 4 Examine the view that the issues we face in the modern world mean that morality should not be based on religion.

Many religions were founded thousands of years ago, and so the world today often bears little resemblance to the way it was then. Times change, and things move on. But does this mean religion should be outdated, too?

Religion, you might say, 'is a system of values, and values such as 'do not kill' are as relevant today as they were back then.

But that does not mean to say that we should subscribe to religion simply because it tells us not to kill. Its' creation mythologies were from a time when the world was not understood, so should we, now, still believe that the world was made in six days?

Other old works ~~of~~ still hold merit today.

Greek philosophy is still the basis of current thinking. ~~And~~ <sup>And</sup> whilst the sword may be an elegant weapon for a more civilised age, and is no longer used now, the art of war, a book written in ancient China, is still read today. Its' style of warfare is applied to a vast

amount of topics, Inspiring Napoleon, the  
Blitzkrieg, and modern military recruits and  
even being ~~are~~ applied to business strategy.

It is still relevant today, despite technology  
having moved on.

Religion, however, is essentially a way of  
~~explaining the~~ explaining the strangeness of  
this world, and how it came to be.

Now that science has shown us the answers,  
it has no place in our modern morality.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

An important point is made in the second paragraph about the relevance of the religious teaching concerning killing but its significance in terms of the question is largely ignored. Two interesting examples of ancient works/ideas still in use today follow but these are not pursued in the context of the question. The conclusion is a somewhat confused assertion which attempts to return to the question and contains the first direct reference to morality. However, the conclusion does not follow from the arguments presented. The answer is placed in band 2 (for a single viewpoint) and the limited range of evidence presented places it at 4 marks. Communication is generally clear and the answer does sufficient to reach 3 marks.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When asked to examine an issue in an essay question it is important to try and look at it from different perspectives before reaching a conclusion. Opinions and assertions need to be supported with evidence.

This answer presents arguments both for and against the question and offers reasons to support each view. There is a limited range of evidence and some evaluation of the two positions. A sound distinction is drawn between basing ideas on religion and adopting religious ideas absolutely. The answer contains a simple conclusion arising from the discussion and was awarded a total of 11 marks.

**4 Examine the view that the issues we face in the modern world mean that morality should not be based on religion.**

Many situations which arise in the modern world are new and were not commonplace in the times when many religions originated. It is therefore difficult if our morality is fixed as it must be if based on religions, which have a set moral code laid out in religious texts, such as the Bible or the Qu'ran. New scientific discoveries, such as genetic engineering, require a more flexible approach.

Furthermore, there are multiple world religions and large numbers of secular societies, and with increasing contact through transport and media it is difficult if everyone refuses to acknowledge a morality not based on their religion.

However, to say that there are different moral codes of religions or that the <sup>truth</sup> proof of their claims cannot be established does not mean that some ideas are not valid. Major world religions preach against many things, such as murder and stealing, which most people would consider to be morally wrong anyway. To merely 'base' morality on religion is not problematic, it is fundamentalism which causes ~~pro~~ difficulties.

Morality can be based upon religion in the modern world.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer provides a limited range of evidence to support both viewpoints and also offers some evaluation of the two positions. A sound distinction is drawn between basing ideas on religion and adopting religious ideas absolutely. The answer contains a simple conclusion arising from the discussion. If more evidence had been advanced the answer would have achieved a higher mark. It is placed in the middle of band 3 and awarded 7 marks. Qwc is clear and lucid and there are few errors so that it earns 4 marks for AO4.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Mini-essays offer candidates an opportunity to demonstrate relevant knowledge as well as their ability to construct an argument. It is best to use a wide range of relevant evidence and to show why the evidence is relevant to the argument and how it is able to provide support in order to justify the conclusion reached.



## **Question 5**

For question 5 candidates were asked to select a correct statement from a selection purporting to summarise the views presented in the source. This involved reading and understanding the passage to identify the main thrust of the argument. An approach used by many candidates was to eliminate incorrect answers.

Although an answer line was provided many candidates simply ticked, circled or underlined their chosen statement in the actual question. This was credited. The easiest approach was to simply write out the number of the correct statement. Some wasted time copying out the entire statement while others wrote unnecessary explanations such as 'The correct statement is statement ii which says 'anti-social behaviour ... values'.

## **Question 6**

In almost every general Studies paper there are questions of this type asking for the identification of types of argument and their characteristics. The key ones are explained in the Student book but many candidates appear to be totally unaware of them. The only acceptable terms in this question were variations on 'inductive' or 'causal'. Candidates were required to correctly identify the type of argument in order to access the other two marks. Many either ignored this requirement altogether or used descriptions and terms which were inappropriate such as 'opinionated', 'historic' or 'argumentative'. These could not be credited and so barred access to the remaining mark. For those candidates who wrongly selected 'deductive' or 'authority' the type mark was not awarded but credit was given to a maximum of 2 marks if clear and accurate descriptions of the named type of argument was given together with a realistic assessment/explanation of strength or weakness.

Many candidates who correctly identified the type of argument were not able to offer sound supported explanations of whether they were strong or weak forms of argument. A few candidates simply attempted to describe the form or content of the argument in the passage without examining either its type or its strength or weakness. A few decided to take issue with the argument rather than answer the set question.

This answer was one of relatively few to achieve all 3 marks.

- 6 Identify the type of argument used in paragraph 1 and give reasons to explain why it is a strong or weak form of argument.

An inductive argument has been used. This is because a specific example of the group of pensioners has been mentioned and this is then used to generalise the conclusion that politics had changed and anti social behaviour has increased. This type of argument is weak because it uses specific examples and then generalises. Therefore its more likely to be falsifiable as another specific example of pensioners being ~~bead~~ treated nicely by teenagers would criticise this conclusion and hence oppose it. However this type of argument is strong in the fact that it does have evidence and hard facts to prove its point.

(Total for Question 6 = 3 marks)



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer correctly identified 'inductive' and gave two clear reasons to explain its strength or weakness. Credit was given for argument from specific to general as leading to weak argument. The final mark was awarded for saying that such arguments/conclusions could be falsifiable if additional observations were available. The final sentence about evidence and facts is not creditworthy.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Candidates need to be aware of the different criteria that define each of the five types of argument and should be able to distinguish between them. These are explained clearly in the AS Student Book.

This answer failed to achieve any marks having identified the wrong type of argument and failing to give correct terms for the type of argument identified.

- 6 Identify the type of argument used in paragraph 1 and give reasons to explain why it is a strong or weak form of argument.

Argument from authority, and it is a strong form of argument because the author is an MP and people will listen to him and his argument because he is in a position of power and knows what he is talking about.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The candidate wrongly identified type of argument as authority and so could not receive the 'type' mark. However the answer did access the 2 marks for reasons. Although there is a reference to 'knows what he is talking about' it is not sufficiently related to expertise to earn a mark. The answer suggests that argument from authority is based on status and power rather than specific relevant expertise in an appropriate area. A mark could have been awarded if the comment had been expanded to say that Field had specialised in social services and therefore knew what he was talking about. Argument from authority is generally regarded as a fairly weak form of argument since different experts can hold opposing positions on an issue.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Candidates need to know, be able to identify and describe the characteristics of five different type of argument (authority, Analogy, Cause, deduction, induction). In this type of question the answer will always be variations on one of these terms. Other descriptors will not be credited.

## **Question 7**

Comments made for question 3 also apply to question 7 since it follows a similar format and testing method. The main difference between the two questions is that whereas question 3 tested the evaluation of strengths and weaknesses question 7 is focussed on the sufficiency of the authors reasoning. In effect candidates are invited to consider the weaknesses of the evidence and arguments presented in relation to the given quotation. Many candidates noted that the reference to good parents was in fact the only reference to parenting, although there was a reference to 'families from hell' in an earlier paragraph. There is no substantial link between the phrase used in the conclusion and the evidence presented earlier in the passage. Many candidates again seemed uncertain about what was required of them and resorted to considering either parenting or anti-social behaviour in a descriptive way without attempt to evaluate the quality of reasoning in the passage. Some candidates who were aware of the need to evaluate attempted to argue that the evidence provided strong support. This led them to make statements that were unsustainable. Other candidates did point out that the relevant phrase appeared to have no relationship to the passage and as such supporting evidence was not available. They did use this as a way to discuss subjectivity or to demonstrate the type of evidence that might support the statement.

Candidates should be familiar with this type of question and with the skills that they need to apply and demonstrate. Once again the marking points in the mark scheme offer a valuable guide.

This brief answer provided enough evidence to justify a mark of 3 out of the 4 marks available.

7 Is the author's reasoning in Source 2 strong enough to support the view that 'we must address our increasing failure to produce good parents' (line 22)?

The author discusses the issue of parenting and the family in paragraph three, discussing how there were no more than "six 'families from hell'" and now there are '50,000'. This statistic does not necessarily support the view in line 22, as the key part of Mr Field's claim is the 'I didn't come across' more than 6 families. This is in no way a credited and valid assessment of national failings in good parenting. Furthermore, there is no time period given to assess the rate of change within. The prime evidence for which the claim in line 22 is based upon is therefore insufficient for a conclusion to be drawn and his reasoning is therefore not strong enough.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer gives clear reasons for dismissing the author's reasoning as weak. Evidence is reviewed and a link shown between families from hell and parenting is made justifying the award of a mark. The weight of evidence is shown to be insufficient to support the claim and so earns a second mark. The answer concludes with a clear objective assessment to justify the candidate's conclusion and so gains a third mark.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

There is no need to write in detail about the issue. The key phrase in the question which should be a guide to the type of answer is '... strong enough to support ...'. The use of the term 'reasoning' indicates the need to consider both types of knowledge and types of argument as well as sufficiency of evidence.

This answer was awarded 2 marks. It demonstrates an attempt to apply some of the necessary skills

- 7 Is the author's reasoning in Source 2 strong enough to support the view that 'we must address our increasing failure to produce good parents' (line 22)?

The author does not give any evidence to support the idea that it is the parents who are responsible for antisocial behaviour, and hence no evidence to support his claim, as the responsibility of good parents was only mentioned in that line.

Most of the evidence and reasoning he gives is for rising antisocial trends, and for ~~an~~ arguing that the government has not been effective in reducing antisocial behaviour. Therefore, I don't believe he supports his claim strongly enough.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Credit is given for showing that there is no evidence for a link between parenting and anti-social behaviour. The answer then demonstrates the insufficiency/irrelevance of the evidence presented to earn a second mark. The final sentence is simply a restatement of the opening sentence and so does not merit an additional mark. The answer could have been improved by reference to the author's subjectivity in introducing an unrelated and unsupported opinion as though it is unquestioned fact. Comment could also be made about the evident bias in the passage.

## Question 8

This question seems very straightforward but it contains two potential traps. Primarily it asks for evidence from the candidates own knowledge which is not mentioned in the passage. A significant number of candidates missed this and wrote about things such as the decline of traditional values and the shortage of police presence which are both referred to or implied in the passage. The second stumbling block is that the question refers specifically to anti-social and not criminal behaviour. Clearly there was a significant proportion of candidates who seemed unaware of what is meant by anti-social behaviour and instead wrote about influences leading to criminal behaviour. On this occasion candidates were given the benefit of the doubt even when explicitly referring to criminal behaviour. Page 83 of the specification makes it clear that candidates should recognise this and other terms. In the event there were many influences which could be identified and which are detailed in the mark scheme. Some of these influences overlap and for marking purposes are grouped together. Most candidates were able to score well.

This answer was awarded both marks.

8 The author mentions influences that may contribute to a rise in anti-social behaviour.  
Give two **other** influences not mentioned in the passage which may also contribute to such a rise.

1 Education, poor/lack of education leads to lack of prospects, turn to crime out of boredom and perhaps money

2 Environment, the where they live influences the sort of people these children mix with; can be bad influences.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Credit lack of prospects through poor education leading to boredom was credited credit as bullet 3 in the mark scheme. General points about local environment are specifically excluded in the mark scheme because they are dealt with in the passage. Here the qualification about "children they mix with" is specific and so could be credited as bullet A8 (peer pressure/desire to conform and gang culture).



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Candidates should be careful that their answer refers specifically to any terms used in the question and not to alternatives which are significantly different.

This answer gained a single mark.

8 The author mentions influences that may contribute to a rise in anti-social behaviour.

Give two **other** influences not mentioned in the passage which may also contribute to such a rise.

1 The issuing of ASBOs as opposed to any stronger form of punishment

2 Bad parenting and a lack of Government effort to induce good parenting.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Use of ASBOs is acceptable because of the way it is qualified in terms of inadequate punishments. "ASBO" on its own would have been excluded because it appears in the passage. Bad parenting appears in the passage and so is not creditworthy. It could have been credited if it had been qualified by reference to the breakdown in family structure.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

If the question contains exclusions be careful to observe them. Inclusion of evidence taken from the passage is explicitly excluded and so cannot be credited.



## **Question 9**

This two part question is designed to test two different skills. Part (a) is about the selection and use of evidence from the passage. A number of candidates ignored the instruction to use the passage and attempted to answer from their own knowledge or took issue with points made by the author. The majority of candidates were able to select at least one relevant piece of evidence (usually the statement that 'trouble used to be spasmodic and exceptional'). A significant weakness was that many candidates referred to his 'use of official statistics' even though they do not form part of his argument. Another weakness was the frequency with which candidates cited evidence and opinion from the passage which did not relate to the quotation in the question.

Part (b) was designed to test the candidates own knowledge about the past. Many generalised without using specific supporting evidence. Key answers presented by stronger candidates included changing social attitudes, different interpretations of trouble and varying approaches to recording 'trouble'. A significant weakness was that few attempted to explain what they understood by the term trouble. Approaches varied from seeing it purely as anti-social behaviour to those who felt it included events such as the two World Wars. Within the context of the question and the passage answers should have been looking for examples of criminal or anti-social activities.

This answer was awarded a total of 5 marks, earning two marks for part (a) and 3 marks for part (b). It was one of the higher scoring answers to this question.

9 The writer claims it is wrong to believe 'there has always been trouble' (line 10).

(a) Explain how he supports this view.

(3)

The author uses evidence such as: 'In Birkenhead, my constituency, there are now more violent crimes against the person than there were in the whole country 50 years ago.' to show that the number of crimes has increased. If these <sup>crimes</sup> were not committed as often in previous years, there was obviously less trouble. He also suggests that there are more 'families from hell' than there used to be, these families are causing more trouble which wasn't before present.

(b) Using your own knowledge, explain why he may be wrong.

(3)

Just because the number of violent crimes against the person in Birkenhead have gone up does not mean that all anti-social crimes in all areas have increased. The number of car thefts has decreased thanks to better locks on cars. Also, the writer does not take into account the fact that there has always been some form of anti-social behaviour in the UK such as IRA terrorism in Northern Ireland in 1970's.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

(a) Credit was awarded for quoting two separate statements from the passage which were listed in the mark scheme as bullets 6 and 7 ('more violent crimes ... than 50 years ago' and 'families from hell'). The commentary is a restating of the evidence cited rather than explanation and so does not gain extra credit. 2 marks (b) Three good points are made. The valid explanatory comment that it is impossible to extrapolate a national trend based on evidence from Birkenhead alone earned a mark. More evidence would be required to justify such a claim. A second mark is awarded for references to declining car theft because of better locks. A third mark is awarded to the reference to localised terrorist behaviour in Northern Ireland. If the reference had been to terrorism in general or a reference to deaths during wartime it would not have been a justified reference to 'trouble' in the past and could not have been credited. 3 marks.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Questions which ask for 'own knowledge' usually require specific evidence to support generalised statements. When asked to use own knowledge it is wrong to make reference to content from the passage unless specifically invited to do so.

This answer was awarded a total of 2 marks.

9 The writer claims it is wrong to believe 'there has always been trouble' (line 10).

(a) Explain how he supports this view.

(3)

He supports this by saying anti-social behaviour used to be 'at an exceptional' level. To imply that anti-social behaviour is considered worse now. He also supports this view by saying people who think there has been trouble always been trouble are just living in a lie, by consistently calling them liars.

(b) Using your own knowledge, explain why he may be wrong.

(3)

He may be wrong due to the fact he has no evidence to support his claim. If all we do is look at football violence for from a few years ago we can see that anti-social behaviour has in fact decreased.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

In part (a) credit was given for the brief reference to 'trouble used to be spasmodic and exceptional' and the short explanatory statement. The final sentence about lies is merely a restatement of the quotation in the statement and is not evidence to support the view expressed. It is not therefore creditworthy.

In part (b) the comment about lack of supporting evidence is simply unsupported assertion and gains no marks. To earn a mark this needed to be expanded, perhaps by showing that the figures given to support the claim are personal estimates rather than official statistics. The reference to the decline in football violence and the extrapolation that this shows a decrease in anti-social behaviour is creditworthy and earned 1 mark. Total 2 marks



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Questions which ask for 'explanation' require more than just simple evidence. Evidence should be presented but there must be an attempt to show how the evidence supports or challenges the issue raised in the question.

## **Question 10**

This question produced a number of excellent answers but also a large number which showed evidence of poor reading of the question. Too many candidates misread the first sentence and focussed entirely on anti-social behaviour, without actually defining it. As a result there was a variety of contorted attempts to show that some forms of anti-social behaviour were not harmful. For example graffiti was not harmful to society because no one was hurt by it and it might count as art. Many of those who equated deviance with criminality attempted to argue that crime was beneficial to society because it created employment for the police and so helped to reduce unemployment.

A careful reading of the question should lead candidates to understand that there were many different forms of deviant behaviour. Many of those who recognised this still associated the term only with criminal behaviour. Better answers started by defining what they understood by the term. This enabled them to show that definitions of deviance were a social construct which changed over time. The examples most frequently used to illustrate this were the changing attitudes to homosexuality and divorce. Illustrations of non-harmful deviance focussed mainly on protest movements and individuals like Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela whose 'deviance' brought about change. Other examples included scientists whose theories challenged existing norms but which in time were vindicated.

The meaning of 'harmful to society' was often simply accepted at face value and few attempts were made to explain it. Often it was translated simply as 'hurt' or 'damage' and rarely did candidates see it as impacting in a harmful way on social values. Very few candidates considered forms of deviancy such as eccentricity (such as teachers wearing slippers or dressing gowns at school 'in order to make students feel at home') which by definition is departure from the norm but is very rarely a social threat.

This answer was awarded a total of 9 marks; band 3 and 6 marks for AO1/2 and 3 marks for communication.

10 Anti-social behaviour is a form of deviance. Examine whether or not deviant behaviour is always harmful to society.

Deviance is when something 'branches off' from the normal way things are done in society.

Antisocial behaviour is obviously a type of deviance that is harmful to society as it can lead to violence and increased crime levels which can cause people to migrate out of the city/area which leads to urban decay. This is harmful to society as it would fully deteriorate to leave a physically, economically and socially unsustainable city.

However there are many types of deviance in society. Charity work is an example as in a money-driven world it is deviance to just want to help fellow human beings (or another causes) without financial gain. Charity is significant for societies, particularly local charity as it can help the local community spirit and general affluence of an area.

If too many people deviate from the norm this could lead to a breakdown in society as people may not be able to pay back the money for government taxes as they may not have a successful income.

Behavioral deviance can lead to the creation of new industries and jobs

as an initial idea is brought to life by someone deviating from the norm. This may benefit society as jobs can be provided adding to the economic area of society.

In conclusion I believe behavioral deviance can be harmless as well as harmful to society as it creates a more diversified society and can benefit the economy of an area, making it more sustainable.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer shows a sound grasp of the meaning of deviance. It attempts two contrasting viewpoints. The concept that charitable activity is a form of deviance might raise questions but an explanation is offered as to why charity might be regarded in this way. The third paragraph is ambiguous and the conclusion seems to ignore points made in the first paragraph.

The answer reaches band three but is not sufficiently developed and does not have a sufficient range of supporting evidence to justify more than the lowest mark in the band. AO1/2 band 3 6 marks Communication generally sound and coherent but the confusion in paragraph three and the lack of agreement between the introduction and conclusion justify 3 marks rather than 4 for AO4.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

In an essay it is always helpful to define key terms. This helps you to understand the question and shows that you know what you are talking about. At the very least it gives the examiner a clue to the way you are thinking.

This short answer shows no evidence that the term deviance is understood and was awarded a total of 4 marks.

**10** Anti-social behaviour is a form of deviance. Examine whether or not deviant behaviour is always harmful to society.

Not always because some deviant behaviour doesn't result in a person getting hurt or something getting damaged, however that is very rare.

Most of the time it's a shop getting broken into, someone getting mugged etc... so all these issues are harmful to society because they are damaging what it used to be.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

There is no evidence that deviance is understood and the term is only associated with anti-social behaviour. The answer consists of two assertions: it is not harmful if no one gets hurt; and it usually causes damage and so is harmful. The illustrations used do not help develop an argument and there is no conclusion. The answer does not do enough to reach low level 2A01/2 band 1 2 marks. Meaning is generally clear but there are errors and poor punctuation which can inhibit understanding. 2 marks are awarded for communication.

Total mark 4

## **Question 11**

Many candidates found this essay quite demanding. The major weakness was a failure to take note of each of the key words in the question. Too often focus was on a single key word, often taken out of context. This was particularly true of 'protest'. Whilst some were able to read it correctly many ignored the qualification of the challenge to traditional values and simply wrote about the protest movement. A considerable number of such answers were well informed but unfortunately were not closely related to the question as set and so earned few marks. Another problem was an apparent confusion about the meaning of 'tolerant' and 'less tolerant'. It was often translated as 'tolerable' and quite frequently treated as though it meant giving greater rather than less freedom of action.

This question demonstrates the importance of careful reading and deconstruction. Those candidates who planned their essays were generally better able to respond appropriately. The key terms were 'tolerant' and 'traditional moral values'. In order to answer effectively candidates needed to be aware of and able to illustrate from their knowledge the way in which moral and social values have changed in recent years. Issues which were frequently considered included: divorce; euthanasia; premarital and casual sex; abortion; and sexuality. Other issues which were given some consideration included genetic engineering; discrimination; religion; the application of scientific discoveries; and the role of the media. Better answers were able to use their knowledge of such issues to show the change in attitudes that has taken place and to question whether this has been universally beneficial. Relatively few candidates attempted to explain or take note of 'life for the majority of people'. Some were able to discuss the relative merits of a changing or a stagnant society. More candidates seemed to favour the idea of challenging values and pushing boundaries rather than resistance to change.

Rather too much attention was paid in this question, as in a number of others, to the pressing issue of student fees. The recent demonstrations were used as an example of protest against immoral actions, but there was rarely any effort to relate the increase in fees to the maintenance of traditional moral values. Few seemed to recognise that there were other forms of protest besides demonstrations, such as letters to newspapers, contact with MPs, petitions and public meetings. Very few attempted to explain what they understood by 'traditional moral values, but nevertheless a significant number seemed to think they were a bad thing.

This question was ideally suited to an open ended consideration from a variety of perspectives and invited the juxtaposition of contrasting views in order to reach a balanced conclusion. Sadly many candidates seemed able only to adopt a single viewpoint with the result that conclusions were often mere assertions.



This was a sound answer which attempted to achieve balance. It was one of the relatively few to score 3 marks for AO3. It earned a total of 22 marks.

**11** 'Life for the majority of people would be better if society was less tolerant and individually we were more prepared to protest when traditional moral values are challenged.'

Critically evaluate this assertion.

**(Total for Question 11 = 30 marks)**

**includes 6 marks for Quality of Written Communication**

---

**12** Critically examine the view that in an age of economic austerity it is wrong to use public funds to subsidise the arts.

**(Total for Question 12 = 30 marks)**

**includes 6 marks for Quality of Written Communication**

---

Plan

For - better

- less deviance,
- less crime
- longer prison sentences
- more pressure on the gov to resist wars
- more pressure on gov to maintain morality.

Against - not better.

- backlash would be stronger
- protests are unruly.
- a more accepting society might be possible.

↓  
second chances.

For many people it is true that a less tolerant society and a more vocal society would be a greater one. This view is supported by the fact that if society was perhaps less tolerant of petty crime or ~~as~~ became more strict on racism - most people would have a better quality of life. The knowledge for delinquent youngsters that stealing from their local shop will land them <sup>a mere</sup> 20 hours of community service or a £50 fine is surely not ~~an~~ ~~is~~ encouragement to consider the legal route and refrain from stealing. Stricter punishments would deter behaviour which disrupts society, there would be a lot less crime if the consequences became more extreme. For example, would a person still drink drive if their licence ~~was~~ would be taken away for their entire life? Or if the fine was doubled? It would make those on the border of crime think again, before doing it. Also, to address the second part of the statement, a society which stands up in the face of moral injustice is surely a better one. If people were more prepared to stand up to the government against wars, laws on abortion or monetary cuts on healthcare, then surely the society can be in agreement that they all did everything they could to prevent such a charge or abomination of morality. Would the

government of still maintained the war on terror if the entire country rose up to stop it? Or if the troops themselves asserted their moral stance that the killing of any life is wrong and unjustifiable? Many peoples tolerance and failure to take action is what leads the authority to believe that their opposition is the minority when in fact ~~the~~ such things play on every single citizen's conscience.

However it could be said that a less tolerant society becomes a dictatorship. It may become a horrible place to live where everyone is forced to retain the same moral views and is never allowed to make their own decisions. For some people, the idea of less tolerance comes hand in hand with the backlash that this would bring. Would a stricter punishment system have an adverse effect? Would people resent authority even more and commit crimes even more than before in protest? Nobody can say for sure what the outcome would be but it is truly possible that further intolerance would lead to many people ~~feeling~~ ~~even~~ dismissing the law and its consequences even further.

Also, the idea that society should protest more for what they believe in may cause serious problems. Who would control such protests on a

large scale? Who is to say that these protests would not end in tragedy and violence? Protesting usually means that the protestors feel strongly and so a group of 6 million protestors who 'feel strongly' is surely not a practical situation if the country wish to maintain order.

In conclusion, the answer appears neither to become less tolerant or more tolerant as a society <sup>in general</sup>. The answer may be that individuals who are persistent troublemakers should be disciplined more than a first time offender of a petty crime. There needs to be a sliding scale and recognition that for some offenders, if they are not removed from society, they will keep causing trouble.

As for the protesting against moral issues, it is always going to be important for people to express their views but as a democracy, the majority rules and so the majority opinion must be accepted so that chaos does not follow. As long as people know personally that they are firmly against the immoral actions of the authority then they can perhaps rest assured that they ~~are~~ are not involved in anything the government or society decides, they have been true to themselves and not conformed, yet have not caused chaos in a full

scale protest.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer considers arguments for and against the statement and does attempt to address all aspects of the question. A weakness is that the focus is largely on criminal and anti-social behaviour and other issues raising moral questions are not considered. It would have benefited from a tighter focus on moral issues and moral values.

It uses a range of evidence to support both perspectives. There is some positive evaluation of points made. Although it attempts to achieve balance it is stronger and better argued 'for' than against. The arguments against the statement are presented as a series of questions with implied answers. The conclusion is developed from the argument and shows an attempt to reach a balanced compromise between the two views. Again the anti-conclusion is weaker than the pro-conclusion suggesting that provided you try to do right it is fine. The answer does contain some unsupported assertions. The answer was placed towards the top of band 3 for AO1/2 and awarded 14 marks.

The answer makes explicit reference to fact and opinion in some of the evidence and the ability to distinguish between them is demonstrated. 3 marks are awarded for AO3.

Communication is generally very sound and the few minor errors of expression do not inhibit understanding.

5 marks awarded for AO4

AO1/2 14 marks

AO3 3 marks

AO4 5 marks

Total 22 marks awarded



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This answer shows the value of planning answers and deconstructing the question to ensure that all parts are addressed.

11) Should society be less tolerant? Should we protest when something seems to challenge our traditional moral values? Many people would argue yes. People may see that tolerance does not always lead to the best outcome for society and there are certain things that should never be tolerated. It appears to be a slippery slope, where do you draw the line between what we allow as a society and do not allow, perhaps a less tolerant and more traditional society would be a safer one, maybe if we were not so tolerant of other people's views and values, many awful events such as the 7/7 bombings and the actions of various killers and terrorists could have been prevented. Is it right that we are so tolerant? Even when something may clearly go against the firm beliefs of society should we still allow it on the basis of free speech when we know all too well that emotive speeches can lead to terrible views amongst people eg. Hitler's speeches that incited ~~more~~ hatred towards Jewish people. Here it is obvious that there are clearly certain

circumstances that call for a more traditional and less tolerant society. But let us take a hypothetical scenario, for many people, the idea of gene therapy or stem cell treatment goes against traditional Christian beliefs in our society, but if it were to lead to an eventual cure for cancer, would this not be the ultimate reward for our tolerance? Is it necessarily right to impose the views of society upon others and does this not compromise free will? Of course, the hard determinists would argue free will does not exist anyway but there is a profound point to be had here, perhaps our experiences of intolerant and traditional societies of the past have made us 'learn from our mistakes' and become a much more tolerant one. Many tragedies took place in intolerant societies, such as the Holocaust or for philosophers the execution of Socrates, even for a religious believer the sacrifice of Jesus shows what happens when people are intolerant of new ideologies and wish to stick to traditional values. But where is the line drawn?

And what is our acceptable price for progression? There is an obvious problem, if a society becomes too tolerant, then this can be just as bad as an intolerant society, people's lives should not be put at risk due to the tolerance of some people's beliefs and progression of science and thinking should not be hampered by an intolerant traditional society, so how do we get the balance correct?

Do we take a utilitarianist view and argue that few people suffer and pay the price of tolerance compared to the many that can possibly gain from it? But when the issue of people's lives are brought into the equation we cannot simply see it as a numbers game.

Perhaps we have not yet found the correct balance and maybe we do need to become slightly less tolerant and more traditional, but there is always the problem of making the same mistakes as society in the past are knowing the right balance appears to be an impossible question to answer. Perhaps



we should put our faith in correct education of society to create similarities rather than differences, but then again the problem of always conforming is hardly good for a progressing nation.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Two distinct viewpoints are considered in a critical way. There is a range of relevant evidence from different disciplines which clearly support the argument. There is evidence of evaluation. The conclusion is balanced and rises from the preceding argument. AO1/2 is awarded band 4 18 marks.

The answer contains explicit reference to beliefs but not to fact or opinion although both are evident in all parts of the answer. It is awarded 2marks for AO3

Communication is generally clear and understandable. There are some errors and poor expressions but these do not inhibit comprehension. 5 marks

AO1/2 18 marks

AO3 2 marks

AO4 5marks

Total awarded 25 marks



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

It is important in essays to pay attention to the requirements of AO3. This requires explicit reference to the use of fact and opinion and the way in which each can contribute to the success of an argument.

## **Question 12**

This was the less popular of the two essays but was one where candidates tended to be rather more successful. A significant weakness was that most candidates had limited understanding of the amount of government funding for the arts and how it was distributed. More importantly there appeared serious misunderstanding of the relative insignificance of such funding when compared to the cuts that have been imposed on the NHS, welfare, education and military expenditure. Some candidates did not understand what was meant by public funding. There was the inevitable assumption that only the working class paid taxes whilst only the middle classes enjoyed the arts and benefited from subsidies. There was often too heavy a focus on economic austerity rather than on the importance of continuing to fund the arts.

Some answers did show strong prejudice either in opposition to or in favour of the arts but most were able to adopt a balanced approach. Understandably in view of recent media reports there was greater awareness of the effects of government cuts than of spending on the arts. Equally unsurprising was that many students showed great concern about proposed increases in University fees which could, apparently, be avoided if the subsidy to the arts was removed.

A number of candidates seemed to feel that public funding of the arts related to the place of art and music in schools and in particular to the lack of an adequate supply of paper, paint and crayons. Better answers were able to recognise the range of the arts (including dance, theatre and museums) recognised the potential for private or corporate sponsorship but also recognised the importance of the arts in preserving heritage and culture. Most tended to think in terms of high culture and few recognised that the arts in popular culture are to a large extent self-supporting.

Economic austerity is a phrase to describe the current economic climate which is tightly budgeted and leading to nationwide cuts in funding.

I think that the current Budget announced for 2011 is wrong to subsidise the arts of society. When even front-line services like the NHS, Police, Fire and local government all announced they will be experiencing critical funding cuts to services which all citizens need for their day to day life.

These cuts will affect every citizen's health, their education and the quality of the area they live in as well as the vital support from the emergency services. Therefore in my opinion these must be priority to be maintained and subsidising the arts is merely boosting the arts industries like theatre, drama etc. these are ~~art~~ hobbies which although the individuals will be passionate about they won't necessarily need them to survive therefore I feel subsidising the arts to be unfair in the current economic climate.

On the other hand if the government is to keep unemployment down through this difficult

economic period it may be necessary to subsidise the arts to keep people employed in these areas in work so they are not reliant on Government Job seekers allowance. To subsidise the arts will firstly reduce ticket prices and attract more people to the arts which has a connected impact of prosperity to all of its related areas. For instance subsidising a city centre theatre would attract customers to use the centre's other businesses like



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer considers the issue with both a negative and a positive slant but only from an economic perspective. Apart from references to government cuts the lack of supporting evidence restricts the answer to band 2, even though there are some quite perceptive comments. The essay appears to be unfinished and lacks a conclusion. AO1/2 is awarded band 2, 7 marks.

The answer consists mainly of opinion. Some facts are introduced although they relate to the economy rather than to the arts. There is no explicit reference to fact and opinion so 1 mark is awarded for AO3. AO4 Communication is generally sound and meaning is normally fairly clear. There are a few errors and 3 marks are awarded for AO4

AO1/2 7 marks  
AO3 1 mark  
AO4 3 marks



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The essays test synopticity. This means it is important to address any issue from different perspectives and draw evidence from a variety of disciplines in order to achieve high marks.

This answer was awarded 22 marks. It shows a clear understanding of what the arts are and of the part they can play in the cultural and economic life of society.

11 'Life for the majority of people would be better if society was less tolerant and individually we were more prepared to protest when traditional moral values are challenged.'

Critically evaluate this assertion.

(Total for Question 11 = 30 marks)

includes 6 marks for Quality of Written Communication

12 Critically examine the view that in an age of economic austerity it is wrong to use public funds to subsidise the arts.

(Total for Question 12 = 30 marks)

includes 6 marks for Quality of Written Communication

PLAN

YES IS RIGHT

- Museums, Art Galleries, theatres attracts tourists
- Human happiness, recreation
- regards
- Pumps money back into economy

NO IS WRONG

- more ~~connected~~ society / NOT everyone agrees
- More pressing matters, unemployment, NHS.
- People less likely to spend on recreation in hard times.
- could fund themselves?

The arts, ~~museums~~ meaning museums, theatres, art galleries, creative arts etc, has always received receives funding from the British government who see it as a valued part of British culture. However, in economically hard times many argue that it is wrong ~~to~~ to spend public money on the arts when it is desperately needed in other areas such as the NHS, ~~and~~ benefits + unemployment.

It could be argued that it is wrong to use public ~~the~~ funds to subsidize the arts when economic austerity means increased unemployment which means that this money is needed to help support these people and enable them to live compared to spending on the arts which compared to human need, is considered of little importance. The arts cannot help all people and therefore why subsidize the arts when we could use that money on the NHS. On the other hand, subsidizing the arts may lead to the creation of more jobs in this sector and therefore it may actually be beneficial to subsidize the arts in times of economic austerity. \* P.T.O.

furthermore, art galleries and museums attract a great deal of tourism and if subsidies are cut then

these attractions are unable to fund exhibitions which means less visitors. From this perspective, subsidising the arts may actually help bring the country into economic prosperity and as the money tourists spend in museums and galleries can be pumped back into the economy.

Although tourists may be willing to spend their money in the British arts, in times of economic austerity people are generally more hard up and are therefore less likely to spend their money on the arts. For example, such as days out to museums and galleries. Therefore, it would be pointless to subsidise an area that is of little interest to the public when they wish for their public funds to be spent in a way that benefits them.

\* Furthermore, cutting public funding in the arts will lead to large job losses which only worsens the problem of economic austerity.

On the other hand, it could be so people are generally more unhappy in times of economic austerity and therefore, they need to the recreation of the arts to continue working through the



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The issue is seen from different perspectives and disciplines including economics, culture and tourism. There is some evaluation of points made and the candidate is able to see and identify strengths and weaknesses of both viewpoints. There are a number of assertions. The conclusion is balanced and arises naturally from the arguments presented. The answer does sufficient to justify band 4 but the limited range of supporting evidence places it at the bottom of the level earning 16 marks for AO1/2.

The answer uses both fact and opinion but does not explicitly distinguish between them. There is an explicit reference to belief in the conclusion. 2 marks are awarded for AO3.

Communication is generally sound and clear.

5 marks are awarded for AO4.

AO1/2 band 3, 15 marks

AO3 2 marks

AO4 5 marks



## Paper Summary

A number of candidates failed to indicate on the question page which question they had chosen to answer. As a result they were classified separately but marked according to the appropriate essay mark scheme.

The paper was broadly comparable to the 2010 paper and contained a similar pattern of questions. Issues that would benefit from attention and could raise candidate achievement include:

- better understanding of the requirements of AO3, including detailed awareness of different types of knowledge and argument
- ability to recognise the demands of questions which require analysis of evidence and arguments used in source material
- the value of planning essays based on effective deconstruction of titles in order to provide full rather than partial answers to questions
- recognition of the importance of providing evidence based on knowledge and understanding of topics in order to support assertions and opinions
- understanding of the value of defining key terms in essays
- greater knowledge of all aspects of Specification content
- time management and the interpretation of marks available for individual questions as a guide to the appropriate length and nature of answers

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA027982 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning