

Examiners' Report  
June 2015

GCE General Studies 3 6GS03 01

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## ResultsPlus

### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2015

Publications Code UA041587

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## Introduction

Overall, candidates responded well to the paper and very few answer spaces were left blank. Most questions were straightforward but one or two did pose challenges. Many candidates appeared to have been well prepared and were able to produce well-reasoned and well-informed responses. Inevitably there were some candidates who seemed to be out of their depths and some who misinterpreted some of the questions in Section B. Pleasingly there were very few inappropriate or unpleasant responses this year.

### Section A

There was a good response to the questions in this section which showed that candidates are very aware of the environmental issues relating to climate change and the exploitation of fossil fuel reserves in the Arctic.

### Section B

The source for this section in this year's paper was an example of social research survey data investigating changes in public attitudes as to whether religious leaders should be involved with politics. There was more statistical information being presented than usual and this seemed to create problems for some candidates when identifying and analysing the relevant data for some of the questions.

### Section C

Twice as many candidates attempted question 13 than question 14 but there was a wealth of well-developed and knowledgeable essays on both topics. Candidates seemed well aware of the issues involved in both debates and many produced balanced and perceptive discussions using a wide range of evidence and achieved high scores as a result.

## Question 1

An accessible question and most candidates were able to distinguish fact from opinion to score 2 marks for 1(a) and 1(b). Some thought that the sentence, "we are ready to respond to a spill within 60 minutes, 24 hours a day" is factual whereas it is actually an opinion. Candidates were less successful with 1(c), "a conclusion or statement based on evidence" and where they were wrong they often quoted the same sentence about the 60 minutes response time.

## Question 2

This was answered very well with "reckless" and "irresponsible" being identified as key words in many cases and most candidates scored 2 or 3 marks.

Most candidates were able to identify the criticisms, some in a more developed way than others ranging from a few words to direct quotes to thorough explanations. Some candidates lost marks by stating that Shell was mainly responsible for global warming and the melting of the sea ice, or by using other quotes from the source.

This is one of few items which was awarded a score of 1 mark.

1 Shell are oil and gas drilling in the Arctic without strong enough safeguards.

2 Shell's pursuit of hydrocarbons in the Arctic is reckless due to the fragile Arctic environment.

3 Sea ice levels are decreasing due to climate change caused by the combustion of oil and gas. Shell are drilling for.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Point 1 is a criticism made by the Environmental Audit Committee not the WWF. It is also not a specific criticism. Point 2 is correct as the candidate has spotted the keyword 'reckless'. Point 3 seems to be blaming Shell for climate change in general. Total 1 mark

A more typical answer.

1 They have helped contribute to lowering sea levels in the Arctic

2 They shouldn't be drilling for oil in such a fragile location

3 Its containment system needs to be fixed.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Point 1 is, again, a general criticism implying Shell are somehow responsible for major climate change and so not worthy of a mark. Point 2 is an appropriate criticism equivalent to marking point 3 on the mark scheme. Point 3 is another mark worthy point as it is an appropriate criticism of Shell's damaged containment system. Total 2 marks.

### Question 3

Most candidates seemed to grasp the main point of this question that this report carried a lot of weight because it had been produced by a group of MPs in a parliamentary committee, though many failed to spot the significance of it being a cross-party group.

Some also noticed the relevance of the timing as the publication of the report coincided with the release of data confirming the extent of the decline of Arctic sea ice.

The other point that was also correctly identified by some candidates is the nature of the environmental problem, i.e. the disappearance of Arctic sea ice, is by itself a serious concern that needs to be addressed by governments and oil companies. Marks were also available to candidates for any further development of any of the points in the mark scheme. So, for example, some were able to score marks for mentioning that the committee report is an argument from authority or that the figures from the US National Snow and Ice Data Centre are scientific or factual evidence.

An example which gained all 3 marks.

It is comprised of MP's therefore <sup>the sense of.</sup> ~~this authority~~ authority that comes with that immediately enables the Environmental Audit Committee <sup>to be of</sup> greater influence and to be taken more seriously. Since 1B is also relatively shocking, ~~so with the idea~~ that the Arctic could potentially be ice free in the summer months ~~and~~ allows the report to be taken more seriously.



#### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer gains 1 mark for stating that the committee is made up of MPs, which is equivalent to the first marking point on the mark scheme. A 2nd mark was given for the additional development of this point about the 'sense of authority'. The candidate also gained a 3rd mark for the comment about the Arctic could be free of summer sea ice in the future which is equivalent to marking point 4 on the mark scheme.

This answer was awarded two marks.

One reason why it might be taken seriously is that it is supported by empirical evidence as it "coincides with the newly announced record low figures for arctic sea ice" therefore this argument is backed up by fact and evidence.

Furthermore it gives the opinion of a "polar expert" this implies that this person is very well ~~was~~ educated in this topic and his/ ~~her~~ opinion should be trusted due to their expertise.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer gains 1 mark in the first paragraph for the quote, "coincides with the release of newly announced record low figures for arctic sea ice", which matches the 2nd mark point in the mark scheme. There is also an additional mark for developing this point with the comment about the figures being empirical and factual evidence. There is no mark for the second paragraph about the "polar expert's opinion" as this is not relevant to the Environmental Audit Committee. Total 2 marks

## Question 4

An equally accessible question asking candidates to identify three specific oil spill-related problems from Source 1A. However, many candidates only scored 2 marks as they quoted or paraphrased the sentence from line 3, "technical solutions are helping us to reduce the risk of oil leaking into the ocean..." This is a generalised aspiration and not a specific problem for which they have developed a specific technique to counter.

This example only gained 1 mark

- 1 Technical Solutions are helping us to reduce the risk of oil leaking into the ocean and lessen the impact if this occurs.
- 2 Systems are designed to detect any drop in pressure in the pipes and activate multiple valve systems to stop the oil flow.
- 3 We are also improving our spill response capability through our involvement in global research and development programmes.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Points 1 and 3 are generalised assertions from the passage, not specific oil spill-related problems as requested by the question. Point 2 describes a particular problem about pressure dropping in the pipes during a spillage and for which solutions have been developed and so is worth a mark. Total 1 mark



This answers gained 2 marks.

- 1 Developing a containment system for Alaska from oil potentially leaking from wells.
- 2 Clean-up technique training for underice oil spills
- 3 Testing response times needed in order for oil spill clean ups to be effective.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Points 1 and 2 are relevant problems which match mark points 1 and 3 on the mark scheme. Point 3 is again too general to be worth a mark. Total 2 marks.

## Question 5

Many candidates lost marks here by discussing examples of ongoing environmental problems such as, deforestation, global warming and acid rain being popular choices, rather than identifying an environmentally damaging incident. Such answers were therefore limited to 2 marks for relevant effects and many only scored 1 by focussing almost exclusively on the effects on the environment. Some went into considerable scientific detail about issues such as global warming without really looking at the effects.

Good answers referred to a wide range of suitable incidents such as, BP oil spill, Chernobyl, Fukushima, Nepal earthquake, tsunamis, hurricanes, forest fires, floods. All these examples were mentioned regularly in responses. Many also scored 2 or 3 for discussing different kinds of effects on habitats, on people living or working nearby, on public health, and on economic matters mainly, although very few candidates scored full marks on this question.

This is an example of a good answer to this question.

Another example is the meltdown of nuclear reactors, as happened in Chernobyl. The explosion of the reactor created a cloud of radioactive dust that travelled over Europe and may have caused health problems. Also the high radiation levels in the area led to people being relocated from their homes and an exclusion zone created, as long lasting residue of radioactive materials is present in the air and the soil, which means any animals or plants in the area may die or become mutated which causes harm to biodiversity.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This answer gains 1 mark for naming an appropriate environmentally damaging incident - Chernobyl. Then gains further marks for commenting on various effects such as, on public health, on the locals and on the wildlife, to match marking points 4, 2 and 1 on the mark scheme. Total 4 marks.

This answer gained 1 mark.

Acid rain is a major environmentally damaging incident because when it falls it kills ~~all of~~ lots of plant life. This has a dramatic effect ~~to the~~ on the ecosystem as the animals further up the food chain have nothing to eat without making themselves ill. Acid rain is caused through the production of fossil fuels where the fumes from burning diffuse into the clouds which release them as <sup>acid</sup> rain when they condense.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This answer does not get a mark for 'acid rain' as this is an ongoing environmental problem and not an example of an environmentally damaging incident. However this answer does make reference to the effects of acid rain on wildlife and so gains 1 mark. Total 1 mark.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

The number of marks given in a question is an indication of the number of separate points expected in the answer. Here there were 5 marks available; if 1 is allocated for the example of an incident that leaves 4 for the effects. In your answer you should try to give four different effects.

## Question 6

This question asked candidates to use the evidence and arguments in both sources to justify the conclusion that climate change is likely to affect the production of fossil fuels in the future. Most candidates made some use of evidence from the sources and were able to discuss both sides of the argument, though not many were able to reach a conclusion. Quite a few misunderstood the point of the question and discussed irrelevant issues such as fossil fuels running out, the difficulties of drilling in ice and how oil is formed.

For the A03 mark many candidates were able to identify relevant evidence from the sources but many marks were lost due to there being no conclusion drawn and no comment being made on the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence or arguments used in the sources. Some candidates have obviously been well-prepared in answering this type of question as they were able to recognise that some of the evidence presented was fact or opinion, and they also noticed that the sources themselves were probably biased.

This is a good answer which scored 12 marks.

Source 1B clearly states that ~~the~~ climate change is likely to affect the production of fossil fuels in the near future and this seems like a logical argument as ~~for~~ the production of fossil fuels does lead to an increase in climate change. Source 1a, however, places little importance on the presence of climate change and states perhaps environmentally damaging accidents such as oil spills are more important. Source 1a doesn't mention the decrease in Arctic sea ice at all ~~however~~ it is clear from the evidence in source 1B that it is ~~definitely~~ definitely occurring. In this respect ~~it would~~ ~~one~~ one would suggest that Source 1a gives a biased report of the extent of climate change and damage to the arctic caused by their pursuit of oil.

From Source 1B it is possible to conclude that climate change is likely to affect the production of fossil fuels in the near future as it gives scientific evidence to suggest that there is definitely a significant decrease of arctic sea ice and that the Arctic could be virtually free of summer sea ice within a generation, largely due to climate change. It also gives evidence

from a "polar" expert to suggest that it is "irresponsible" for ~~the~~ Shell to drill for oil in the Arctic as it is a "fragile environment".

Furthermore the fact that the Environmental Audit Committee called for a halt on oil and gas drilling in the Arctic until there are stronger safeguards suggests the government is willing to protect the Arctic from the threat of drilling and climate change meaning climate change is very likely to affect the production of fossil fuels in the near future.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer has considered and critically evaluated the evidence from both sources in some depth and has reached an appropriate conclusion - AO2 level 4. For AO3, relevant evidence is quoted from the sources. There are references to bias in the second paragraph and the quality and authority of the evidence and sources in the 3rd. There is also a conclusion so the AO3 mark is 4. For AO4 the answer is clear and lucid - 4 marks. Total 12 marks.

This answer gained 6 marks.

The production of fossil fuels has a fairly small affect on climate change, its our use of them that causes the problem. This will cause production to slow down, for one we are running out of fossil fuels, but also the search for greener and cleaner fuels will slow production down.

Another factor is peoples perception on fossil fuels and climate change. Some are far on the green side and think we should ban the use of fossil fuels, and some on the other extreme who try to argue climate change is a myth. This is where the media plays a massive role as they are the source of peoples information.

Another thought is that as climate change inevitably gets worse, there will be less ice caps so makes it easier to find more fossil fuels, potentially increasing the production of fossil fuels. This will also bring prices down on everything as the cost of fuel would decrease as it would cost less to produce oil as there won't be any ice left for companies to try to protect.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer does not really use any evidence from the sources but does discuss some other limited evidence. This response seems to have missed the point of the question and does discuss some issues which are not really relevant and in a rather one-sided manner - A02 2 marks. There is a conclusion implied in the discussion so A03 is 1 mark. A04 - the answer reads well but there are a few errors of syntax and grammar so 3 marks. Total 6 marks.

## Question 7

This question was well answered by most candidates as they were able to recognise the main justification for the survey, that being the monitoring of changes in attitudes and beliefs. A large proportion also went on to add that it could also help the government make informed decisions and changes to policy that would benefit society as a whole. Quite a few quoted directly from the first paragraph of the introduction to the table, "*constantly monitored and interpreted the British public's changing attitudes...*" which matches the first marking point very well. Some also quoted the first line about the survey being primary social research but this does not get a mark as it is not a justification for the survey.

This answer was awarded 2 marks

- 1 To monitor the British public's changing attitudes towards different issues.
- 2 ~~The~~ To improve the government and the running of the country in line with people's beliefs and opinions.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Point 1 - a good answer to match the first mark point in the mark scheme.

Point 2 - this answer implies the information is influential in government decision-making which matches the 4th mark point in the mark scheme.  
Total 2 marks.

This is one of few examples which was not awarded any marks.

1. It allows ~~you~~ the ~~the~~ national centre of social research to monitor the change and progress of the country year after year
2. It allows them to adhere to the majority's views, to make a happier country.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Both answers here are too vague; "

*to monitor the change and progress of the country...*"

does not specify attitudes and, "allow them to adhere to the majority's views" does not quite make the point that it influences government policy. Total 0 marks.

Here is a typical example which gained 1 mark

1. So that the government can ~~help~~ to get opinions from the public so they can work towards improving the country.
2. So they can get information on people e.g. what religion is the ~~the~~ most popular ~~is~~ in one city.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Point 1 gets 1 mark for marking point 4 as it clearly says that the government is using the information to inform its decision-making. Point 2 is confusing this survey with the Census. This survey is about attitudes and participants are not required to give their own personal details. Total 1 mark



## Question 8

This question produced a wide range of responses with many candidates scoring full marks. The main reasons cited in responses were issues of a religious leader only presenting one narrow view, or that there are many religions, or that the country is too multicultural for one religious leader to cover all beliefs.

Some candidates struggled to express their ideas clearly and seemed to equate religious influence with fundamentalist intolerance or even to talk of civil unrest being caused by the imposition of strict religious practices. Quite a few thought that the UK is a secular state, which, of course, is technically incorrect, but others did make the relevant point that UK society is becoming increasingly secular.

This is a typical example which was awarded 2 marks.

- 1 as our country has become alot more secular in the past 50 years - religions no longer influences our lives
- 2 there is religious diversity in england, muslim, christian, it is not fair for certain religions to influence government decisions as not everyone has same views



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Point 1 gains 1 mark as it refers to the declining importance of religion in the UK which matches mark point 2 on the mark scheme. Point 2 also gains a mark for commenting on the multiplicity of religious points of view which matches mark point 4 on the mark scheme. Total 2 marks.

This answer gained 1 mark

1 Religious leaders are not trained to deal with government matters.

2 There are many different religions so how can one influence decisions and one not.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

There were a quite a few answers which made a similar point to the first point about, "*religious leaders not being trained to deal with government matters*". However it is not a relevant answer to this question. The second point gets 1 mark for "*many different religions*" which is satisfactory for marking point 4. Total 1 mark.

## Question 9

Many candidates misinterpreted this question and used their answers to discuss the differences between the results from the two surveys.

The question was actually asking them to focus on the sampling process and how this could affect the quality of the data collected. Many candidates were able to recognise that the difference in sample sizes would have some effect on the analysis. Many also discussed representative samples quite well and identified possible sources of sample bias such as immigration, multiculturalism, religion and geographical location.

Some candidates also linked sample size and reliability but very few discussed the advantages of percentages for making comparisons.

This answer was awarded 1 mark.

The participants used may have differ be from different age groups, so will have different opinions. For instance, in 1991, the participants may have been older than the participants for the 2008 ~~street~~ survey, so may be slightly more religious. Furthermore, more people may have migrated to the UK since 1991, so there are more people from different religions which may have caused them to also agree with the statement as they do not have religious leaders that influence the government in the UK.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Although this answer did make several suggestions about the make-up of the survey participants, it was only awarded 1 mark for mark point 6 as it repeats the same point, that we do not know how the samples were selected. Total 1 mark.

The samples may not be taken from the same area and therefore different people may have been asked. The people that answered in 1991 may be dead or have moved elsewhere. The sample size may be bigger. The sample may not no longer be random as the same area should be chosen <sup>to make it fair.</sup> This means that the sample is ~~more~~ biased and does not truly reflect changes in people's attitudes.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The first sentence matches mark point 6 on the mark scheme as it is making the point that we do not know how the samples were selected. In the middle of the paragraph there is a comment about sample size and its effect which matches mark point 2. Near the bottom there is a reference to the sampling being biased which matches mark point 7. Total 3 marks.

## Question 10

Some candidates attempted to answer this question by referring to the statistics in the source but found it difficult to make sense of the data. However, this was not necessary as this question was mainly asking why non-religious people are more likely to agree with the statement that religious leaders should not try to influence government decisions than religious believers.

In some ways this item was very similar to question 8 and many candidates covered similar themes in their answers. Popular answers referred to religious leaders forcing their own agendas, ideas or beliefs on the general public, as well as non-believers being generally wary or mistrustful of religious leaders promoting sectarian or radical views.

Some also mentioned wars, terrorism and religious scandals as turning people against religion altogether.

This answer gained 1 mark

*This is because people believed that no religion should influence government decisions. This would be because less people were religious and would not want religious views to influence how the country is ran. People wouldn't want radical Christian ideas about homosexuality and adultery to influence laws in today's government.*



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The first 4 lines are too vague to get any marks. However with the additional comments about radical religious ideas there is enough for this answer to gain marking point B1 on the mark scheme. Total 1 mark.

This is a better answer which gained 3 marks.

Religious people more likely to have strong beliefs <sup>and values</sup> which are represented by religious leaders. More likely to believe leaders have authority which should be used to influence policy. If religious leaders ~~to share~~ have influence policies favouring religious groups is more likely. Non-religious people will see religious leaders as having no authority to influence policy as they do not believe in god.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The first two lines about 'religious leaders having strong values' matches mark point B2 on the mark scheme. In the next sentence, 'more likely to believe leaders have authority...' - is satisfactory for mark point A3. In the final sentence it states, "non-religious people will see religious leaders as having no authority...", which matches mark point A1. Total 3 marks.

## Question 11

This question asked candidates to directly compare the data from both years to assess any changes to the rates of agreement with the survey question among different groups of religious believers.

Many candidates quoted relevant figures from the tables but struggled to clearly express the significant points of change in the comparison. Some were confused about which data to use and tended to quote either the 'agree' or 'strongly agree' figures, whereas others made good use of both sets to make more accurate and valid comparisons.

Most picked up the point that the increase was across the board and many were also able to score a mark for quoting some relevant data to illustrate the increase. Fewer candidates spotted which groups increased the most or least.

Many candidates did speculate on the reasons for these increases and even though this was not specifically demanded by the question, relevant responses were credited in the mark scheme. A popular answer was the decline of the role of religion in society.

Here is a particularly good answer for this question

This is true with all of the other groups of religions too. All of the religions showed an increase in either agreement/strong agreement to the question, the largest increase was within the category of 'other christian', which increased by over 10%. The smallest increase was within the 'Roman Catholic' which increased by just over 5%.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

In the 2nd sentence it states that, "all of the religions showed an increase..." which matches mark point 1 on the mark scheme. Then it adds, "largest increase... other Christians... by over 10%" which is a satisfactory response for mark points 4 and 2. Finally it also gets mark point 3 for stating that the smallest increase was for Catholics. Total 4 marks.

This answer gained 2 marks

By 2008, 10.7% more Anglicans agreed that religious leaders shouldn't influence government. Roman Catholics in 1991, 57.4 agreed, but by 2008, 62.8% agreed. Those people of 'other religion' had also gone up by 10% by 2008, but 'strongly agree' had gone up by 28%, with an increase in number overall from 28 to 120. Overall, all of the other religion groups had agreed more that religion shouldn't influence government.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The reference to 10.7% increase for Anglicans is a correct use of the figures for mark point 2 on the mark scheme. The answer also adds that, 'all the religious groups increase' to get another mark point 1. Total 2 marks.



## Question 12

A significant number of candidates failed to notice that the statement, "religious leaders should be politically involved" is a converse of the question in the survey. This led to candidates selecting incorrect and contradictory data in their answers as they used the 'agree' and 'strongly agree' data from the source, whereas the only relevant data for this question are the 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' percentages.

In addition, a fair proportion of candidates did not seem to be familiar with the different Christian groups. For example, some did not realise that Roman Catholics and Anglicans are also Christians and a few did not understand the term 'Anglican'.

However many candidates were able to extract and evaluate some meaningful data from the source and discussed reasons why 'Other Christians' are more supportive of religious leaders being politically involved. Such responses scored 3 or more marks for AO2.

For AO3 most candidates were able to identify some relevant evidence and draw a conclusion. Many were also able to critically scrutinize some of the evidence presented, though a lesser number commented on the authority or limitations of the evidence.

Some candidates seemed to have been over-prepared for this examination in mentioning facts and opinions. Many candidates continually included in their responses, "it is a fact that..." or "in my opinion..." even though the context may not be relevant

This is a good answer which was awarded 12 marks.

It can be argued that other Christians support the concept of religious leaders being more politically involved due to the fact that their moral beliefs are very similar to the policies already present within the government. This can clearly be seen through the fact that in 2008, 10.4% of other Christians strongly disagreed with the statement, the highest level recorded that year. It can be viewed that this is inevitably a result of the Christian religion holding similar beliefs, such as murder and stealing to be wrong, to the government, therefore the argument of fact reflects using statistics clearly ~~expresses~~ supports no assertion.

Moreover, this view is problematic due to the fact that ~~has~~ this is an argument of induction. Not all Christians hold the same religious beliefs despite being part of the same religion, which is clearly shown through the contrasts of 28.0% supporting the idea and 10.4% strongly disagreeing with it. Therefore, it can be argued that their religion is not a factor, but instead their social upbringing affects their views on the government.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that Roman Catholics and Anglican believers are within a minority within the UK and thus would strongly disagree with this statement in order to get more recognition. However, this view is problematic due to the fact that more Anglican people were recorded in the survey, ~~167~~<sup>436</sup>, compared to other Christians, 317. Therefore, it can instead be viewed that

In conclusion, it can be argued that other Christians simply support the idea that religious leaders should be politically involved due to the fact that the government already follows several of their religious doctrines.

(Includes 4 marks for Quality of Written Communication)



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer considers and contrasts relevant evidence from the source and looks at both points of view in some depth (AO2). There is some critical evaluation of the evidence and an appropriate conclusion. (4 marks). Relevant evidence is quoted and some is critically scrutinised (AO3). There is also reference to factual evidence and there is a conclusion. (4 marks). A lucid and coherent argument is well presented (AO4), despite the poor handwriting. (4 marks). Total 12 marks.

This answer was awarded 6 marks.

It is possible that other Christians see their form of Christianity to be less forceful and to have more room for compromise, and therefore be more reasonable to ask people to follow it, or at least aspects of it.

It could also be put forward that 'other Christians' could be putting forward a more traditional way of life. Rather than religious ideals, they could want an increase in community and being 'neighbourly' which are often thought of as Christian ideals.

In the area of strongly agree, both in 1991 and 2008, other Christians had almost or double the percentage of Anglicans or Catholics.

However it could also mean that other Christians are made up of groups who are more determined to spread Christianity. If they are made of Jehovah's witnesses it's possible they just want others to follow their beliefs.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is some evidence referred to in the discussion though some of it is not relevant. The arguments presented are not very clear and there does not seem to be any consideration of different sides of the argument. 2 marks is awarded for AO2. For AO3, there is some evidence quoted from the source but no conclusion. 1 mark. For AO4, the answer reads well but there are a few mistakes in syntax and grammar. 3 marks. Total 6 marks



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

In the mini-essays like this one, (and question 6) there are usually several AO3 marks available. There is usually 1 mark for using evidence from the source and 1 mark for a conclusion. Other marks can be gained by commenting on the types or quality of the evidence or arguments used in the source.

### Question 13

This was the more popular of the two choices of essay and there were many well-structured answers that identified and discussed a variety of relevant issues.

Good answers covered a range of topics such as accountability, Murdoch, Leveson, the general election, Charlie Hebdo, Edward Snowden, freedom of speech and the right to privacy and freedom of the press, as opposed to irresponsible reporting. A surprising number mentioned Profumo.

Good candidates were able to draw conclusions based on the freedom of speech aspect and the role of the press as an information hub for modern society.

Many candidates made references to China, North Korea and Nazi Germany in comparison to the UK press. The better responses analysed these as a contrast to complete freedom.

Weaker candidates tended to focus on the celebrity aspect and phone hacking with the discussion of press freedom being largely underdeveloped.

The vast majority of candidates structured their responses to include a discussion of the arguments for and against regulation before drawing a conclusion. Therefore, these types of response would be rewarded by achieving level 3 or 4 for AO1/2.

This essay was awarded 15 marks

Yes, British press should be regulated as the audiences age varies and younger generations should be able to keep up with the news without seeing crude obscene stories or pictures. ~~That~~ British press should be regulated by using censors. The audience for British press is very large as well, so all stories should be regulated before release as many people are going to be reading and believing this the story. If British press was not regulated then anyone could make up a story and publish it.

The stories could be full of lies and trying to frame someone. This could lead to national outrage and ~~the~~ incorrect persucution of innocent people. If the British press was not regulated then people would begin to loose trust in the press and business would decline. People would just use social media instead such as Twitter or Facebook as it is free and also not regulated.

However the British Press is usually biased and has a political accompianee which they usually side there stories with. For example the daily mail is Right wing. If the press was not ~~err~~ regulated ~~to~~ stories would be more true and even than bias. Stories would not be leaked on websites such as Wikileaks as the press would report it instead.

I believe that whether the press is regulated or not stories can still be leaked and told and that it is ~~is~~ safer for the British public if the press was regulated.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There was some evidence considered but this was limited in scope and rather one-sided. A weak mid-level 3 answer given 9 marks for AO1/2. For AO3, there was a reference to bias and a conclusion. (2 marks). For AO4, the answer was broadly understandable (4 marks). Total 15 marks.

In Britain there are laws that have been put in place that mean that the British press can only report under certain regulations. Yet, some people believe that the press should be further regulated and others say that the press should not be bound so tightly.

One reason why some people believe the press should be regulated is because there have been many cases whereby the people working within the press have worked purely with vested interests and that they have worked under gross-misconduct purely for their own benefit. For example, the Sun newspaper was revealed to have hacked into many people's phones to try to uncover new and exclusive stories, purely so that they make more money by selling more newspapers. Here, the press (of the Sun) actually broke privacy laws whereby people were under surveillance for a large proportion of time. To many this proves a point that the press should be regulated as they are causing damage to people's lives by overstepping the boundaries that have been put into place anyway. Jude

Law is a prime example whereby his phone was hacked for months whilst he was going through a traumatic divorce.

Conversely, some people would argue that in Britain we are privileged enough to have freedom of speech and it is going against human rights to try to oppress this. The British press should be allowed to publish whatever stories they feel most

appropriate at that moment in time. For example, the current scandal surrounding the uncovering of the corruption in FIFA. Any newspaper should be allowed to report on this incident as it seems to be of genuine interest to the general public and if this was regulated and disallowed to be published, then this information could be seen to be unduly withheld from the British public; even if it is being published in many other countries around the world.

Although, linking back to the first point of vested interest, it has also been well documented by other forms of media that the British press have consistently manipulated the truth in order to sell more copies of their documentation. Piers Morgan is an interesting case study to highlight this. From his time of editing a very well known and well read newspaper he is now known for his widely cross opinions and general unprecedented fabrication of the truth. So, if this is the case then what even is the point of the British press if it is not regulated well enough that we do not even believe the stories by which we are reading? This strongly argues the case that there is no point in the British press if it is not correctly regulated.

The final point however raises the assertion that the British press is indeed a business: it exists due to its primary purpose to make money. Therefore, if people enjoy what they are reading then they will continually buy the newspaper anyway. This is inline with the Utilitarian principle put forward by Bentham whereby we should do whatever makes the greatest number of people happy. Surely if this was not the case then the



British press could no longer be economically viable? Yet it is still making millions of pounds a year as people gain happiness and satisfaction from what they are reading. Also if this is the case, then people must be generally happy with the ethical codes the British press uses, meaning that regulation seems unnecessary anyway.

To conclude, I believe that the British press should be more closely regulated due to the seemingly harmful exploitation of the minorities. This goes against J.S. Mill's Harm Principle; so it is ethically wrong to exploit the minority for the benefit of the majority. Again, this was recently highlighted by the tacks and disrespectful press coverage of the new series of 'Benefit Street' as the minority of one road in Britain meant a humorous joke for the rest of the country at their expense.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A well developed answer which considers a good range of evidence, examines both sides of the argument in some depth and draws a well-justified conclusion. This response would be placed in the mid-level band for AO2 (4-16 marks). For AO3, there is some reference to bias, ("*vested interests*") and subjective opinion. There is also a conclusion (3 marks). The essay is well-written and clearly understandable (AO4), though there are a few mistakes in syntax and grammar (5 marks). Total 24 marks

## Question 14

The less popular of the two essay questions but which still produced many interesting and intelligent answers which successfully integrated a detailed knowledge of climate change and a thorough understanding of scientific methodology.

Many candidates approached this question by developing the points made in the stimulus about the reliability of scientific studies, and whether sceptics had any genuine scientific knowledge or not. Most candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of global warming and the debate around its causes.

There were some very articulate essays in support of the sceptics.

Most came to the conclusion that the sceptics challenge was not particularly valid when weighed up against the scientific evidence of the state of the planet, and the knowledge and experience of qualified scientists. It was pleasing to see that most candidates had well-considered conclusions to their analysis. There were significant numbers achieving levels 3 and 4 for AO1/2.

Some weaker answers merely built up on the introduction to the question and used evidence from source 1. Others went into unnecessary detail about the process of climate change itself and gave little attention to the sceptics' arguments. Therefore, their responses were not balanced.

This essay was awarded 18 marks

It is scientifically proven that human activity increases global warming which increases climate change. Human activities that contribute towards this are things such as driving petrol/diesel fueled cars and executing machinery to produce goods, for example, cement. Both activities involve burning things that release harmful gases such as carbon dioxide into the atmosphere thus adding to the greenhouse gas effect, resulting in global warming and ultimately, climate change. This evidence therefore illustrates that the challenging by sceptics is not valid. Furthermore, the sceptics are not scientists and therefore have not had the ability to conduct research into their theory which therefore means that there is

~~Not~~ No evidence to support their theory and therefore it is invalid and is just a matter of an opinion unlike the conclusion ~~of~~ that human activity increases global warming which leads to climate change which is supported by research that is repeatable and valid. However, it could actually be challenged that the research supporting this conclusion is invalid as it was most likely conducted in an artificial setting in order to avoid the ethical issue of harming citizens which therefore means that it lacks ecological validity and therefore the research is not one hundred percent valid. Although it could be criticized by this, it is still proven as the  $\text{CO}_2$ , along with other <sup>harmful</sup> gases, that are released during certain human activities e.g. driving, come together to act almost like a cloud that covers the air and acts as 'shield' almost, meaning that the rays from the sun that are usually reflected off the



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This essay considers some evidence, though this is limited in scope and rather one-sided. However the essay is unfinished which suggest this candidate ran out of time. A good mid-level 3 essay for AO1/2 (11 marks). For AO3, there is some reference to opinion and some consideration of the limitations and authority of the evidence but there is no conclusion (2 marks). The essay is well-written and offers coherent arguments for AO4 (5 marks). Total 18 marks



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Do remember that there is always an AO3 mark in these long essay questions for which you can increase your marks by commenting on the nature and quality of the evidence used in your arguments.

Climate change sceptics oppose the view that our planet is changing due to human activity. When measuring how valid the view of climate change sceptics is it is important to note that any challenges to their theories are not backed up by definite evidence.

Much of the research into climate change is based on readings from fossils of the planet from millions of years ago to try and form a definite pattern/understanding of natural occurring cycles on Earth. However, this evidence cannot be deemed 100% fact as it is an assertion, therefore the only factual evidence of climate change is gathered from the last 40-50 years looking into satellite measurements. Therefore, it is unreliable to assume climate change was caused by humans as we have no hard evidence to prove it is not just another natural cycle.

In the past scientists have found <sup>suggesting</sup> evidence of severe climate change such as the ice age which led to the extinction of dinosaurs causing global temperatures to plummet. Such lack of evidence allows the challenge from climate change sceptics higher levels of validity.

On the other hand, the challenge of climate change sceptics is invalid. Overtime fossils which have been created <sup>store</sup> ~~storing~~ information about the environment, ~~at the time~~ have seen natural cycles of climate change occurring overtime. However, what is found is that these changes occur over thousands of years and are extremely slow processes. Where as <sup>evidence</sup> ~~data~~ from the last 30 years of satellite data has show Arctic sea ice to halve due to rising temperatures which is an extremely short period of time for the change to be <sup>occurring</sup> naturally. Moreover, sea levels are predicted to rise almost 1m in the next 50-100 years which would cause shorelines to move inwards drastically, causing such places like the Maldives to become no existant. Therefore, whilst fossils cannot be guaranteed 100% fact they give scientists an excellent basis to form predictions on as they are a close representation of what the past environment was like. We know this due to technological advancements and scientific discoveries which therefore suggest human ~~are~~ activity is the cause of global warming.\*

To conclude, the view of climate change sceptics is not valid as it is not based on fact. Many sceptics chose information that supports their view rather than looking at the whole picture. For example, many sceptics claim climate change is due to sunspots <sup>which naturally occur over time,</sup> yet fail to take into account the cycle of <sup>rising</sup> temperature <sup>linked with rising levels of</sup> and CO<sub>2</sub>, ~~which is~~ CO<sub>2</sub> being at the highest level its even been at over 400ppm. Therefore in order to gain a valid argument for or against climate change all evidence must holistically be considered in order to <sup>best predict</sup> ~~discover~~ what the cause of climate change is as ~~it~~ without such reassurance we may unknowingly be leading our planet <sup>(as we know it)</sup> into utter destruction.

\*It should also be taken into account as to who these climate change sceptics are, many are sponsored by large organisations to oppose climate change so that their business is not affected. For <sup>many</sup> large business particularly ~~it~~ ~~positif~~ energy <sup>companies,</sup> ~~it would mean~~ ~~it~~ people being to blame for climate change would result in

higher restrictions on environmental impact, resulting in higher cost, or alternatively loss of business to more environmentally friendly alternatives.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Good range of evidence used and critically examined, both sides of the argument considered in depth. AO1/2 - a good mid-level 4 essay- 16 marks. For AO3, reference was made to factual evidence and opinion. In addition, there is some consideration of the quality and authority of the evidence, and the question of bias is also raised. There is also a conclusion (4 marks). A well-written essay, well laid out and with coherent arguments (AO4), though with just a few mistakes (5 marks) Total 25 marks.

## **Paper Summary**

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Read the question carefully. And if in doubt read it again and highlight any key words. Many candidates have lost marks because they have misinterpreted the question or misunderstood what the question is actually asking.

AO3 questions are a key feature of this specification but candidates regularly fail to score high marks here. They need to practice thoroughly the skills of weighing up the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and arguments used in a source.

The longer questions, such as the essay and mini-essay questions need some planning before writing out the answer. It is noticeable how many high scoring answers have a simple plan or spider diagram at the beginning.

A continual concern that has been raised over several examination series is that of poor handwriting. If an examiner finds it difficult to read what a candidate has written they will also find it difficult to award the appropriate marks. Please write as clearly and legibly as possible.



## **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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.