



Examiners' Report

January 2010

GCE General Studies 6GS02



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. 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.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022805

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General Studies 6GS02/01

Introduction.

It is pleasing to report that candidates performed more strongly on this paper than when it was first offered in January 2009. Clearly, as teachers and centres have become more familiar with this specification, confidence has grown and most candidates have been well prepared to meet the challenges presented by the paper. Three ways in which a significant proportion of candidates could still improve their scores would be to

1. make sure they answered all the Section A questions, even adopting a 'best guess' approach if they do not know an answer for certain multiple choice questions
2. spend more time practicing questions about thinking and analytical skills - facts, opinions, types of argument, strengths of evidence, etc (as outlined in pp5-8 of the Student Book) and
3. plan their time more carefully so they can concentrate on Section C questions which carry about 45% of the total marks for the paper.

Questions 1-20

Questions 1-20 are multiple choice and the answer key can be found in the mark scheme. Statistical data relating to the questions is available on ResultsPlus.

Question 21

Most candidates had no difficulty in calculating the answer of 1,500.

Question 22

Few candidates had any difficulty in calculating the answer of 7,000.

Question 23

Most candidates secured full marks for this question, successfully calculating the answer as 55,500. However, those who scored 0 or 1 marks usually did so either because they misread 'county' in the question as 'country' and therefore calculated the rural numbers only (securing 1 mark only) or else they wrongly seemed to think that the number of children calculated needed to be subtracted from the number of adults, (securing 0 marks).

23 How many adults and children live in the county?
(Show your working)

$$20,000 + 30,000 + 1500 + 4000 = 55500$$

children in urban areas = 20% of 20,000 = 4,000.

children in rural areas = 5% of 30,000 = 1,500.

$$\begin{array}{r} +20,000 \\ +30,000 \\ \hline 55500 \end{array}$$



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer (55,500) is correct and the working is clearly shown, so 2 marks are awarded.

23 How many adults and children live in the county?
(Show your working)

30,000 adults 5% 30,000 = 1500.

$$30,000 + 1500 = 31,500 \text{ adults \& children}$$



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Candidate has calculated population in rural area only (may have misread 'county' for 'country') so 1 mark was awarded - as in bottom bullet point of mark scheme.

23 How many adults and children live in the county?
(Show your working)

Rural = $30,000 - 1500 = 28500$
 28500 adults in rural area.
 1500 children in rural area.
 Urban = $20,000$, $10\% = 2000 \times 2 = 4000$
 $20,000 - 4000 = 16000$
 16000 adults, 4000 children in urban area.
 (Total for Question 23 = 2 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate has incorrectly deducted the number of children from the number of adults in each category, so no marks could be awarded.

Question 24

Essentially this question required candidates to recognise that 19,500 over 65s live in the rural areas and only 3,000 in the urban areas, so the difference is 16,500; most answers were able either to secure full marks or to be awarded at least one mark for recognising that one total (even if incorrectly calculated) had to be subtracted from the other total.

24 How many **more** people aged **65 and over** live in the rural areas than the urban areas?
(Show your working)

Urban	Rural
15%	65%
20,000	30,000
$20,000 \times 0.15$	$30,000 \times 0.65$
$= 3,000$	$= 19,500$
$19,500 - 3,000 = 16,500$	



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

3 marks for correct answer.

24 How many **more** people aged 65 and over live in the rural areas than the urban areas?
(Show your working)

Urban	rural
15%	65%
15% of 20 000	
65% of 30 000	
$20\,000 / 100 \times 15 = 3000$	$30\,000 / 65 \times 100 =$
	46 000
$46\,000 - 3000 = 43\,000$ people	



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Candidate calculates the number of elderly in urban area (3,000) correctly (1 mark) but not the number in rural areas. The answer recognises that the urban figure needs to be subtracted from rural figure (1 'method' mark). So 2 marks were awarded overall.

$$20\,000 \div 100 = 200 \times 65 = 13\,000$$

$$30\,000 \div 100 = 300 \times 15 = 4500$$

$$13\,000 - 4500 = 8500 \text{ more in rural area}$$



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Calculations of both rural and urban elderly are wrong but candidate does recognise need to subtract urban from rural, so 1 'method' mark was awarded.

Question 25

Candidates mostly did well in discussing any two of the differences between rural and urban areas shown in Source 1. Many discussed the high proportion of the population aged over 65 in rural areas compared to a much lower proportion in the towns but usually only the stronger candidates recognised that this was because so many younger adults brought up in rural areas moved to urban areas to gain housing, employment and schools conveniently situated for their children. Examiners welcomed the variety of interpretations offered by candidates, as long as these were firmly based on reality.

25 Give reasons for any **two** differences in population or employment between rural and urban areas, as given in the information.

1 In urban areas there is only 15% who are over 65 compared to the 65% in rural areas. This may be because when people get to a retireable age they decide to leave the city and move to a quieter environment ~~and a better~~ where there is less traffic and noise.

2 Since so many people who live in rural areas are employed in agriculture, hunting, forestry, mining or quarrying. This may be because that most of these jobs are situated in rural areas so the workers who apply their trade in this line of work move to the rural area to be close to their job.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The first bullet point echoes in simple terms with little or no development an issue raised in the mark scheme (people retiring for a quieter life in the countryside) (1 mark). The second bullet point ('rural' types of work mostly done by people living in the countryside) is worth 2 marks. If the answer had ended with 'rural areas' in line 4, 1 mark would have been appropriate but the two lines that follow justify the second mark. Communication isn't perfect but it is clear enough to be understood - 2 marks

25 Give reasons for any **two** differences in population or employment between rural and urban areas, as given in the information.

- 1 There is a huge difference in the percentages of children in the two areas. In urban areas, society is much more civilised than rural areas. The urban areas have more money so therefore more money is put into health care, for example. Many children in more rural areas are born with diseases or soon pick them up because there is no hygiene and ~~also~~ limited amount of doctors. The lack of food in rural areas mean the children are weak, making them more susceptible to disease. If they do catch a disease, often the chance of survival is low.
- 2 There is also a great difference in the percentages of people aged 65 and over. Life is much more difficult in rural areas. The men ^{often} need to hunt and scavenge for their food, which takes physical strength, strength which doesn't get supplemented as there is a lack of food in the first place. Similar to the reason ~~there~~ above, diseases are prone in rural area, therefore shortening the life expectancy. People have a tougher life living in the ~~area~~ rural areas and this is reflected in the percentages we are given.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer identifies important differences - proportions of children and of the elderly - as distributed between urban and rural areas, but the reasons offered are implausible and match nothing in the mark scheme. 0 marks awarded. The communication matches all the criteria relating to the awarding of 2 marks. Although the reasons given are implausible, the candidate does attempt to deal with differences between urban and rural living and is therefore 'mainly relevant'.

Question 26

Stronger candidates produced excellent responses to this question, often explaining that travel was now easier thanks to high performance cars and improved public transport, so more and more people lived further from their workplace often enjoying employment in an urban area and family living in the suburbs or the countryside. Some weaker candidates scored badly because they seemed to think that 'commuting' was either about immigration or else some form of communication. Others, who may or may not have understood the term, failed to mention specifically how the points they made directly related to travelling to work, so were limited to gaining a maximum of half marks.

26 Using your own knowledge, explain why Commuting has increased in the UK in the past 40 years?

Commuting has increased because public transport has improved, ^{it is} there are now easier to travel into work on a train or bus. Also, there are more job opportunities available and more people with the skills/~~to~~ qualifications to do the job, so people are being forced to look further afield for work. The roads have also improved, and motorways have been built, which makes it far easier for people to travel to and from work on a daily basis.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gained full marks - 2 marks for public transport has improved/easier to travel to work on train or bus, 1 mark for saying there are more people with skills/qualifications so people are forced to look further afield for work and 1 mark for mentioning improved roads/motorway infrastructure . . . travelling on daily basis.

26 Using your own knowledge, explain why Commuting has increased in the UK in the past 40 years?

Transportation networks have become more reliable. This along with personal vehicles and the car industry improving on makes and models, the car has changed from an item of status in the past, to a viable form of cheap transport. The car is also more flexible than a bus or train, allowing a person to travel door to door.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

It would be impossible to know this answer was about commuting without looking at the question itself. If there had been a clear reference to commuting or going to work (see second bullet point on mark scheme) this answer would have gained 4 marks. However, since there is no such reference, the maximum mark available was 2.

Question 27

This seemingly simple question appeared to cause candidates considerable difficulty either because they quoted a statement that did not come from the specified lines 1-5 or because they may have included a fact as well as an opinion (when the question asked for opinion **only**) or because the explanation offered for their choice of opinion did not match the clear and explicit points in the mark scheme sufficiently closely. Even where an appropriate example had been chosen, candidates did need to offer reasons such as

- it cannot be verified/proved
- not everyone would agree
- personal views
- it represents a value judgement
- no factual evidence produced

27 Identify one phrase from lines 1-5 containing **only** opinion. Briefly explain why it is an opinion.

Opinion 'environment of bleak estates'

Explanation it is his opinion that it is bleak, not everyone may think the same.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The opinion is acceptable and so is the reason ('not everyone may think the same') so 1 mark can be awarded

27 Identify one phrase from lines 1-5 containing **only** opinion. Briefly explain why it is an opinion.

Opinion I guess in many ways I conform to the stereotype that Trevor Phillips recently warned...

Explanation This is opinion as he begins the sentence stating I guess, therefore showing it's his own personal guess, and therefore his opinion.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

'Trevor Phillips recently warned' is factual so the phrase selected is unacceptable. The explanation matches bullet point 3 in the mark scheme so 1 mark could have been awarded if the 'opinion' had been correctly selected. Total 0 marks.

Question 28(a)

Many candidates did not score the mark linked to this question either because their answer simply repeated the question, adding little or nothing, or because their answer was so muddled as to demonstrate their uncertainty or confusion.

28 (a) What is an ethical or moral judgement?

(1)

An ethical or moral judgement is what
is right or wrong what is deemed to be right
or wrong.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

1 mark was awarded for the idea of 'right or wrong'

28 (a) What is an ethical or moral judgement?

(1)

A ethical or moral judgement is a judgement that
considers the ethical and moral implications of
something or someone.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Answer effectively repeats the question without adding an answer, so no mark could be awarded.

Question 28(b)

Only half the candidates correctly recognised the 'it has to be wrong...' statement in line 15 of Source 2 as the correct answer.

(b) Identify and write out an ethical or moral judgement from lines 9–17. (1)

It has to be wrong that the only way to get from a Kilburn comprehensive to the rich suburb of Hampstead is to walk up the road rather than earn a handsome amount.

(Total for Question 28 = 2 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Candidate correctly identifies the 'It has to be wrong...' statement, so 1 mark was awarded.

Question 29(a)

Slightly fewer than half the candidates identified Statement 1 as directly contradicting the view of the writer.

(a) Which one of these statements **directly contradicts** the views of the writer? (1)

① the modern-day conservative party has always believed talented children should be helped and encouraged to gain qualifications and achieve success.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate could have saved valuable time by simply writing 'Statement 1' as her or his answer.

Question 29(b)

Slightly more than half the candidates identified Statement 3 as directly supporting the view of the writer.

Question 30

On most papers there is a question about evidence and arguments and, perhaps, how well a writer has justified a particular conclusion - and on this paper Question 30 is just such a question. Most, but unfortunately on this occasion not all, candidates realised they needed to focus on the way in which facts and opinions have been used, the strength and relevance of evidence, the quality of inductive or deductive or other forms of argument - eg arguments by analogy, arguments from cause or authority. Where answers engage with the writer's arguments and argue 'for' or 'against' a particular conclusion they tend to miss the point of the question and achieve few if any AO3 marks. Typically examiners assess answers to these 'evidence and arguments' questions by asking themselves a number of questions such as

- Does the candidate refer to identified (but not necessarily quoted) evidence?
- Does the candidate subject the evidence to albeit limited critical scrutiny?
- Does the answer distinguish between fact and opinion or recognising bias or problems of stereotyping?
- Does the candidate refer to the strength or weakness of arguments used?
- Is an overall objective assessment made of the sufficiency of the evidence and arguments presented?

30 Assess the strength of the evidence and arguments used in Source 2.

In effect, the piece of writing in Source 2 is the opinion of one 17 year old, and there is not much evidence supporting his claims. For example, he begins with the opinion that he 'conforms to the stereotype'. However, this stereotype is also just the opinion of one man, Trevor Phillips, and has not been supported by any evidence, and is just argument from authority. Moreover, Burgin makes the assumption that 'many of (his) contemporaries' would vote for Labour. As he has not carried out a survey or gained any information to support this, he is assuming that his peers are similar to him and will therefore have the same views. This could be seen as an argument from analogy, which is a weak form of argument, as he doesn't actually know for certain how the other people will think. I would say that the writer uses too many assertions for this to be seen as a strong argument. For example, on line 15, he says 'it has to be wrong'. This is not an argument because he doesn't have strong evidence to back it up, and the only evidence he does give is his own opinion, the judgement about the only way to get to Hampstead from Kilburn being by walking up the road.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate believes there is little evidence and much subjectivity in the passage (2 marks for 1st and 2nd questions). He gains the mark from the 4th question with his references to argument from authority and 'too many assertions' (but the reference to argument from analogy doesn't work). The 5th question (overall assessment) is in fact consistently pursued throughout the answer - so overall 4 marks were awarded. In terms of communication, the candidate's points are clear and well structured, so 3 marks could be awarded.

30 Assess the strength of the evidence and arguments used in Source 2.

The strength of the evidence given in Source 2 is very strong at certain points for example by quoting names. Within his argument, when he said 'that Trevor Phillips recently named' this makes the argument a lot more realistic and also makes the argument a lot more easier to relate to and have a opinion upon. Also when he uses Gordon Browns name and then backs up his ^{argument} with the use of his fellow peers 'As would many of my contemporaries in my inner-city school.' This strengthens the evidence in which he is giving, as he is showing that he is not the only one who feels as he does.

The strength of his argument is also very good as he gives a good and strong example of conservatives views over himself, stating a very clear opinion: 'Why? Because in a conservative world, I, son of a London-born part-time leaflet distributor and a Filipino Supermarket Supervisor wouldnt study economics...' However he could have further strengthened his argument by giving examples of other people and not just himself.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a fairly general answer. The candidate does refer to the evidence (first q) and offers some scrutiny (second q) and comments on arguments (fourth q). The answer does not adequately answer questions 3 and 5 so 3 marks only can be awarded.

Communication isn't perfect but it is certainly acceptable (2 marks) so 3+2 was the appropriate mark.

Question 31

While weaker candidates tended to focus on the particular case of censorship involving Wikipedia and Amazon (and often largely ignored the question), stronger candidates recognised that the question asked was much broader and that the information about Wikipedia simply provided them with context or a starting point. The question carried 20 marks, of which 8 could be allocated for AO1 (knowledge and understanding), another 8 for AO2 (selecting, interpreting, integrating and evaluating) and a final 4 for AO4 (communication). Often a basic AO1 statement in an answer is added to by an 'interpretation or evaluation' AO2 statement. Many candidates achieved good results on this question using and developing the kinds of points explored in the Student Book(pp78-79).

To what extent can censorship of cultural, political or social matters ever be justified?

Censorship is a sensitive issue. I can completely understand why you would want to ~~see~~ censor certain language, violent or "adult" images from young children, who are impressionable and easily influenced, and ~~so~~ this cultural censorship is valid, I feel. However, once you are 18, there should be no such thing as cultural censorship, as our culture is what makes us what we are, and is an important part of our lives. If certain traditions are "censored" then we risk losing our culture, our heritage, and our personalities. We should be shown our culture and decide for ourselves what parts of it we want to embrace.

~~Political censorship is~~ My gut instinct tells me that political censorship is wrong, why should the people we elect to guide us, blind us? That, by its very nature, is counter-productive, and unfair to everyone who ~~a~~ (mis)placed their trust in the government, who lead by example. Political censorship is not justified. Don't we have a right to see the whole picture?

Despite this, I think that while it is a dangerous game to play, if withholding information from the public would prevent mass hysteria / widespread panic, I can see how political censorship could be construed as a good thing, with the health warning that if the public found out, the breach and betrayal of their trust would make people resent the government, so while justified, it is possibly double-edged.

Social censorship can be seen as a bad thing too, as it is our society and we have a right to know about local and global issues. For example, if the BBC censored a BBC's news broadcast of a famine in Ethiopia, due to "distressing" images of starving children, Bob Geldof would never have watched it, and been spurred into the action that resulted in "Do they know it's Christmas?" and Live Aid, the second biggest charity event in the history of the world (second only to Live 8, the second concert Geldof organised).

The BBC showing that news broadcast, despite its content, raised millions of pounds for charity and saved untold numbers of lives (albeit by accident). This example perfectly illustrates how social censorship cannot be justified.

On the other hand, social censorship of terrorists or religious extremists could go a

long way to stopping them from gaining a large cult following, which can only be beneficial to the greater good. Censorship of cigarette adverts can only be good as less people will smoke, justifying social censorship for health reasons too. In conclusion, censorship is both justified and unwise, depending on the situation and information being censored, but a better choice

(Total for Question 31 = 20 marks)

Includes 4 marks for Quality of Written Communication

of word would have been "right", as to 'justify something' is to make it 'just', meaning it wasn't just before, implying that ~~censorship~~ censorship isn't just and should be stopped, when as I have just argued, it is sometimes ^{the} right thing to do.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer starts by supporting the idea of censorship to protect the young (1 - AO2) says that culture makes us what we are (1 - AO1) but says that for over 18s censorship cannot be justified (1 - AO2) since we should 'decide for ourselves' (1 - AO2). The answer then moves to discuss political censorship asking 'why should the people we elect...blind us... don't we have the right to see the whole picture?' (1 - AO2). The answer then points to the case for political censorship - withholding information to prevent hysteria/panic (1 - AO1) but shows how this could be foolhardy (1 - AO2). In terms of social censorship, the answer says speculatively that withholding information (eg about famine in Ethiopia) could have meant that good works by Bob Geldof and others would not have happened (1 - AO1) and that any censorship of such matters would be unjustified (1 - AO2). This view is contrasted by the need to protect the public from terrorists or religious extremists (1 - AO1) for the greater good. Censoring smoking advertisements is also seen as promoting good (1-AO1); the answer then goes right to the bottom of the page to distinguish between a decision being 'just' and 'right' (1 - AO2). Communication is clear and 4 marks were awarded.

AO1 - 5, AO2 - 7, AO4 - 4 = 16 marks awarded

Wikipedia is a free, open source webpage allowing anybody in the world to input ^{information on} pages and adjust information others have put on. It is unsecure and relies on end users who read the pages to report items that may need to be removed or censored.

Many pages have been put up on Wikipedia not with racial and hatred remarks and terms, which in this day and age are social, ethically and morally wrong. While Amazon may have money to provide 'watchdog services', Wikipedia does not. ~~It is~~ This in my opinion is why IWF watches open source ^{not only Wikipedia.} pages with more scrutiny.

The IWF's involvement can be seen as targetted censorship, on open source information, where demeaning terms, racial hatred and political slander can be posted and left unchecked for months at a time.

Can it ever be justified? Yes, but then the rules would have to apply to everyone. Ethically and morally, one should not run down another person, party or group of people because they are different or their views and beliefs are different. A democracy is ~~standing~~ ^{democratic vote for} is A party is voted in for by the people for the people and as such should defend all walks of life, censorship

should be the same.

Censorship can be justified to allow a level playing field politically. To protect ethnic groups and everyone on the earth, but the same rules must apply across the board. This can be seen as a communist/dictatorships view on things, but when compared to Chinas censorship, it is light in comparison. I believe censorship is needed, but too much can be destructive or counter-active to free thinking and free speech.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The second paragraph sees censorship as a means of combating racial hate material (1 - AO1) followed by a justification for Wikipedia being censored (1 - AO2). The third paragraph discusses targeted censorship and unchecked postings (1 - AO2). The fourth paragraph suggests censorship must be fair to all (1 - AO1) and suggests that parties need to treat censorship the same for all (1 - AO2). The tension between censorship and free speech is considered (1 - AO2) in the final paragraph. Communication is reasonably clear, so 3 marks could be awarded.

AO1 - 3, AO2 - 3, AO4 - 3 = 9 marks awarded

Question 32

Weaker candidates tended to focus mainly on the issue of a third runway at Heathrow while stronger candidates recognised that this was simply a starting point or context for a broader answer on democracy. Some of the better answers developed the kinds of points set out in the Student Book (pp92-95). This question is marked in the same way as Question 31 and in many ways the outcomes were broadly similar.

In a democracy, how much attention should be paid to pressure groups and opinion polls when important decisions are being made?

Pressure Groups and opinion polls ~~can~~ can be useful as a barometer to help decision makers see how popular their ideas are. But, over use removes the whole basis for having a representative democracy and can lead to some unsavoury decisions being made.

Pressure Groups can give people a means to let decision makers know their opinion on a matter. For example, Greenpeace are vigorous in pressing against issues of environmental concern as the one cited in the passage above. However, many pressure groups just represent special interest groups and listening to them too closely can aid them at the expense of others. For example, one of the most powerful interest groups in the UK is the CBI which represents many of the largest corporations. Just listening to them at the expense of others would have for example prevented the introduction of the minimum wage, a measure which helped

many people. Therefore pressure groups can help and should be listened to when making decisions. But, listening to them too much and not recognising that each one has its own interests that can contradict those of other groups would be disastrous for effective decision making.

Their opinions can be invaluable, but it seems that they should only be listened to ~~selects~~ and that decision makers should weight them up with the various pros and cons before acting.

Similar arguments apply to opinion polls. They can aid decision makers, especially politicians, as they enable them to see what the people they are governing in the name of actually think. However, the reason we do not have direct democracy is that we entrust governance to people who can be better informed than the general public and make coherent decisions. For example, government by vote initiative in California has ruined the state finances as the people have voted to lower taxes but increase spending. These vote initiatives are just a form of legally binding opinion poll (referenda) and this serves as a warning that opinion polls could cause problems if decision makers listened to them too much. *

Therefore, when people are making decisions in a democracy, pressure groups and opinion polls can be beneficial in seeing the advantages and disadvantages of certain decisions. But the actual decisions should remain in the hands of the decision maker because too much influence can lead to incoherent decisions or courses of action that harm some in order to serve special interests of others.

* Opinion polls could also lead to other decisions which many would see as unjust if implemented. For example,

The death penalty would be reintroduced in the UK, the Muslim veil or 'Burqa' would be banned and children would be 'seen and not heard' whilst being cared at school.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Paragraph 1 sees pressure groups and opinion polls as barometers of opinion - but too much notice given to them might undermine representative democracy (1 - AO1, 1 - AO2). Although pressure groups do give people a say and help to promote ideas, groups such as Greenpeace and the CBI are powerful - if their wishes are heeded this may be at the expense of others - eg the CBI opposed the introduction of the minimum wage (2 - AO1, 2 - AO2). This means although pressure groups are helpful to government and should be listened to, decision-makers must be on the lookout for balance (2 - AO2). Opinion polls are similarly useful but paying too much attention to them could suggest a switch to direct democracy (2 - AO1), particularly if this meant opinion polls were treated as voter initiatives in California or referenda (2 - AO2). In the final paragraph the candidate recognises that opinion polls reveal support for death penalty, limitations on Muslim dress or children being 'seen and not heard' (2 - AO1). If groups and polls have too much influence, decision-making can become incoherent or unfair to some if special interests win the day (1 - AO1, 1 - AO2). Communication is good so 4 marks were awarded. Where 2 marks are indicated above (eg 2 - AO2) for AO1 or AO2, this is because two distinct markworthy points were awarded for that part of the answer.

AO1 - 8, AO2 - 8, AO4 - 4 = 20 marks awarded

In a democracy, how much attention should be paid to pressure groups and opinion polls when important decisions are being made?

In a democracy I think a lot of attention should be paid to pressure groups and opinion polls. Why? Because otherwise it would not be democratic.

Attention should be paid ~~for~~ to the pressure groups and opinion polls when important decisions are being made, because ~~then~~ the decision makers should take all views into account before making the decision. And then make the decision on the majority's view. They could also judge the decision on the democratic ethical theory that is Utilitarianism and aim for the greatest happiness for the greatest number. I think that this is a good way of doing it as it follows God's Golden Rule 'treat others how you would like to be treated' to make everyone happy.

I think that the amount of attention that pressure groups and opinion polls get should be the same as everyone else. So it will be fair for everyone. This is also democratic.

I think that attention should be paid to these groups because everyone's view should be taken into account and they can then make a

fair decision. If not it might as well be decided by a dictator, in a communist way not a democratic way. So therefore it is important everyone's opinions are heard.

However this idea could backfire, for example there could be extremist opinions ~~made~~ or opinions which are not helpful, which may mess up the poll and then which could overall affect the decision made.

In conclusion, I do think that pressure groups and opinion polls should get some attention when important decisions are being made.

However, I think that the decision makers can still make up their mind after hearing the decisions to bring the greatest good in the democracy. So the attention does have an effect on the decision made, but not necessarily a big one.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Paying attention to groups and polls is seen as being democratic (1 - AO1). Groups and polls help to keep decision-makers informed, help to promote majority rule and may lead to utilitarianism in the sense of 'greatest happiness to greatest number' (1 - AO1, 1 - AO2). The paragraph at the top of the second page adds nothing. The idea that if all views are not taken into account, it could be claimed we live in a dictatorship is interesting, setting up a 'democracy v dictatorship' tension (1 - AO2). But it is seen that polls or group influence can involve promoting extremist views (1 - AO2). The conclusion is that poll and groups should have an influence 'but not necessarily a big one' (1 - AO2). Communication is mostly clear so 3 marks were awarded.

AO1 - 2, AO2 - 4, AO4 - 3=9 marks awarded

Appendix A: Statistics

6GS01/01: Challenges for Society

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	55	49	43	38	33
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6GS02/01: The Individual in Society

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	63	56	49	42	35
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6GS03/01 Change and Progress

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	58	53	49	45	41
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Maximum Mark (Raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme.

Boundary Mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022805 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

