



National
Qualifications
2016

X749/77/11

Modern Studies

MONDAY, 30 MAY
9:00 AM – 12:00 NOON

Total marks — 90

Attempt ONE Section only

SECTION 1 — POLITICAL ISSUES AND RESEARCH METHODS — 90 marks

Part A – Attempt TWO questions
Part B – Attempt BOTH questions

SECTION 2 — SOCIAL ISSUES, LAW AND ORDER AND RESEARCH METHODS — 90 marks

Part A – Attempt TWO questions
Part B – Attempt BOTH questions

SECTION 3 — SOCIAL ISSUES, SOCIAL INEQUALITY AND RESEARCH METHODS — 90 marks

Part A – Attempt TWO questions
Part B – Attempt BOTH questions

Write your answers clearly in the answer booklet provided. In the answer booklet, you must clearly identify the question number you are attempting.

Use **blue** or **black** ink.

Before leaving the examination room you must give your answer booklet to the Invigilator; if you do not, you may lose all the marks for this paper



* X 7 4 9 7 7 1 1 *

SECTION 1 — POLITICAL ISSUES AND RESEARCH METHODS — 90 marks

PART A — Attempt TWO questions — 60 marks

Question 1 — Power and influence

“The media plays a key role in strengthening and enhancing democracy.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

Question 2 — Living political ideas

“Governments and political parties are no longer motivated by political ideology.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

Question 3 — Political structures

“The ability of legislative and judicial branches of government to check executive power is limited.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

PART B — Attempt BOTH questions — 30 marks

Question 4

You are researching the possible outcome of a General Election.

To what extent would an online survey be a more appropriate research method than face-to-face interviews?

In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples.

15

[Turn over

Question 5

To what extent can **Source A** be considered trustworthy?

15

Source A

Article from *The Guardian* Newspaper

Meet the pollsters who are predicting the general election results.

Whether using online data collection or traditional telephone interviews, the polling companies are still unclear which way you will vote on 7 May 2015.

By Alberto Nardelli, Data Editor follow at (@AlbertoNardelli) and Tom Clark, Editor.

More numbers will probably be crunched in this year's UK general election than in all past elections added together. We can count it, all right, but we still can't call it.

The pollsters predict: **Miliband nudging ahead**

How the different polls are created

Most polls will have a sample of about 1,000 people, which is weighted to be representative of Britain's adult population by demographics such as age, geography and gender (ONS or National Readership Survey is usually used for this). However, there are important differences between each company's methods.

First, the regular Ipsos Mori, ICM and Lord Ashcroft surveys are telephone polls. While YouGov, Populus, Opinium, Survation and TNS are internet polls. ComRes does both. Phone polls have randomised samples, while internet polls are to some extent self-selecting—respondents have to sign up to a panel but cannot choose the poll they respond to. Historically, phone polls have tended to be more accurate, but there is no evidence to suggest that this will always be the case. On the contrary, the fact that fewer people use a landline will in time prove challenging to phone polling (even if nowadays a proportion of the sample is interviewed by mobile phone), especially as internet polling is cheaper, so more data can be collected, and panels become increasingly representative of a population as they grow in size. Second, each polling company will apply different weighting and adjustments to the data it collects—and this is where the main differences between the firms appear.

There are several areas that are common to most of the polling companies:

- All but Ipsos Mori weight voting intention based on past voting. The majority of companies do this by asking voters to recall who they voted for in 2010. Others, YouGov being the most notable, normally use 2010 voter identification (the party that voters said they most identified with five years ago) although for this election YouGov too will weight by previous voting intention.
- All but YouGov apply some sort of filter and weighting based on people's likelihood of voting (however, in proximity to this election even YouGov will take into account likelihood to vote)—respondents who say they aren't certain to vote are filtered out or weighted down. ICM additionally weights down the responses of those who didn't vote in 2010, and ComRes applies tighter filters to supporters of smaller parties.
- "Don't knows" are either excluded, reallocated based on past voting intention or "squeezed" (asked who they are most likely to vote for).

Source A (continued)

- A more recent addition to the mix is whether pollsters prompt for UKIP — meaning if Nigel Farage’s party is included as an option alongside the main parties, or is only offered if a respondent answers “others” to the voting intention question. Opinium, ICM and Ipsos Mori don’t prompt for UKIP.

One effect of the different methods used by the pollsters is that each will have varying levels of support for the different parties, resulting, for example, in a particular polling company producing consistently higher Labour scores than other pollsters. These are known as “house effects”. This doesn’t imply that a poll is partisan, but is simply the result of different approaches.

At the end of the day, pollsters want to get it right. Reputations are on the line at every election and how each company applies past behaviour to interpret present-day data is a matter of judgement. Fortunately, the fact that there is an election will allow us to see which method works best. It is always best to look at not just one poll that shows the result we like best, but at the trends across polls.

Further links

[More analysis](#)

[General election 2015](#)

[Opinion polls](#)

<http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/apr/08/meet-the-pollsters-predicting-general-election-results>

[Turn over

SECTION 2 — SOCIAL ISSUES, LAW AND ORDER AND RESEARCH METHODS — 90 marks

PART A — Attempt TWO questions — 60 marks

Question 6 — Understanding the criminal justice system

“Recent government actions to protect national security represent a threat to human rights, individual privacy and liberty.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

Question 7 — Understanding criminal behaviour

“Crime affects disadvantaged groups more than other sections of society.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

Question 8 — Responses by society to crime

“Rehabilitation is more beneficial to society than punishment.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

PART B — Attempt BOTH questions — 30 marks

Question 9

You are researching possible measures to tackle drug misuse in prisons.

To what extent would an online survey be a more appropriate research method than face-to-face interviews?

In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples.

15

[Turn over

Question 10

To what extent can **Source B** be considered trustworthy?

15

Source B

Article for *The Guardian* newspaper

Legal highs and prescription drugs face ban in English and Welsh prisons

Justice secretary gets new powers in bid to crackdown on substance misuse linked to rising violence and self-harm in jails. Mandatory drug tests in prison to include uncontrolled substances under crackdown.

By Alan Travis, home affairs editor [Alan Travis follow at \(@alantravis40\)](#)

The justice secretary will be able to ban any legal drug inside prisons, including prescription drugs and “legal highs”, under a crackdown to start this week. Chris Grayling linked the rising use of “legal highs” behind bars to more cases of assault and self-harm in jails in England and Wales. In a speech at the Centre for Social Justice thinktank on Monday, he said: “We will take a zero-tolerance approach to stamping out their use.”

The move came as Home Office minister Lynne Featherstone asked MPs on Monday to back the banning of two new psychoactive substances used as legal highs. They are the drug 4,4'-DMAR, known as Serotoni—which has been linked to 37 deaths in the UK, mostly in Northern Ireland—and MT-45, a synthetic opioid not currently available in Britain but linked to deaths in Europe and the US.

The Ministry of Justice is to send guidance to prison governors on Tuesday, requiring them to extend their mandatory drug testing to uncontrolled substances. Those who fail the drug tests can face a range of penalties, including prosecution, up to 42 days added on to their sentence, segregation in their cells for up to 21 days, strictly no contact with visitors—known as “closed visits”—and forfeiting their weekly prison earnings for up to 12 weeks.

The power to order an extension of mandatory drug testing is contained in the criminal justice and courts bill, which is shortly to reach the statute book. This allows the justice secretary to specify “any substance or product” in the prison rules which is not already banned in the 1971 Misuse of Drugs Act.

Prison governors and the prison inspectors have warned of the increasing use of legal highs and abuse of prescription drugs in jails across England and Wales. Nick Hardwick, the chief inspector of prisons, has said that synthetic imitation cannabis substances, such as the now illegal Black Mamba and Spice, have become the “drugs of choice” among inmates. Other new psychoactive substances which have not yet been banned are regularly found within prison. Hardwick has also warned of the rising use of prescription painkillers, in particular Gabapentin and Pregabalin.

Mandatory drug testing has shown illegal drug use in prisons has gone down over the last 20 years, with the proportion of prisoners testing positive falling from 24% in 1996/97 to just over 7% in 2013/14. Seizures of substances such as Spice, however, have risen from 133 in 2012 to 430 in 2014. Grayling said: “Go on to any prison wing and staff will tell you that whilst we’ve made good headway on drug misuse in prisons, there’s a new phenomenon they are increasingly seeing in the form of so-called “legal highs”. What we’re also hearing is that these substances seem to be part of the problem around increasing violence in our prison estate. No one should be under any illusion how dangerous the abuse of any drug is. We are determined to make sure governors have every power at their disposal to detect supply, punish those found using or dealing, and enforce a zero-tolerance approach.”

More on this story

[Lincoln to ban public consumption of legal highs](#)

[Legal highs in Lincoln](#)

[Warning over legal highs in jails after emergencies at Bristol prison](#)

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/jan/26/legal-highs-subscription-drugs-prison-ban>

[Turn over

SECTION 3 — SOCIAL ISSUES, SOCIAL INEQUALITY AND RESEARCH METHODS — 90 marks

PART A — Attempt TWO questions — 60 marks

Question 11 — Understanding social inequality

“Theories that view inequality as harmful fail to recognise the function that it serves in society.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

Question 12 — Impact of inequality

“Heightened levels of crime are the most significant socio-economic effect of inequality.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

Question 13 — Responses to social inequality

“Collectivist approaches fail to recognise the responsibility of individuals in tackling inequalities in society.”

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland **and** any other country/countries you have studied.

30

PART B — Attempt BOTH questions — 30 marks

Question 14

You are researching why social mobility is difficult to achieve.

To what extent would an online survey be a more appropriate research method than face-to-face interviews?

In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples.

15

[Turn over

Question 15

To what extent can **Source C** be considered trustworthy?

15

Source C

Article from *The Guardian* newspaper

Social mobility barely exists but let's not give up on equality

By Gregory Clark

“Elites and underclasses endure just as strongly in the US and Sweden as they do in the UK.”

We live surrounded by inequality. Some have wealth, health, education, satisfying occupations. Others get poverty, ill-health and drudgery. The Conservative reaction, personified by David Cameron, is to promote social mobility and meritocracy. History shows this will fail to increase mobility rates. Given that social mobility rates are fixed, it is better to reduce the gains people make from having high status, and the penalties from low status. The Swedish model of compressed inequality is a realistic option, the American dream of rapid mobility an illusion.

How do we know we cannot change the rate of social mobility? The answer is that social mobility remains at its slow pre-industrial pace. Tracking the status of rare surnames across generations we can measure social mobility rates for wealth and education in England from 1670 to 2012. The descendants of earlier elites only become average after about 10 generations, or 300 years. Status persists as strongly in the Cameron meritocracy as in pre-industrial England. Lineage is destiny. At birth, most of your social outcome is predictable from your family history.

An illustration of the power of lineage comes even from the first names children receive at birth. Naming your daughter Jade means she has one hundredth the chance of attending Oxford as a girl whose parents chose for her Eleanor. Similarly for Bradley versus Peter.

Even more surprising, in the model social democracy of Sweden, social mobility rates again are as slow as in England. Sweden has a class of people descended from aristocracy who have distinctive, and legally protected, surnames: Leijonhufvud, Gyllenhaal, Rosencranz and von Essen, for example. Someone with such a surname is still, eight generations later, three or four times more likely to be a doctor or attorney, or to be in the royal academies, than the average Swede. The descendants of aristocrats are still wealthier than average, and live in the more expensive areas of Stockholm. Sweden is a better society to be lower class in, not because it offers rapid upwards mobility, but because the living conditions of the poor are better. Since the material gains from achieving high status are much less in Sweden, it also shows that you do not need the wide-earnings inequalities seen in the US or UK to incentivise people to high professional performance.

Source C (continued)

Growing wealth inequality in the UK is a ticking timebomb

You can also structure educational systems to narrow the social rewards to those at the top of the ability distribution, or to amplify these rewards. In the UK we choose at present to admit to Oxford and Cambridge the top 0.4% of each cohort based on academic performance. This is a highly meritocratic system. But it is also a system that ensures that Oxbridge attendance confers high status. The beneficiaries of this status are mainly the children of the English upper classes, given limited social mobility.

A perfectly feasible alternative would be to define a much larger share of students equally able to benefit from an Oxbridge education—all those with 3 A grades at A-level, for example—and then admit from this pool at random. This system, similar to the one used in Dutch medical schools, would widen the pool from which Oxbridge elite are drawn to 3% of each cohort. Proportionately more students without elite family lineages would be admitted. Oxbridge would be less elite, and we would have a less socially divided society. Other European societies—Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy for example—have maintained much less hierarchical education systems. There are important choices we can make about how hierarchical we make our educational systems, and consequently how much status differentiation we build into society.

Gregory Clark is a professor of economics at the University of California, Davis, and author of *The Son Also Rises: Surnames and the History of Social Mobility*. Contact at: <http://www.econ.ucdavis.edu/faculty/gclark/index.html>

Further links

[Growing wealth inequality in the UK is a ticking timebomb](#)

[The estate we are in: how working class people became the problem.](#)

[Latest report on global wealth](#)

<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/feb/04/social-mobility-equality-class-society>

[END OF QUESTION PAPER]

[BLANK PAGE]

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS PAGE

[BLANK PAGE]

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Question 5 Source A – Article is adapted from “Meet the pollsters who are predicting the general election results” by Alberto Nardelli and Tom Clark, taken from *The Guardian*, *Wednesday 8 April 2015*. Reproduced by permission of The Guardian. © Guardian News & Media Ltd 2016.

Question 10 Source B – Article is adapted from “Legal highs and prescription drugs face ban in English and Welsh prisons” by Alan Travis, taken from *The Guardian*, *Monday 26 January 2015*. Reproduced by permission of The Guardian. © Guardian News & Media Ltd 2016.

Question 15 Source C – Article is adapted from “Social mobility barely exists but let’s not give up on equality” by Gregory Clark, taken from *The Guardian*, *Wednesday 4 February 2015*. Reproduced by permission of The Guardian. © Guardian News & Media Ltd 2016.