



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

General Studies B

Unit GSB2

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Unit 2**(GSB2 Power)**

Answers given in the mark schemes are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points must be credited, even if they do not appear in the mark scheme.

SECTION A

Marks for answers in this Section should be awarded in these bands:

Band	Marks	
1	33 - 40	A very good response showing understanding of the stimulus, of the issues, and of the task. Information of a specific kind from within and beyond the stimulus is analysed critically. The writing is well structured and balanced; facts, opinions and values (implicit and explicit) are clearly distinguished and weighed. Expression is clear and logical with no significant errors of style or grammar.
2	25 - 32	A good response showing understanding of the stimulus, of the issues, and of the task. Some attempt is made to combine information and examples from the stimulus and from elsewhere. The writing is quite well structured and balanced. Facts, opinions and values are recognised as such. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, with few errors of style and grammar.
3	17 - 24	A competent, average response showing some understanding of the stimulus, but one that is largely dependent on it. Evidence is moderately well marshalled in writing that may lack structure and balance, and that may generalise. An adequate attempt is made to distinguish between fact and opinion, and to reach a conclusion. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, although there may be some carelessness in style and grammar.
4	9 - 16	A limited response showing little understanding of the stimulus. No other information is drawn on. Evidence is loosely marshalled in writing that lacks structure and balance. Only a limited attempt is made to separate fact and opinion and to come to a conclusion. There is a lack of clarity, and inaccuracy in style, expression and grammar.
5	1 - 8	A response that barely addresses the issues; that shows little or no understanding of the stimulus. If there is other information it is of doubtful relevance. There is more assertion than argument, and no attempt is made at evaluation, summary, or conclusion. Clarity and accuracy are seriously impaired by significant errors in style, expression and grammar.
6	0	No response, or no relevant points.

1 Read Jeremy Paxman’s account of the Plowden family, opposite.

It could be argued either that the real power in Britain still lies with such families; or that they have lost hold of the power they once had.

Argue one way or the other, as if you were a member of such a family.

You might consider in your account:

- **the source, and present basis, of your wealth**
- **whether this wealth gives you power and influence**
- **where the power that you once had might have gone.**

(40 marks)

Candidates might argue that ‘I’ still have power:

- (a) I have local power, as a magistrate
- (b) I represent the county to the Queen, no less
- (c) I run a sizeable business that creates wealth
- (d) if I were to pronounce on matters agricultural, I would certainly be listened to and my views would command respect
- (e) my family’s name is enough to ensure that many an editor would print an article or letter of mine
- (f) political and celebrity power is ephemeral; as a landowner with a stake in a locality, my power and influence will endure.

‘I’ no longer have much power:

- (n) agriculture is no longer a way of life that creates much wealth – and, anyway, wealth does not confer power by itself
- (o) land value cannot be realised easily for non-agricultural purposes
- (p) the rural lobby has less of a voice in national affairs than it had
- (q) I employ only 23 people, so it is a modest-sized business
- (r) power has shifted to footballers, actors and media pundits
- (s) my family is rather tucked away in this rural spot; London is the locus of real power.

Note: Candidates are not expected to write as William Plowden; if they do so, it is likely to be at a band 3, source-dependent level.

SECTION B

Marks for answers in this Section should be awarded in the following bands:

Band	Marks	
1	25 - 30	A very good response, showing awareness of issues and usually going beyond a discussion of examples given in the question. Facts, concepts and opinions are well selected, interpreted and integrated in a balanced argument that is furnished with well chosen examples. These are evaluated critically and perceptive conclusions are drawn. Expression is clear and logical with no significant errors of style or grammar.
2	19 - 24	A good response, in which some attempt is made to draw on relevant knowledge. Evidence with apt examples is effectively marshalled in an argument that is structured and that recognises the difference between fact and opinion. Valid conclusions are drawn. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate with few errors of style or grammar.
3	13 - 18	A competent, average response, which draws on knowledge that is mostly relevant. Evidence is moderately well marshalled in an argument that recognises some distinction between fact and opinion, but it may be cue-dependent and generalising. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, although there may be some carelessness in style or grammar.
4	7 - 12	A limited response showing little understanding of the question, and dependent on cues. Some knowledge is drawn on, but evidence is only loosely marshalled in an argument that lacks structure and recognises little distinction between fact and opinion. Examples are few, inapt, or missing. Expression is unclear and there is inaccuracy in style or grammar.
5	1 - 6	A very limited response, that draws on scant knowledge and this is of doubtful relevance. There is more assertion than argument and no distinction is made between fact and opinion. No examples are given to support the answer and no real conclusion is drawn. Clarity and accuracy are seriously impaired by significant errors in style or grammar.
6	0	No response, or no relevant points.

- 2** There are signs that nuclear energy may be coming back into favour. Examine the strengths and weaknesses of the case for putting nuclear energy back at the heart of British energy policy

You might consider the following in your answer:

- the costs of building and decommissioning nuclear reactors
- fossil and renewable alternatives to nuclear fuels
- the environmental consequences of present policies
- the moral implications of nuclear waste disposal.

(30 marks)

The strengths of a nuclear-energy policy:

- (a) we have developed technology and growing expertise in the UK which should not go to waste
- (b) nuclear power stations do not emit greenhouse gases
- (c) uranium stocks are practically inexhaustible when reprocessing is undertaken
- (d) nuclear power stations can be built away from centres of population in wild coastal areas, as at Dounreay and Sellafield
- (e) it is unlikely that renewable energy could supply our needs as fossil fuels are exhausted and emission limits are imposed
- (f) it is clean energy whose potential has only really been harnessed on a wide scale in France.

The weaknesses of a nuclear-energy policy:

- (n) it is extremely costly to build a nuclear power station
- (o) nuclear reactors do not have a long life, and decommissioning is, likewise, costly
- (p) many nuclear power-stations are *not* far from centres of population, viz. Sizewell, Heysham, Hinkley Point
- (q) there is still legitimate concern about the hazards to health of ‘normal’ radiation leaks; leukaemia clusters remain to be explained
- (r) it is in the nature of human endeavour that there will be massive systems failure somewhere, at some time. We know from our experience of Chernobyl what consequences such a failure might have
- (s) there is still no viable solution to the problem of nuclear waste disposal. Can it be moral to hand down a legacy of slowly-decaying waste material to our descendants?
- (t) There is widespread public opposition to nuclear energy; no government wants to saddle itself with a deeply unpopular policy.

- 3** **The comprehensive school was designed to equalise opportunities for all, regardless of social class, gender, or ability at age 11. Now a number of state schools select pupils on the grounds of religion, gender, ability, or aptitude for a particular subject or skill.**

Discuss the view that all schools should be open to all pupils, no matter what their abilities or backgrounds.

You might consider the following in your discussion:

- **the value of a diversity of school types**
- **whether 11 is a suitable age for transfer to different types of secondary school**
- **whether different types of school affect pupils' life chances**
- **the right of access for all pupils to the same body of knowledge.**

(30 marks)

There should be a diversity of schools:

- (a) a one-size-fits-all school-system cannot be appropriate in a multicultural society
- (b) parents have an inalienable right to choose a suitable school for their children in a free society
- (c) schools that are free to select, and experiment, and establish a certain ethos, are often successful schools
- (d) attempts to achieve a cross-section of children from different backgrounds in a truly comprehensive school (e.g. bussing, banding) have not been conspicuously successful
- (e) it is appropriate that there should be boys-only, girls-only and co-educational schools for pupils who might be thought to benefit from them
- (f) religion plays a big part in the lives of significant minorities; it is right that schools should reflect religious affiliations
- (g) it is fatuous to imagine that a common school can somehow engineer a society of truly equal opportunities.

There should be no selection:

- (n) selection and 'specialism' create schools perceived to be 'good', and in consequence, schools perceived to be inferior
- (o) it is too early at 11 to decide what life chances pupils should be offered
- (p) parents ought not to let their own religious proclivities determine the life-chances of their children; and, anyway, we cannot provide for all possibilities everywhere
- (q) all children have a right to the commonly-shared stock of knowledge and skills, in schools open to all
- (r) schools that segregate children according to their religion (or social class, or ethnicity) accentuate divisions in society – as in Northern Ireland
- (s) we have never agreed about just what 'ability' is, and how it can be assessed without its becoming a proxy for social class
- (t) the principle (and practice) of equality of opportunity need not mean homogeneity.

Approximate distribution of Assessment Objective marks across Unit 2

Question Numbers		1	2 / 3	AO marks per unit
Assessment Objectives	AO1	5	5	10
	AO2	5	5	10
	AO3	15	10	25
	AO4	15	10	25
Total marks per question		40	30	70