



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 5766

Specification B

GSB2 Power

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

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 the article by George Monbiot on the opposite page. It outlines the options open to us as we approach the end of the oil age.**

Imagine that you take part in a debate whose motion is:

When the oil runs out, civilisation as we know it will collapse.

Write a speech in which either you defend this motion (that is, you agree with Monbiot) or you oppose it (you disagree with him).

(40 marks)

Defence of the motion:

- (a) we shall not be able to service our urban and suburban transport infrastructure;
- (b) the cost of food – production and distribution – will increase beyond the amounts that many can pay
- (c) planes will be grounded, therefore tourism and income from this industry will suffer
- (d) having exhausted oil, we shall have warmed the globe in such a way as to submerge many low-lying areas with high population densities
- (e) paint, chemical, plastics industries that are oil-dependent will suffer badly
- (f) there will be massive unemployment, e.g. in all transport-related sectors
- (g) we shall have had to re-direct huge sums of investment moneys into more expensive fuel-sources creating opportunity costs.

Opposition to the motion:

- (n) new fields are being opened up in Sao Tome and in Central Asia that give oil companies time to develop alternative sources
- (o) traffic congestion will have forced us to upgrade relatively fuel-efficient public transport systems before the oil runs out
- (p) teleworking will expand to obviate the need for commuting
- (q) we can and will reduce ‘food miles’ – that is, we shall sell food closer to where it is produced
- (r) ‘civilisation’ adapted itself to the oil economy; it is capable of surviving even a radical change of energy-source as long as the adaptation is evolutionary
- (s) talk of civilisation collapsing is apocalyptic; the Club of Rome was wrong – Monbiot overstates his case.

- Band 1 The answer sounds like a speech; it is *specific* in regard to likely effects, and draws on information and ideas from *beyond the article*.
It is *coherent, persuasive*, and thoroughly realistic.
- Band 2 The style is appropriate. There is some material from beyond the stimulus material, but it may be rather *unspecific* and *unoriginal*.
It is well organised, realistic, and comes to a *conclusion*.
- Band 3 The speech-likeness may be lacking.
The answer is *generalising* and *lacks detail*.
It is *dependent on the stimulus material* for ideas and language.
There is still understanding of the task, but the response is unconvincing, and expression falters in the lower half of the band.
- Band 4 Neither the article nor the task is fully understood.
The argument is *unclear* and *unconvincing*; there may be heavy dependence on the article.
Expression is quite weak, and the response may be short.
- Band 5 The response is seriously inadequate.
There is little understanding of the article or the task.
There is irrelevance, weak expression, and brevity.

(40 marks)

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 It is government policy to enable 50 per cent of all 18-30 year olds to enter higher education.

How far do you support this policy?

You might consider the following in your answer:

- **the growing numbers of applicants**
- **alternatives to university education**
- **the economic needs of the country**
- **the value we attach to higher levels of education**

(30 marks)

Support:

- (a) demand for higher education is rising and will rise further; the government is merely adapting to reality
- (b) the costs of going to university have been incurred on full-time residential courses; there is a place for more localised, part-time, and more distance-learning enrolment
- (c) the country needs more skilled workers, and better-informed citizens; they don't need degrees, but they do need education/training beyond 18
- (d) university education has been too élitist for too long; even 50 per cent is a modest target; our competitors do better than this
- (e) life-long education is what we should be aiming at; and this is recognised in the reference to the 18-30 age-band.

Do not support:

- (n) it is not university-level education that is wanted: it is apprenticeships and other forms of skills training
- (o) it is unlikely that 50 per cent of the population can benefit from university-level study
- (p) the country cannot afford to supply higher-education facilities for so many, and high fees are already discriminating against the less well off
- (q) there are other ways of acquiring education and of being informed than going to university for three years
- (r) there will be diminishing economic returns from being a graduate as graduation becomes the norm.

- Band 1 Answers are *well-argued*, and make *specific* points drawing on relevant knowledge, ideas, and *examples*.
- Band 2 There is less detail, and less well-informed conviction, but the question is *fully-answered*, the argument is *reasonable*, and it comes to a conclusion.
- Band 3 There is *generalisation*. The four cues are picked up in order, rather mechanically, but the task and the broad issues are understood.
- Band 4 The question is *not well understood*. There may be some *irrelevance* and *ill-based* assertiveness.
Understanding and expression go more seriously astray in the lower half of the band.
- Band 5 The response is seriously inadequate.
The issues are ill-understood, and no relevant knowledge is drawn on.
Expression is poor and/or the answer is brief.

(30 marks)

3 A company typically spends 2-5 per cent of its annual income on advertising.

Discuss whether you believe this money is well spent.

You might consider the following in your answer:

- **the extent to which we are exposed to advertising**
- **whether advertising influences your own buying behaviour**
- **what advertising contributes to the media**
- **the degree to which we believe what advertisers tell us**

(30 marks)

It is well spent:

- (a) studies show that customer-awareness of brands is all-important to purchasing behaviour
- (b) companies would not spend the sums they do if there was no correlation between advertising costs and sales figures
- (c) we can all confess to having bought one brand rather than another because we recognised it from advertisements
- (d) advertising is often informative and helpful; it isn't all propaganda
- (e) advertisers make much television, much journalism, and many sporting fixtures possible
- (f) 2-5% is, after all, a very small proportion.

It is not well spent:

- (n) we know that much advertising is mendacious, or merely sloganising
- (o) it sets up false and emotive associations which insult the intelligence of thinking consumers
- (p) most of us ignore TV and press advertising: it is mere padding – a necessary nuisance
- (q) much advertising disfigures the environment, bulks newspapers, and fills waste-paper baskets
- (r) it encourages needless over-consumption.

- Band 1 Answers are *well-argued*, and make *specific* points drawing on relevant knowledge, ideas, and *examples*.
- Band 2 There is less detail, and less well-informed conviction, but the question is *fully-answered*, the argument is *reasonable*, and it comes to a conclusion.
- Band 3 There is *generalisation*. The four cues are picked up in order, rather mechanically, but the task and the broad issues are understood.
- Band 4 The question is *not well understood*. There may be some *irrelevance* and *ill-based* assertiveness.
Understanding and expression go more seriously astray in the lower half of the band.
- Band 5 The response is seriously inadequate.
The issues are ill-understood, and no relevant knowledge is drawn on.
Expression is poor and/or the answer is brief.

(30 marks)**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