

General Certificate of Education

General Studies 5766

Specification B

GSB2 Power

Mark Scheme

2006 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 the following 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 passage opposite about IKEA, the Swedish home-furnishings retailer.

The company's founder, Ingvar Kamprad, believes that his company is 'improving the world'.

Write a letter to the customer-relations department of IKEA, or of any other global company, in which you question whether the company is improving the world.

(40 marks)

Candidates might argue in their letter that the company:

- (a) takes over small companies and so reduces competition
- (b) exploits suppliers by buying in bulk and holding down the prices it pays
- (c) moves its operations to poor parts of the world where it can pay low wages
- (d) drives out the local competition by flooding the market, advertising, promotion and sponsorship
- (e) compromises local culture with its uniform building style, logo, livery
- (f) uses natural resources wastefully, pollutes, and otherwise threatens the environment
- (g) Holds LEDC governments to ransom by being 'footloose'.

Band 1 Answers will be in appropriate letter form, will focus on a particular company and mount an informed, well-constructed case against its improving the world by fastening on quite specific negative effects of the company's behaviour; it will be a convincing argument.

Band 2 Answers will be in recognisable letter form, there will be a strong sense of a particular company's being targeted, and there will be some focus on actual or plausible negative effects; the case will be quite structured, and concluded.

Band 3 There may be some wandering from the letter form, a company may not be well chosen (it may not be truly 'global', for example), and there will be little sense of particular shortcomings; there is rather a lot of generalisation, and weaker expression in the lower half of the band.

Band 4 There may be only a token nod to letter form; the choice of company is scarcely appropriate, and there is only a loose appreciation of its contribution to global problems; the response is unconvincing and/or brief.

Band 5 The response is inappropriate in style and content; it is ill-informed, ill-expressed, and brief.

(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 Highly-paid sports men and women, entertainers, actors, models, and media commentators all have high *status* (or position) in society. But how much *power* do they have?

You might consider the following in your answer:

- **their influence as role models**
- **the way they feature in advertising**
- **their involvement in political matters**
- **whether they *ought* to have power**

(30 marks)

Candidates might write that celebrities:

- (a) have the power to influence what young people wear and what they aspire to – and how much money and time they spend in celebrity-influenced ways
- (b) influence society's vision of what is desirable and to be emulated, of what is valued and talked and written about
- (c) are enlisted by politicians to promote their manifestos and identify themselves with policies; campaign for change in their own right and command respect for so doing (e.g. Geldof, Bono, Jagger, McCartney)
- (d) are looked to as pundits beyond their fields; are awarded titles, elevated to the peerage, mix with royalty; they might be commended for using their influence to support 'good causes'.

Band 1 Answers will fasten on a number of particular individuals and evaluate the power they have in specific ways, convincingly, and well-roundedly; cue-4 is suitably handled.

Band 2 There will be some particular individuals referred to, and some worthwhile attempt made to assess what power they have, and what power they ought to have.

Band 3 Celebrities and the power they have will be spoken of in rather general terms; worthwhile points are made – perhaps rather obvious ones – though cue-4 is not made much of, and expression weakens in the lower half of the band.

Band 4 Answers are perhaps unbalanced, generalising, ill-informed, and rather brief; there will still be some relevant points being made, but they will be inadequately supported.

Band 5 There will be little convincing engagement with the question; answers are likely to be uninformed, uncertain of definitions (of status, power), and brief.

(30 marks)

- 3 Voter turn-out at elections has been dropping in the UK, particularly among the young. Voting is compulsory in Australia, and those eligible to vote, who fail to do so, have to pay a fine.**

Discuss the view that voting should be made compulsory in the UK.

You might consider in your answer:

- **if the British public would accept compulsion**
- **there might be undesirable consequences**
- **it is a citizen's duty to vote**
- **such a move would really be democratic.**

(30 marks)

Arguments *for* compulsion:

- (a) an advanced democracy cannot allow its citizenry to be disengaged from the political process
- (b) we are compelled to do many other things as citizens (pay tax, serve on a jury, send our children to school etc.)
- (c) compulsion works in Australia
- (d) only a good turn-out really expresses the popular will; abstention is open to interpretation
- (e) elections are our best guarantee against an overweening government.

Arguments *against* compulsion:

- (n) a coerced vote is not a free and committed vote
- (o) ballot papers are likely to be spoilt
- (p) an election (or referendum) may not always be called with good or sufficient warrant
- (q) to have to vote is as bad as not to have the possibility of voting
- (r) to change the law in this matter may contravene European human rights legislation.

Band 1 There will probably be some balance (i.e. there will be acknowledgement of a contrary view); the argument will be advanced persuasively, specific examples/items of evidence will be given to support it, and there will be a convincing conclusion.

Band 2 There may be some acknowledgement of an alternative view; the case is quite convincingly made, and there is some specificity; the argument is plausible and quite well rounded.

Band 3 A case is made but it is rather generalising and fairly obvious; there may be more indication than argumentation, and some lack of realism; but the issue is understood and engaged with.

Band 4 Expression is weakening, there is a lack of focus and some evidence of misunderstanding; the argument is unconvincing, and may be brief.

Band 5 There is little to suggest that the candidate has thought through the implications of the bare case made.

(30 marks)**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