



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 6766 *Specification B*

GB4W Conflict–Resolution

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Unit 4 **(GB4W Conflict - Resolution)**

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

Study the source and answer the following three questions.

- 1 Using the source, analyse the nature of the problem and identify the underlying issues. *(15 marks)***

 - 2 Identify which parties you consider to be responsible for the problem and analyse the extent of their responsibility, explaining why some might be said to be more responsible than others. *(15 marks)***

 - 3 Explain what measures might be taken to avoid a recurrence of the problem and evaluate the likely success of these measures. *(20 marks)***
- A further ten marks will be awarded for communicating in a concise, logical and appropriate way. *(10 marks)***

General Descriptors

(i) Knowledge and Understanding (0 – 15 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the candidate's knowledge of the situation, and understanding of the problem.

- 11 – 15 the focus is clear and well-chosen; knowledge is thorough and comprehensive; and the problem is evidently well understood.
- 6 – 10 the focus is less clear; knowledge is adequate for the task in hand; and the problem is quite well understood.
- 1 – 5 the focus is unclear; too little is known about the situation; and understanding of the problem is limited.
- 0 no relevant knowledge and understanding.

(ii) Critical Analysis (0 – 15 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the candidate's understanding of the different interests involved, and appreciation of the limits of each in terms of their knowledge, their beliefs and their interpretation of the facts.

- 11 – 15 there is thorough understanding of the relative positions of the interest groups and their impact on the situation. There is also clear appreciation of their knowledge, their beliefs, of their interpretation of the facts, and of the limits of their knowledge-base and impartiality.
- 6 – 10 there is appropriate understanding of the relative positions of the different interest groups and their impact on the situation. There is also some appreciation of their knowledge, their beliefs, of their interpretation of the facts, and of the limits of their knowledge-base and impartiality.
- 1 – 5 there is little apparent understanding of the relative positions of the different groups and their impact on the situation. There is also little appreciation of their knowledge, their beliefs, of their interpretation of the facts, and of the limits of their knowledge-base.
- 0 no critical analysis or judgement.

(iii) Evaluation and Interpretation

(0 – 20 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the appropriateness and thoughtfulness of the steps chosen for resolving the problem in an interdisciplinary context.

- 16 – 20 marshalling of evidence is excellent, and conclusions drawn are highly appropriate; facts and values are well integrated in a very thoughtful resolution of the problem.
- 11 – 15 evidence is well marshalled, and appropriate conclusions are drawn; data, concepts, and opinions are quite well integrated; the resolution suggested is an appropriate one.
- 6 – 10 adequate evidence is marshalled, and conclusions are drawn; there is some confusion of factual matter and opinion; the resolution suggested is partly appropriate.
- 1 – 5 little evidence is presented, and conclusions are limited; evaluation is limited, and indistinguishable from factual matter; resolution of the problem is questionable or absent.
- 0 no relevant evaluation or conclusion.

(iv) Communication

(0 – 10 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the clarity and accuracy of communication and with the logical progression of ideas.

- 8 – 10 the language used is in an appropriate register; ideas and information are organised in a well-structured, logical way; there are few errors, if any, of punctuation, spelling and grammar.
- 4 – 7 the language used is mostly appropriate and generally clear; links between ideas and information are for the most part clear and adequately structured; there are some errors of punctuation, spelling, and grammar, but these do not hinder communication.
- 1 – 3 the language used is mostly imprecise or inappropriate; links between ideas and information are not always clearly made though there is some structure; there are errors of punctuation, spelling, and grammar, some of which may obscure points made.
- 0 no relevant knowledge and understanding.

Specific Descriptors

1 Candidates might analyse the problem in terms of:

- The location of IKEA stores. People travel a long way and become frustrated.
- The location of this store in a deprived area.
- Aggressive marketing techniques prior to the store's opening.
- IKEA's inflexible rules of purchasing policy and staffing ratio.
- The greed of customers overriding health and safety issues.
- The failure of IKEA to put the infrastructure in place and to estimate correctly or prepare for the numbers who turned up at the store.
- The sudden change of strategy by IKEA staff (voucher system).
- The inability of IKEA security staff/the police to maintain order.
- The apparent poor advice given to IKEA by the local council and the police.
- People being too consumer driven.

(15 marks)

Band 1	11 – 15	Shows good knowledge and understanding of several aspects of the problem. Has thorough knowledge and understanding of both the immediate and the underlying problem. Analyses rather than describes the problem. Makes generic points supported by examples from the source.
Band 2	6 – 10	Shows reasonable knowledge and understanding of some of the issues. Focuses mainly on superficial aspects of the problem with some reference to the underlying problem. Mixture of description and analysis of the problem. Uses examples from the source to support points made.
Band 3	1 – 5	Gaps in knowledge and understanding. Focuses on superficial aspects of the problem/ignores underlying issues. Deals with different aspects of the problem separately – fails to make links. Largely descriptive of the problem – superficial or no analysis. Source dependent.

2 Candidates might take account of:

IKEA	The company's selling strategies The strategic planning for the store's opening The way the store's staff handled this incident – managers, security, floor staff.
Customers	Their greed The way they conducted themselves Their lack of respect for themselves and others.
Local Council	The poor advice given to IKEA in advance of the opening.
Police	Their inability to control the situation The poor advice given to IKEA in advance of the opening.
Society	Emphasis on materialism.

(15 marks)

Band 1	11 – 15	Good analysis of several interest groups. Some discussion of the relative positions of each group. Some discussion of the values of each group. Makes reference to the limitations of a few groups.
Band 2	6 – 10	Mixture of description and analysis. Focuses on the more obvious interest groups, probably limited to 2 or 3 groups. A little discussion of their relative positions. A little discussion of the limitations of groups.
Band 3	1 – 5	Largely descriptive of interest groups – superficial or no analysis. No reference to relative positions of groups. No reference to limitations of groups.

3 Measures might include:

- Analysis by IKEA to learn from this incident.
- Thorough risk assessments for future new store openings and appropriate health and safety measures.
- Appropriate training in crowd management for staff of IKEA stores.
- Internal review of IKEA's purchasing policy and practice.
- Government controls on company selling methods.
- Controls on advertising – self-imposed or regulated.
- Education in schools on responsible consumerism.
- Local authorities regulate opening of such stores as well as planning permission.
- More police presence in similar situations (as at football matches).
- People being more self-disciplined.

(20 marks)

Band 1	16 – 20	<p>Suggests several measures, all realistic. Offers thorough evaluation of each suggested measure. Uses evidence from the source to support suggested measures. Links suggested measures explicitly to the problem. Draws an overall conclusion/resolution.</p>
Band 2	11 – 15	<p>Suggests several measures, all realistic. Evaluates each measure, some more thoroughly than others. Uses some evidence from the source to support suggested measures. Links suggested measures implicitly to the problem.</p>
Band 3	6 – 10	<p>Suggests some measures, mostly realistic. Evaluates some measures, but not in depth. Presents measures in isolation – not well-linked to evidence or to the problem.</p>
Band 4	1 – 5	<p>Suggests few measures, some unrealistic. Superficial or no evaluation of measures. Copies the source or makes little reference to it. Presents measures in isolation – measures are poorly linked to the problem.</p>

Distribution of Assessment Objective marks across Unit 4

Questions	((1) (2) (3))	(Comm)	
AO1	15		
AO2		10	
AO3	20		
AO4	15		
Total marks	50	10	60