



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 6766

Specification B

GB4W Conflict-Resolution

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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 resolve the problem in this case and to prevent a recurrence of the problem in similar cases, 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 apparent poor professional relationship between the school and Mrs Hanson
- The high financial costs of employment tribunal cases and subsequent appeals
- The inadequacy of school budgets, particularly when faced with unexpected expenditure
- The lack of financial support for schools from the Local Authority
- The level of autonomy of school governors, their apparent lack of knowledge of employment law and the way they ignored the advice of the Local Authority
- The potential impact on the pupils' education of having no headteacher/being short of one member of staff
- The emotional impact of employment tribunal cases and subsequent appeals on all involved
- The dilemma of schools in tackling disciplinary issues relating to teachers

(15 marks)

- Band 1 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 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 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:

- **Sally Parker** The impact of her recommendation to governors to dismiss Mrs Hanson
The impact of her decision to resign from her post – on pupils, parents and the school
- **Governors** Their decision to dismiss Mrs Hanson
The way they ignored the advice of the Local Authority
- **Local Authority** The advice given to the school about Mrs Hanson's case
Their failure to support the school financially
- **Ruth Hanson** Acting in such a way as to be guilty of gross misconduct
Her decision to take her case to an employment tribunal
- **Legal System** The high financial cost of taking a case through an employment tribunal
- **Government** Its provision of resources to schools

(15 marks)

- Band 1 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 responsibility of a few groups.
- Band 2 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 responsibility of groups.
- Band 3 Largely descriptive of interest groups – superficial or no analysis.
No reference to relative positions of groups.
No reference to limitations of responsibility of groups.

3 Measures might include:

- Sally Parker could withdraw her resignation
- Boxhill Primary should appoint a new headteacher and make savings elsewhere over time
- Mrs Hanson could drop the appeal
- Mrs Hanson could be made to pay the court costs
- Schools could receive support for costly legal cases either from the Local Authority or from the government
- Schools could be more generously funded to allow for such cases
- Schools could take out liability insurance to protect themselves
- Governors could be given less power – or receive more specific training on employment law
- Procedures to tackle disciplinary issues relating to teachers could be simplified
- Employment tribunal cases could be simplified so they are less traumatic and less costly

(20 marks)

- Band 1 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.
- Band 2 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.
- Band 3 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.
- Band 4 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.

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