



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
June 2012**

General Studies B

GENB4

(Specification 2765)

Unit 4: Change

Final

Mark Scheme

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 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.

INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the Ofqual Subject Criteria for General Studies are:

- AO1** Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.
- AO2** Marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.
- AO3** Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge appreciating their strengths and limitations.
- AO4** Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

- Candidates will often perform at a uniform level across the four Assessment Objectives. Sometimes, though, their performance will be uneven across the AOs.
- The mark awarded for a response should reflect the relative weightings of AOs for the unit (see below).
- **Thus, for Unit 4, the ability to marshal evidence and draw conclusions [AO2] is the primary determinant of the level (1 to 4) to which a response is allocated.**
- Knowledge and understanding [AO1] will lend or withdraw support for the allocation.
- Whether fact and opinion are distinguished [AO3], and whether communication is clear and accurate [AO4] have equal weight, and should determine the mark within the level.
- **Answers given in the mark scheme are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points must be credited, even if they do not appear in the mark scheme.**

Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 4

Question Numbers		Q1	Q2/3	Total marks
Assessment Objectives	1	10	10	20
	2	14	14	28
	3	8	8	16
	4	8	8	16
Total marks per Question		40	40	80

SECTION A

01 It is Lord Sainsbury's view that the public should have more understanding of what science is and of what scientists do (Text A).

For what:

- **economic**
- **political**
- **ethical**

reasons would you agree or disagree with him?

(40 marks)

Reponses may include:

Economic:

- employment prospects in the science and technology sector are closed to those without an understanding of science
- countries whose people score poorly on tests of science understanding are unlikely to be economically competitive
- those without good understanding can still benefit from scientific advances.

Political:

- people whose understanding of science is poor cannot engage fully in the democratic process in respect of decisions on scientific issues
- a country cannot pull its political weight in the world when its citizens are backward in technologies that contribute to development
- in a complex polity we accept that there will be experts and non-experts.

Ethical:

- the principle of equality of opportunity demands that all can contribute to and benefit from scientific understanding
- there are important decisions in science and technology to be made; it is not right that such decisions are taken over the heads of the uncomprehending
- it would be unjust to expect that we should all be polymaths.

Well-supported points controverting the above should also be credited.

Any other valid points should be included.

Refer to the 4 Level Mark Scheme on page 5

Level Mark Scheme for Question 01

Level 1 (40 – 31 marks)

- A very good to good response showing keen awareness of the importance (or not) of widely diffused scientific understanding in all three dimensions; text and task are understood [AO1]
- Well-chosen examples are given of contexts in which such understanding is, or is not, of value and importance, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- There is critical analysis of what the understanding might amount to and of why it might or might not be important as a matter of principle; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (30 – 21 marks)

- A good to fair response showing understanding of the text, including the data, and of the implications of an equal or unequal understanding of science; text and task are understood [AO1]
- One or more non-text examples are given of issues that call for public understanding of science, or not, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- There is understanding of the value of public participation in decision-making in scientific matters, or of its irrelevance; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (20 – 11 marks)

- A fair to weak response showing some general awareness of the consequences of the public understanding of science or the lack of it; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- It is unlikely that there will be other examples than those in the text and table; there may be too much quotation, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- There is reference to interests and values that may be in conflict, but there may be little distinction of fact and opinion [AO3]
- There are errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (10 – 1 marks)

- A weak to poor response showing little understanding of the text or data, or of the thrust of the question [AO1]
- There may be too much quotation from the text, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- Limited understanding is shown of the value implications of an unequal understanding in the three dimensions, and of the distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

(0) No response or no relevant information.

SECTION B

EITHER

02 Text B is about social and economic change at the level of one individual;
and Text C is about social and economic change across the world.

**How sure can we be that *economic* growth will lead to good *social* outcomes?
(40 marks)**

Points that might be made include:

- the social outcomes of economic change have evidently been positive in Neil Davis's case
- employment has been shown, time and again, to be a positive contributor to the social rehabilitation of offenders and drop-outs
- migration may make for social friction on the one hand, but it may bring economic benefits to host communities on the other
- fertility is not all: we need to ensure economic security in developing countries so that the motive for having large families is removed
- economic growth measures ought not to be only monetary; they should include social-cultural factors also
- for economic growth to have positive social outcomes, it must be fairly, if not equally, distributed across and within nations.

Any other valid points should be credited.

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 7

Level Mark Scheme for Question 02

Level 1 (40 – 31 marks)

- A very good to good response showing keen awareness of the interplay of social and economic factors in positive change; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- Well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of social implications of economic growth or recession that support the argument and that lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- There is critical analysis of the values inherent in a policy that ensures positive social as well as economic outcomes; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (30 – 21 marks)

- A good to fair response showing awareness of the social implications of economic policies; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- One or more non-text examples are given of social benefits accruing from economic growth, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- There is understanding of the principle that economic growth ought not to be conceived in narrowly financial terms; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear, and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (20 – 11 marks)

- A fair to weak response showing some awareness of the relatedness of social and economic development; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- There is no reference to material from beyond the texts, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- There is reference to the value implicit in a broad definition of economic growth; there is little distinction of fact and opinion [AO3]
- There are errors in the language, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (10 – 1 marks)

- A weak to poor showing little awareness of what social implications might be of economic growth; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- No concrete examples are given of social outcomes of economic policies; there is text-dependence and little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- Limited understanding is shown of what social-ethical values, or of what facts or opinions might be in play [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

(0) No response or no relevant information.

OR

03 Sometimes, the media are reluctant to tell the whole truth (Text D); and sometimes they need to be prevented from giving too much information (Text E).

Are we more at risk from the new ‘social media’ of being given too much information or too little? (40 marks)

Points that might be made include:

- it is less likely with new media that information will be suppressed, as it might be by big corporations
- freedom of information has been enacted and accepted irrespective of new social media
- there are still limits placed on the publication of confidential government documents, cabinet minutes and the like
- the law continues to protect personal privacy in cases where communications are intercepted illegally
- new social media do give us instant and widespread publicity to events, opinions, and factoids that might not have been intended for public consumption.

Any other valid points should be credited.

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 9

Level Mark Scheme for Question 03

Level 1 (40 – 31 marks)

- A very good to good response showing keen awareness of the issues involved in a surfeit or deficit of information in a contemporary context; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- Well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of actual cases of suppression, distortion, or dissemination of information having positive or negative effects, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- There is critical analysis of the principles involved in the freedom of information that is the rationale of social media; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (30 – 21 marks)

- A good to fair response showing awareness of the tension between the dissemination of too much or too little 'confidential' information; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- One or more non-text examples are given of positive or negative outcomes of free-wheeling social-media publicity, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- There is understanding of the principles underlying freedom of information and privacy; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (20 – 11 marks)

- A fair to weak response showing some general awareness of the implications of there being too much or too little information; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- There is no reference to material from beyond the texts; but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- There is reference to values that might underlie freedom of information in the social-media context, but there may be little distinction of fact and opinion [AO3]
- There are errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (10 – 1 marks)

- A weak to poor response showing little awareness of what limits there might have been, or might be placed on information; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- Examples of what might be too little or too much information are ill-chosen or absent, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- Limited understanding is shown of values relevant to the freedom-of-information issue, and of the distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

(0) No response or no relevant information.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion