

SECOND SPECIMEN PAPER TO PREPARE FOR THE JANUARY 2010 AND SUBSEQUENT EXAMINATIONS



General Certificate of Education
Specimen Paper

GENERAL STUDIES (SPECIFICATION B)

GENB3

Unit 4: Change

Insert

STIMULUS MATERIAL

These texts are to be read in conjunction with unit GENB4.

The questions arise from the texts, but they should **not** be answered by reference to these texts alone.

Text A

Are biofuels the road to go down?

Q. What is biofuel?

A. Biofuel describes any type of transport fuel made from organic matter. It covers good stuff like recycled cooking oil and biogas from waste, as well as more problematic agrofuels, made from crops like palm oil and soya grown on large plantations often in poorer countries.

Q. Agrofuels sound a lot less friendly than biofuels.

A. They are. Crops like palm oil and soya are making huge demands on land in Indonesia, Malaysia and Brazil. To make way for them companies are clearing rainforests, destroying peat bogs and damaging other important ecosystems.

Q. But aren't we going to need agrofuels to cut emissions?

A. In theory agrofuels are carbon neutral. In reality, there are many sources of greenhouse gases in their life cycle. First, the destruction of rainforests and peat bogs, both important carbon sinks. Clear them and the carbon stored is released. Then there's the energy demand from industrial farming, including the release of nitrous oxide from inorganic fertiliser. Nitrous oxide is a powerful climate gas. Add to this the emissions from processing the crops and the fuel it takes to ship it to motorists around the world and it's clear agrofuels are far from carbon neutral.

Q. So, their benefits to the climate are being questioned?

A. Nobel prize-winning chemist Paul Crutzen has shown that rape-seed oil diesel, which is the most commonly used type of agrofuel in Europe, contributes 70 per cent more to climate change than its fossil equivalent, due to nitrogen emissions from fertiliser.

Q. What about the benefits fuel crops are bringing to people in poorer countries?

A. In many countries the huge expansion of plantations is pushing small farmers off their lands and exacerbating conflicts. The UN has also warned that agrofuels compete with food for land. This pushes up global food prices – it's already contributed to the riots in Mexico due to the rising price of maize.

Q. What if agrofuels were grown locally?

A. Fuel from crops grown in the UK and Europe are thought to be better – they don't threaten rainforests directly – but it's just not possible to meet demand with domestic production. The current target proposed by the EU means that by 2020, 10 per cent of all transport fuel will have to come from agrofuels. An estimated 40 per cent of all arable land in Europe would need to be converted to agrofuel production to meet this target.

Aside from this there are indirect effects. Use up all the maize grown in the UK in our cars and you end up with a shortage of animal feed. The result: a rise in demand for soya from South America, and more rainforest destruction.

Q. Why do the UK and the EU continue to promote agrofuels as a solution?

A. The science is moving quickly. New reports weekly warn of the negative impacts of agrofuels. Also the car industry has been successful at avoiding stricter legislation on car efficiency, promoting high agrofuel targets as a solution instead.

Source: Friends of the Earth, *Earthmatters*, Spring 2008

Text A continued**Consumption of Biodiesel and Bioethanol* in the UK**

Unit: Thousand tonnes

Year	Biodiesel	Total Diesel	Biodiesel % share	Bioethanol	Total Petrol	Bioethanol % share	Total % biofuel share of road fuel
2002	2.3	16,431	0.01	0.0	20,620	0.00	0.01
2003	16.2	17,378	0.09	0.0	20,172	0.00	0.04
2004	17.4	18,438	0.09	0.0	19,901	0.00	0.05
2005	27.3	19,313	0.14	62.9	18,920	0.33	0.24
2006	140.4	20,188	0.70	70.1	18,206	0.39	0.55
2007	280.0	20,831	1.34	105.0	17,729	0.59	1.00

Source: © Crown Copyright, HM Customs and Revenue (includes estimate for 2007)

* Bioethanol – ethyl alcohol that is a by-product of the sugar-fermentation process. It can be got from corn, maize, sorghum and many other plants.

Turn over for the next stimulus material**Turn over ►**

Text B**Novelty and Nonsense**

For many in Britain, modern art was summarized by the name *Pablo Picasso*. Though popular, artistic appreciation of Picasso had altered very little since before the First World War when, at Roger Fry's Post-Impressionist exhibition, Desmond McCarthy had had to carry out a man so helpless with laughter that he seemed to be endangering his life. In 1945, a large Picasso-Matisse exhibition at the Victoria and Albert had been ferociously reviled¹. British insensitivity, however, was not unparalleled: an aristocratic lady, carrying her portrait by Picasso, was charged by Spanish customs officials with attempting to smuggle out a map of the fortifications of Madrid.

Picasso's innovations were not unanimously accepted by British artists. Michael Ayrton, a young painter, sculptor, stage designer, book illustrator, art critic of the *Spectator* and novelist, admitted Picasso's genius and technical mastery. Though he acknowledged his influence on the applied arts and decoration, he believed that this was largely to art's disadvantage, and that Picasso's originality was less than it at first sight appeared. Indeed, he claimed that much was a regurgitation of the ideas and formulae of others, without coherent vision or organic conviction, more an intellectual exercise, 'a vast series of brilliant paraphrases on the history of art'. His were superhuman talents striving to communicate the spurious², intriguing the credulous with exciting trappings of bulls, women, guitars, blood, cruelty, harlequins, circus performers.

Intellectuals mostly ignored this, though in an interview published in 1951, Picasso told Giovanni Papini, perhaps jokingly, that he was only a public entertainer exploiting his contemporaries' imbecility, vanity and cupidity³. 'Since Cubism, and indeed, before it, I have aimed to satisfy a public craving for novelty and scandal with all the bits of nonsense that enter my head, and the less they understand the greater their admiration for me.'

Source: adapted from PETER VANSITTART, *In the Fifties*, 1995

¹ reviled – abused, mocked

² spurious – false

³ cupidity – greed

Text C

A formula for morality

Suppose we open the *News of the World* on Sunday and find pictures of a nude Gordon Brown engaging with prostitutes in a scenario seeming to allude to German history. He would be out of No.10 by lunchtime.

Max Mosley, though, runs an organisation – Formula One – which is the opposite of a public body. *Grand prix* racing is notorious as the only major sport owned privately by a few men. Mosley takes money from the public, through tickets and TV fees, but he is not state-paid or nation-representing – the basis for kicking out Brown. So, on these criteria, Mosley stays.

Ah, no, the response comes, any public figure has a duty to uphold certain standards. And yet Formula One is not the Church of England. What values might the *grand prix* business stand for? Three that come easily to mind are personal gratification, greed and risk-taking. Mosley's sex life can be said to have upheld these principles.

The problem has always been where the line should be drawn, partly because the boundaries shift. Forty years ago, divorce could end the career of a children's entertainer; now, the disqualifying threshold seems to be use of class-A drugs. But is this morality now solid, or might there be a future in which a known 'cokehead' can continue being cheeky for pre-schoolers on TV?

The latter seems unlikely but the fluidity of definitions is a constant difficulty. A common view, sanctified by the Press Complaints Commission, is that there must be a direct connection – usually hypocrisy or conflict of interest – between private and public conduct. So, a bishop's mistress is a different matter from a baker's. But this rule is difficult for Mosley. Just as the children of a home secretary must expect more scrutiny of their drug use than the average adolescent, so the son of the leader of the British Union of Fascists needs to be extra careful, even behind closed doors, about touching certain sores.

Source: adapted from MARK LAWSON, *The Guardian*, © Guardian News & Media Ltd., 5 April 2008

Turn over for the next stimulus material

Turn over ►

Text D

Farming for a better future

Coming from a background in social enterprise rather than farming, Heather Anderson and Pete Ritchie put making connections and building a relationship with their customers at the heart of their business. They have been farming at Whitmuir's 140 acres for seven years and became fully organic four years ago. Their aim is to sell their produce within a thirty-mile radius of their farm, at Lamancha in the Scottish Borders, just south of Edinburgh. The farm produces organic meat, eggs, over 40 varieties of vegetables and a range of soft fruit.

On a bright Saturday in January, with a biting wind coming up the valley, the farmyard was bustling with customers visiting their farm shop and looking in on the livestock – a small herd of Shorthorn cattle, some Tamworth-cross pigs, the sheep and hens. Open seven days per week, the shop sells a wide range of home-grown seasonal fruit, and vegetables, eggs, cheese, bread, milk, groceries and ice-cream along with fair-trade products plus, of course, locally-reared beef, pork, mutton and lamb from their own butchery.

By word of mouth alone, Pete and Heather have built up a core group of 'supporters' who pay a regular standing order. Whitmuir lets them know what's available and they can then order what they want, when they want it, and it is charged to their account. So Pete and Heather benefit from a regular and predictable income while supporters obtain food of the best quality and gain a real connection to its production.

The connections aren't just to the farm. Cows and sheep produce significant quantities of methane, a potent greenhouse gas. Pete estimates one cow is responsible for producing as much greenhouse gas as a small car. To compensate, customers pay a small carbon offset charge – 10p per kilo of meat – which is currently supporting the creation of new native woodland by the local Leadburn Community Woodland Group.

Source: adapted from PHILIP REVELL, *Triodosnews*, Spring 2008

Text E

Bill of Rights

I live and work in the loyalist working-class estate Old Warren in the affluent city of Lisburn, just outside Belfast.

It was not until the late '90s that I fully understood the power of human rights and the benefit that a Bill of Rights could bring to our community. In the early '90s our estate was considered the 'second least popular housing estate in Northern Ireland' because of the poor housing. It is also a community that has been stigmatised as a direct result of the conflict. I worked as a volunteer and then as the community worker.

In 1998 we developed a programme for young men in the area. As part of it the young men asked to learn more about their rights in relation to the police. We invited the Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ) to speak to about 40 young men and CAJ director Maggie Beirne responded. Maggie initially talked about and answered questions on policing powers and then opened up the debate and asked the young people what they believed they needed to 'flourish as human beings'. The list that came out of that group was then linked to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The first campaign the young men carried out was the right to heating. They forced the housing authorities to reverse a decision and to fulfil their obligations to consult tenants about changes to heating installations in their homes.

Buoyed by their success and with the support of Maggie and the CAJ the young men pressed on and campaigned on Social Housing for Social Justice. The housing authority was challenged regarding its intention to sell off public land, part of Old Warren Estate, to private developers. Again the young men were successful and the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, instead of selling the land, invested in the estate thereby transforming the image of the area and increasing the social housing stock.

Maggie Beirne leaves CAJ soon, but what she and others have given to my community is the dignity and respect and the power to effect social change that comes through using the language of human rights.

Source: FIONA MCAUSLAND, *Amnesty Magazine*, January/February 2008

END OF STIMULUS MATERIAL

There is no stimulus material printed on this page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-HOLDERS AND PUBLISHERS

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright-holders have been unsuccessful and AQA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgements in future papers if notified.

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

SECOND SPECIMEN PAPER TO PREPARE FOR THE JANUARY 2010 AND SUBSEQUENT EXAMINATIONS



General Certificate of Education
Specimen Paper

GENERAL STUDIES (SPECIFICATION B)

GENB3

Unit 4: Change

Date ##### ##### Session

For this paper you must have:

- Stimulus Material enclosed as an insert
- a 12-page answer book.

Time allowed: 2 hours

Instructions

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book. The *Examining Body* for this paper is AQA. The *Paper Reference* is GENB4.
- Answer **two** questions.
- Answer **Question 1** from **Section A** and **one** question from **Section B**.
- Do all rough work in your answer book. Cross through any work you do not want marked.

Information

- The maximum mark for this paper is 80.
- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- You will be marked on your ability to use good English, to organise information clearly and to use specialist vocabulary where appropriate. All questions should be answered in continuous prose.

Advice

- The questions arise from the texts, but they should not be answered by reference to these texts alone.
- Where appropriate use examples to illustrate your answer.

There are no questions printed on this page

SECTION A

Answer this question.

Read **Text A** and use this as your starting point to answer this question.

- 1** Scientists and politicians have sung the praises of biofuels until recently – but now doubts are setting in (**Text A**).

For what

- scientific
- political
- economic

reasons might we doubt the possibility of a ‘technological fix’ to solve the climate-change problem?

(40 marks)

SECTION B

Read the relevant texts and use them as your starting point to answer **either** Question 2 **or** Question 3.

EITHER

- 2** Picasso’s paintings delighted intellectuals, and confused the public (**Text B**); and Mosley’s behaviour, though considered immoral by some, is held to be a private matter by others (**Text C**).

To what extent can we say, as a matter of fact, that any particular painting is ‘beautiful’, or that any particular act is ‘wrong’?

(40 marks)

OR

- 3** Whitmuir Farm is changing consumer habits in an area south of Edinburgh (**Text D**); and ‘social justice’ has been brought to one estate just outside Belfast (**Text E**).

How realistic would it be for changes at the local level to be generalised to the nation as a whole?

(40 marks)

END OF QUESTIONS

There are no questions printed on this page



General Certificate of Education

General Studies

Specification B

GENB4

Unit 4 Change

Second Specimen Mark Scheme

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams

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.

INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the QCA 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 5) to which a response is allocated.**
- Knowledge and understanding [AO1] will lend or withdraw support for this 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 questions and assessment objectives for Unit 4

Question Numbers		Q1	Q2/3	Total marks
Assessment Objectives	AO1	10	10	20
	AO2	14	14	28
	AO3	8	8	16
	AO4	8	8	16
Total marks per Question		40	40	80

NB. Candidates answer three questions only.

1 Scientists and politicians have sung the praises of biofuels until recently – but now doubts are setting in (Text A).

For what

- **scientific**
- **political**
- **economic**

reasons might we doubt the possibility of a ‘technological fix’ to solve the climate-change problem?

(40 marks)

Points that might be made are:

Scientific:

- the essential problem is that in order to create any fuel, we must use up energy and give rise to emissions of some sort
- renewable sources of energy require significant inputs of energy and material resources, and their energy output is unreliable.

Political:

- countries that have reserves of fossil fuel will go on using them and exert a political leverage in trading them
- even were a technological remedy available to us, there would be difficulty securing international agreement as to access and use.

Economic:

- vast costs are involved in developing a viable, and sustainable energy source; there would inevitably be huge inequalities in terms of investment and benefit
- the ‘fix’ may not be technological at all; the problem may require that we use less technology – this would have enormous economic consequences.

Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing clear awareness of the scientific, political and economic issues thrown up by biofuels, where the emphasis is on the realistic possibility of a ‘fix’; text and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- there are specific examples of ‘fixes’ other than biofuels, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the three points of view, leading to well-based judgement; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (25-32)

- a good response showing awareness of the issues involved in what ‘fixes’ there might be in the climate-change context; text, including the table, and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples of alternative remedies are given, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of values that might be in play, and of how they might be weighed; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (17-24)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the issues arising from the use of biofuels; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- it is unlikely that there will be examples of solutions to the climate-change problem beyond that in the text; there may be too much quotation, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to values; there may be no explanation as to how expert and lay perspectives might be reconciled, and little distinction between 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 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little understanding of the text or the table, 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 what values may be served or compromised by technological fixes, 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].

Level 5 (1-8)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the text or the table, or of the thrust of the question [AO1]
- assertions are given no support in examples, and there is no clear line of argument and no conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of values, and of what facts and opinions, may be in play [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) – No response or no relevant information.

2 Picasso's paintings delighted intellectuals, and confused the public (Text B); and Mosley's behaviour, though considered immoral by some, is held to be a private matter by others (Text C).

To what extent can we say, as a matter of fact, that any particular painting is 'beautiful', or that any particular act is 'wrong'?

(40 marks)

Points that might be made are:

- we can say that a painting is beautiful if, as a matter of fact, our judgement agrees with that of critics and other art experts
- on the other hand, art experts do not apply criteria that are universally accepted; they express (informed) opinions, and these change over time – indeed, it is evident that money and fame may colour judgement
- we can say that an act is 'wrong' if it breaks the law of the land, or if it infringes a code that the majority lives by
- it is clear that we cannot be objective about behaviours about which there is no cultural agreement, or about which judgements have changed within living memory.

Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of the problem of objectivity in the contexts of aesthetics and ethics; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of examples where judgements may or may not be based on facts, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the extent to which objectivity is possible, and of values that might be appealed to; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (25-32)

- a good response showing awareness of the problem and some knowledge of what it is to make value judgements; texts and tasks are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given of contexts in which the problem of objectivity is evident, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the values that may underpin judgements in both contexts; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear, and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (17-24)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the similarities and dissimilarities between the two contexts; 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 hazards of absolute judgement in matters aesthetic and ethical; however, there is little distinction made between fact and opinion [AO3]
- there are errors in the language, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the parallelism of aesthetic and ethical judgements; there may be misunderstanding of the texts and task [AO1]
- no concrete examples are given of what might be considered beautiful or wrong; there is text-dependence and little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of the play of values in either context, or 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].

Level 5 (1-8)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue or of texts and task [AO1]
- assertions are given no support in examples; there is no clear line of argument and no conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of any principles underpinning the issue or of what facts and opinions may be in play [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) – No response, or no relevant information.

3 Whitmuir Farm is changing consumer habits in an area south of Edinburgh (Text D); and ‘social justice’ has been brought to one estate just outside Belfast (Text E).

How realistic would it be for changes at the local level to be generalised to the nation as a whole?

(40 marks)

Points that might be made are:

- Whitmuir Farm is showing the way in which we shall all have to go if we are to consume sustainably and responsibly
- such a farm might meet the needs of a relatively rural area, but it could not feed Edinburgh – or Birmingham or London; and there is much produce that we are bound to import
- we are all capable in our localities of engaging in the political process, to call councils to account, and to ensure that justice is done
- the needs of one estate in Northern Ireland are not the needs of other communities elsewhere; and charismatic individuals are, regrettably, impossible to clone.

Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of what might or might not be achieved at the national level; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of actual local initiatives and/or national constraints that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the generalisability of values and of their being acted upon; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (25-32)

- a good response showing awareness of the problem of generalising from local to national levels; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples of the extent and limits of such generalising are given, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the particularities of local initiatives and of the difficulties of generalisation; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (17-24)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the possibilities of extrapolating from local change; 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 relevant issues raised in the texts, but there may be little distinction of fact and opinion [AO3]

- there are some errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the problems of generalising from local to national; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- examples of other local issues are ill-chosen or absent, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of values underpinning the two cases, 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].

Level 5 (1-8)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue and of texts and task [AO1]
- assertions are given no support in examples; and there is no clear line of argument and no conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of why a universalising of local changes might be a problem, and of what facts and opinions may be in play [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used, and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) – No response or no relevant information.