

### **General Certificate of Education**

### **General Studies**

Specification B

**GENB3** 

Unit 3 Power

# Specimen Mark Scheme

This mark scheme uses the <u>new numbering system</u>

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 © 2009 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.
The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX  **Dr Michael Cresswell Director General**

#### 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 3, 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 3

Question Numbers		Q01	Q02	Q03/04	Total marks
Assessment Objectives	1	5	5	10	20
	2	7	7	14	28
	3	4	4	8	16
	4	4	4	8	16
Total marks per Question		20	20	40	80

## 01 Read Texts A and B, and argue the case for tighter public control of private-sector companies. (20 marks)

Points that might be made:

- (a) private-sector companies are backward in regard to reviewing whether their pay scales conform to equal-pay policies
- (b) private companies (as in the catering industry) are more likely to be employing ethnic minorities at low rates of pay
- (c) we may infer that they are less likely than public companies to employ women full-time, and ethnic minority women in particular
- (d) drug companies may be deceiving people about their ailments in order to sell them drugs that they don't need; other companies may act in analogous ways
- (e) private companies are motivated to act in ways that increase their profits, and shareholder value; the public interest may not be a priority
- (f) this means that, if not 'control', then careful regulation of private companies is necessary, to ensure that the public is protected.

#### Level 1 (17-20)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of what the social-economic shortcomings may be of unregulated private companies; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of actual and alleged failures to secure the public interest that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the different values that may underlie public and private organisational behaviour, and facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured. [AO4]

#### Level 2 (13-16)

- a good response showing awareness of the need for tighter public regulation of private companies in the public interest; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given of the interests of private companies and of the public at large, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the values that may drive public and private organisations; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

#### Level 3 (9-12)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the need for public oversight of private companies; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, but they are taken straight from the text with little or no interpretation; however, there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to the values that may be in tension between public and private interests, 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 (5-8)

- a limited response showing little awareness of why there may be a need for regulation of the private sector; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- examples of private-sector malpractice are ill-chosen or absent, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of any potential conflict of values, 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 (1-4)

- 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 the tension between public and private interests, 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.

### O2 Read Texts C and D, and argue the case for allowing companies and their advertisers the same freedom we give to artists. (20 marks)

Points that might be made:

- (a) companies should be free to advertise products that are perfectly legal, and from which governments derive considerable revenues
- (b) consumers should be free to make their own lifestyle choices
- (c) cannabis isn't advertised, yet it is still bought and sold by those who want it
- (d) products, information, ideas there should be no restriction on freedom of expression in a democracy
- (e) when that freedom of expression is limited in film or in comedy, we rightly object and rush to defend human and social rights
- (f) advertising is an art form, and art is often intentionally provocative.

#### Level 1 (17-20)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of the case for the indivisibility of freedom of expression in commerce as in art; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of the possible inconsistencies in bans on advertising, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the value that might be attached to freedom of expression in advertising as in art, and facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

#### Level 2 (13-16)

 a good response showing awareness of the risks involved in imposing bans on freedom of expression; texts and task are understood [AO1]

- one or more non-text examples are given of these risks, and there is argument that leads to a reasonable conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the values held by those who oppose a ban on advertising; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

#### Level 3 (9-12)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the freedom of expression issue; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be an example, but it is taken straight from the text with little or no interpretation; but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to a difference of view as between the health commissioner and the tobacco companies, 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 (5-8)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the tension between controls and freedom of expression; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- the example is ill-exploited, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of why freedom of expression might apply to advertising as to art, 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 (1-4)

- 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 conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of the potential inconsistencies in a ban on advertising of particular products, 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.

### 'We all have equal rights, but we cannot have equal access to power.' How far do you agree with this statement? (40 marks)

Agreement points that might be made:

- (a) the principle of equal pay for equal work should be applied across industry, but unequal work will mean unequal responsibilities and unequal influence
- (b) the rights of women and ethnic minorities are enshrined in law and must be honoured but we cannot force Pakistani and Bangladeshi women to do paid work and exert influence when this may not be in their culture
- (c) there will always be some low-paid work, relatively speaking; there will always be an inequality of skills and of aspirations
- (d) tobacco advertisers and drug companies do not have the same right to promote their products as others; and their power to influence us is regulated
- (e) we all have the right to see films, but we may have to wait to be of an age to exercise that right; and powers of other sorts must wait upon coming of age.

#### Disagreement points that might be made:

- (n) It is at the heart of equal pay legislation that if we do equal work, we should receive equal pay; this should mean equal treatment and status
- (o) equality of rights and access to power must be blind as to gender and colour
- (p) freedom of expression is indivisible; we cannot pick and choose what will be acceptable by majority votes
- (q) we can and must be equal in respect of our right to speak out against the powerful and governments without fear of arrest and imprisonment, or worse
- (r) all governments should be held to account equally, whether it be in respect of tobacco advertising or allowing dissent.

#### Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of the tension between rights and equality, and access to power; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given, from the four sources and elsewhere, of where rights and powers might be in tension, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the important principles at stake and of how they might be reconciled; 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 essential problem of ensuring equality of rights and powers in an unequal world; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given of where rights and powers may be in tension are taken from sources, and from elsewhere, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the limits to which the principles of rights and equality can be applied in practice; 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 problem of assigning rights and powers; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, but they are taken straight from the text with little or no interpretation; but there is some credible, if perhaps one-sided argument [AO2]
- there is reference to the principles at stake, but the tension may not be convincingly resolved, and there is 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 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little awareness of where and why rights and access to power might be in tension; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- examples of where equality might or might not be possible are ill-chosen or absent, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of the principles that might be applied in equality issues, 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 there should be equality, and of why it might be limited in practice, 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.

### 'Truth comes out of the light that artists bring, and the powerful often fear this' – Oscar Torres (Text D).

How reasonable is this claim in your view?

(40 marks)

The claim is reasonable in that:

- (a) there has always been fearlessness about great art; a boldness to 'tell it like it is'
- (b) there is a long tradition of 'underground' or 'samiszdat' art, particularly in literature, in countries with oppressive régimes
- (c) art uses symbol and metaphor to tell uncomfortable truths indirectly to those who can understand
- (d) the powerful have demonstrated their fear of the truth in art by imprisoning artists and writers and censoring their work.

The claim is unreasonable in that:

- (n) art has never changed anything, never saved anyone's life, never really had effective power
- (o) art may comment, may interpret, may critique, but only from the safe sidelines, and after the event
- (p) few artists really assume responsibility for 'speaking out'; even those who 'protest' do so self-regardingly
- (q) those in power arrest banner-waving activists for the most part who might threaten their power, not those who deploy metaphors.

#### Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of the possibilities and limitations of art as a force for freedom; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given of artists who have spoken out against the powerful, other than those in the source(s), examples that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of values that may underpin art and threaten those in power; 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 what it is for an artist to challenge power and what it is to fear the truth; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- there is probably at least one non-text example given of an artist or of art that has challenged power, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of what there may be in art that challenges the values of those in power; 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 what it is for art to confront power; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, but they are taken straight from the texts without interpretation; however, there is some credible argument [AO2]

- there is reference to what may motivate artists, and to what may count as truth, 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 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little awareness of what it might be for art to challenge the powerful; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- examples of actual art or artists are ill-chosen or absent, and there is little sense
  of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of what values may underpin art or freedom, and of the distinction between facts 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 what principles may be at stake in this issue, 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.