

version 1.1

General Certificate of Education

General Studies *Specification B*

GENB4

Unit 4 Change

Mark Scheme

Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

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.

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 two 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.