

# Mark Scheme (Final)

## June 2008

GCE

### GCE General Studies (Unit 6453/01)

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Section A

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(a)	E 39%	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	B 10 673	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(c)	B 2002	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(d)	C £2.8m	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(e)	C 22°	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(f)	C 14,300	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(g)	D 1 213	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(a)	<p>Allow estimates in the following ranges - both must be correct to gain mark.</p> <p>1970 - between 60,000 and 75,000</p> <p>2003 - between 160,000 and 175,000</p> <p>If candidate just gives two numbers without indicating THOUSANDS, award mark if numbers come within above range - so '65' and '165' would get mark but '70' and '180' would not</p>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(b)	<p>Acceptable reasons (1 mark each) could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in law (Divorce Reform Act 1969, took effect 1971) has made divorce easier to obtain.</li> <li>• Instead of being frowned on by society, divorce became more socially acceptable</li> <li>• As population of marriageable age rises, increase in number of divorces likely</li> <li>• More (financial) support now for single parents/more independence for women</li> <li>• more opportunities for a woman with a career</li> <li>• a dis-satisfied spouse may be more able to move away from the marriage</li> <li>• Fewer people influenced by religious beliefs, and more inclined to divorce</li> </ul>	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(c)(i)	<p>One mark to be allocated for a simple reason (three or four words maybe, as underlined, or longer but vague generalised answer provided it definitely engages with question);</p> <p>two marks if there is some development or further explanation.</p> <p>Acceptable reasons could be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Increasing cohabitation</u> - marriage was seen as expensive and unnecessary as it became increasingly likely that a marriage would break up after a few years anyway</li> <li>• <u>Changed attitude to childbirth</u> - many people were married because of an unplanned pregnancy; nowadays having a child out of wedlock is socially acceptable so there is less pressure on a couple with a child to get married</li> <li>• <u>More people say they will marry later</u> - but relationship may prove unstable or even where this is not the case, some never get round to it at all</li> <li>• <u>No social stigma to be unmarried OR socially acceptable to be unmarried</u> - so not surprising there are fewer marriages</li> <li>• <u>Focus on careers greater for many women now</u> - so marriage is delayed until later or may never happen</li> <li>• <u>Costs of marriage are so high</u> (dress/reception/honeymoon) they are becoming a barrier to some couples)</li> </ul>	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(c)(ii)	<p>One mark to be allocated for simple reason (three or four words maybe, as underlined, or longer but vague generalised answer provided it definitely engages with question);</p> <p>two marks if there is some development or further explanation.</p> <p>Acceptable reasons could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Increasing divorce (perhaps because divorces are now easier to obtain)</u> - as more people divorced, potential for re-marriages inevitably increased.</li> <li>• <u>Greater longevity</u> - as many elderly people live longer, those who lose a spouse may wish to re-marry.</li> <li>• <u>Greater acceptance in society</u> - less stigma towards remarriage and/or people can now remarry in more churches.</li> </ul>	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3	A - In the 2001 and 2005 general elections, Labour elected more women MPs than any other party.	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	C - The Liberal Democrats opposed UK participation in the war in Iraq.	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	D - In the past twenty years both John Major and William Hague were Leader of the Conservative Party.	1

## Section B

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(a)(i)	<p>The key 'opinion' element is at the start of the sentence - 'It's a great pity...'. (allow mark as long as answer does not go beyond '..at 65' provided a satisfactory reason is also given, as exemplified below.)</p> <p>It is an opinion because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is a value judgement or</li> <li>• it cannot be tested/verified or</li> <li>• it is subjective or</li> <li>• it cannot be proven or</li> <li>• not everyone would agree</li> </ul> <p>Both correct identification <b>and</b> simple reason are required for 1 mark to be awarded.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> It isn't sufficient for a candidate to justify an opinion as 'their own view or personal thoughts' or 'there are no facts' unless such a statement is supported by one of the points above.</p>	<b>1</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(a)(ii)	<p>The key factual element is at the end of the sentence - 'like the Americans did'.</p> <p>It is a fact because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it can be tested or verified or</li> <li>• it can be proved to be correct or</li> <li>• it is objective or</li> <li>• it actually happened or</li> <li>• it is supported by evidence</li> </ul> <p>Both correct identification <b>and</b> simple reason are required for 1 mark to be awarded.</p>	<b>1</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(b)	<p>This is a case of <u>several facts/observations/points of evidence being presented leading to a general conclusion</u> (inductive argument).</p> <p>For <b>one mark</b>, candidates will make simple points (as underlined) which refer to inductive arguments (as above).</p> <p>To gain the <b>second</b> mark candidates will either:</p> <p>set the inductive argument in context, deploying the particular examples from the text - <b>NB if the basic definition is incorrect or missing this second mark is not available</b></p> <p><b>or</b> they could point out that in the case of inductive arguments the conclusion reached is still only more or less probable</p> <p><b>or</b> they will have simple points to make about deductive arguments - eg candidates could point out that such arguments involve an opening general premise leading to a particular or specific conclusion (deductive argument)</p> <p><b>or</b> they could point out that in a deductive argument if the premises are true and the argument is a good one, the conclusion must be true</p>	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(c)	<p>One mark for simple point (underlined) - additional mark for some development/explanation. <u>Although anecdotal, the 'holiday comments' are relevant to the writer's conclusion because they highlight/exemplify the 'mindset' that older people need to recognise they are not 'past it'.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates who refer to the 'mindset' (explicit or implicit) in discussing the relevance of the holiday experiences with some development will gain 2 marks.</li> <li>• The 'holiday experiences' represent a kind of analogy and will gain 1 mark</li> <li>• If there is no explicit or implicit reference to the 'mindset' appropriate mark will be 0 or 1.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates who focus largely on parallels between holidays/leisure and work may be missing the point (0 marks)</p> <p>But if they fairly clearly reject the parallel/analogy between work and leisure (so claiming relevance is low or non-existent), 1 mark may be justified.</p>	2



Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(d)	<p>NB Evidence is facts or examples which support arguments; evidence should not be taken to be direct quotes from the passage.</p> <p>Perhaps the most telling evidence in the passage will be identified as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>holiday experience in the Canadian wilderness this summer</b> (leading to the reflection that 'we are imprisoned by a mindset that tells us our age defines our capabilities within limits that have nothing to do with contemporary realities') (lines 5-10)</li> <li>• <b>When Lloyd George introduced the retirement pension, life expectancy was 61. Today, a similar relationship would argue for the state pension beginning at 75.</b> (lines 10-11)</li> <li>• <b>Alan Greenspan, the former American Federal Reserve chairman, left office just months before his 80th birthday - so we going to need the old to work longer and they are healthy enough to do so.</b> (lines 13-16)</li> </ul> <p>Other examples/evidence include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>One of the fastest growth areas in the British labour market is the proportion of over-55s recently finding work.</b> (lines 16-19)</li> <li>• <b>The government did not abolish the idea of a universal retirement age at 65...., like the Americans did.</b></li> <li>• <b>The British business lobby ensured that 65 remained as the age of retirement.</b></li> </ul> <p>Evidence is important because it is intended to support or challenge arguments. Candidates who make this link and recognize which types of argument do this most/least/reliably/effectively will probably gain at least 2 or 3 marks as long as their comments are linked to 'evidence'.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:</p> <p>Candidates identify one piece of evidence and, in simple terms, discuss its usefulness or at least two pieces of evidence are identified <span style="float: right;">1</span></p> <p>Two pieces of evidence are identified and a simple attempt is made to assess the adequacy of such evidence <span style="float: right;">2</span></p> <p>Items of strong evidence are identified and the answer clearly recognises a link having been established by the evidence and the arguments/conclusion which it helps to justify <span style="float: right;">3</span></p> <p>Appropriate evidence is highlighted and its adequacy is assessed in an appropriately critical manner <span style="float: right;">4</span></p>	<b>4</b>

A02 Mark Scheme	
<b>3 marks (above average)</b>	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.
<b>2 marks (average)</b>	The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form, arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
<b>1 mark (below average)</b>	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.
<b>0 marks (exceptionally poor)</b>	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question too seriously, there may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling <b>OR</b> there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably (as is sometimes the case in Section B).
NB The A02 mark is not dependant on the A04 mark	

Section C (A03 - 17 marks; A02 - 3 marks) indicative content

Marks for Section C questions should be awarded according to A03 and A02 level descriptors

Marks should be given A03 should be allocated using these guidelines:

Question 7

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer.
Level 1	1	<b>Partial and inconclusive answer</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit. <i>Candidates may write in general terms about one or more social or natural sciences without addressing the specific question set. Supporting evidence will be almost missing and the answer will be largely assertive and possibly prejudiced.</i>
Level 2	2-6	<b>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion.</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence <i>The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. e.g. the certainty of the natural sciences. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill-informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for/ against the view in the question.</i>
Level 3	7-11	<b>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints.</b> Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion. <i>Here there is an answer which <u>does</u> at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be heavily one sided; answers could focus on the different methodologies of natural and social sciences and the fact that they ask different questions so, arguably should reach different answers/conclusions</i>
Level 4	12-16	<b>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more way, two sides of the question.</b> Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s) <i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question, candidates may well suggest you would expect social scientists to be more effective in 'analysing the problems of society' whether from an economics standpoint or as sociologists. But others may point out that if a physicist achieves a breakthrough in the generation of energy, this innovation in itself may have a big impact on other important but different concerns of society.</i>
Level 5	17	<b>A fully balanced perceptive answer.</b> Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion

Question 8

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer.
Level 1	1	<b>Partial and inconclusive answer</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit <i>Candidates may write in general terms about increasing calls for heavier sentences to be imposed on law-breakers without addressing the specific question set. Supporting evidence will be almost missing and the answer will be largely assertive and possibly prejudiced.</i>
Level 2	2-6	<b>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion.</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. <i>The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. e.g. many of those occupying prison places have mental or social problems and would not even recognise the idea of deterrence. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill-informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.</i>
Level 3	7-11	<b>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints.</b> Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion. <i>Here there is an answer which does at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be heavily one sided; - answers could focus on candidates' beliefs that it is right for law-breakers to go to prison but this may be because they are seeking to impose retributive sentences and have little interest in the idea of deterrence.</i>
Level 4	12-16	<b>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more way, two sides of the question.</b> Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s) <i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question, candidates may well explore the pros and cons of deterrence and go on to suggest that those who do wrong need to be helped not to make such mistakes again - in which case it may be argued there are many better places to improve behaviour than over-full prisons with their record of alarmingly high levels of recidivism.</i>
Level 5	17	<b>A fully balanced perceptive answer</b> Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion

Question 9

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer.
Level 1	1	<p><b>Partial and inconclusive answer</b>            Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit</p> <p><i>Candidates may write in general terms about children in single parent homes and an apparent wish to defend 'their' parent, sometimes to the exclusion of answering the question actually set. Supporting evidence will be almost missing and the answer will be largely assertive and possibly prejudiced.</i></p>
Level 2	2-6	<p><b>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion.</b>            Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate.</p> <p><i>The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence            The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. The question focuses not so much on marriages, divorces, stepfamilies or co-habitation - it is looking instead for the 'single versus two parent families' debate. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill-informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.</i></p>
Level 3	7-11	<p><b>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints.</b>            Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.</p> <p><i>Here there is an answer which <u>does</u> at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be (but not necessarily) heavily one sided; - answers could focus on candidates' beliefs about how values are transmitted in contemporary society and particularly the importance of parent-role models.</i></p>
Level 4	12-16	<p><b>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question.</b>            Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s)</p> <p><i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. Those who want to challenge the proposition in the question will presumably claim that youngsters have many role models and they are also greatly influenced by peer groups, so it isn't totally down to whether there is a 'mother' and 'father' figure in every home.</i></p>
Level 5	17	<p><b>A fully balanced perceptive answer</b>            Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion</p>

A mark should be given for the level of written communication using these level guidelines:	
3 marks (above average)	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.
2 marks (average)	The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form, arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
1 mark (below average)	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.
0 marks (exceptionally poor)	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question too seriously, there may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling <b>OR</b> there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably (as is sometimes the case in Section B).
NB The Quality of Communication marks are not dependant upon the A03 mark	