

General Certificate of Education June 2011 Advanced Level Examination

Communication and Culture

COMM3 Communicating Culture

Mark Scheme

Final

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

Copyright © 2011 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.

MARK SCHEME (June 2011)

Aims

When you are marking scripts your aim should be:

- 1. to identify and reward the achievements of candidates
- 2. to ensure compatibility of assessment for all candidates, regardless of question or examiner.

Approach

Please be *positive* when marking scripts, looking to reward relevant points that candidates make rather than to penalise what they don't know.

A specification of this type must recognise the variety of experiences and knowledge that candidates bring to the examination. The questions have been designed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate what they have learned about different aspects of Communication and Culture.

The Principles of 'Best Fit'

This paper requires candidates to make two extended responses in essay format. Thus, although aspects of each response (like its technical accuracy) can be addressed separately, the ultimate discretion of the examiner must be reserved for an appreciation of the essay as a whole.

In this case, marks are notionally divided between the three Assessment Objectives (AO1, AO2, AO3) in the ratio 1:4:5. Individual mark ranges are suggested for each AO, but these are provided for guidance only. Ultimately the response should be placed at the level that 'best fits' its qualities.

The Marking Grid

The marking grid covers the generic qualities of all essays written as responses on this paper in terms of their ability to communicate in a technical register and the knowledge and understanding displayed of Communication and Culture concepts.

A set of question-specific prompts support the application of marks and are included after the grid.

Annotating Scripts

It is important that the way you arrive at a mark should be recorded on the script. This will help you with making accurate judgements and it will help any subsequent markers to identify how you are thinking, should adjustment need to be made.

To this end you should:

- identify points of merit
- write a brief summative comment at the end
- put a ringed total in the margin at the end of each answer.

Generic Marking Grid

| Level | Overall Marks | AO1: This tests the ability of candidates to communicate in the register of communication and culture | Marks | AO2: This tests the ability of candidates to understand the content and concepts offered by the qualification | Marks | AO3: This tests the ability of candidates to apply knowledge | Marks |
|-------|---------------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|
| | | This reflects the degree to which the candidate has extended their grasp of the discourse of the subject and/or produced effective communication in their chosen medium. | | This reflects the degree to which the work provides evidence of further knowledge and understanding of the content and concepts of Communication and Culture | | This reflects the degree to which the content of the work manages to provide insightful analysis of more sophisticated texts and situations. | |
| 4 | 31-40 | Highly technical in its register and/or creative and/or proficient in its use of the chosen format. | 4 | Knowledge and understanding will be very good in terms of its range of knowledge and/or depth of understanding. | 13-16 | Analysis will be exploratory and open and will offer insights into its chosen theme. | 16-20 |
| 3 | 21-30 | Sound in terms of its range and control and good in terms of its effectiveness. | 3 | Level of knowledge and understanding will be secure and will evidence sound subject specialist knowledge. | 9-12 | Analysis will be good in the sense that it will offer a specific informed commentary on the candidate's cultural practices. | 11-15 |
| 2 | 11-20 | Limited vocabulary, perhaps only partly understood, rising to a degree of competence evidenced by the effective use of a fairly narrow range of terms/concepts. | 2 | Evidence will range from a limited, largely non-specialist relevance through to a simple but competent grasp of Communication and Culture content. | 5-8 | Analysis will rise from being of limited use through to the establishing of competence. | 6-10 |
| 1 | 1-10 | Basic, non-technical and unconvincing. | 1 | Evidence will be basic, non-specific and unconvincing. | 1-4 | Analysis will be ineffective or unduly derivative. | 1-5 |

MARK SCHEME (June 2011)

Question 1

0 1 The increasi

The increasing influence of Disney-style theme parks on culture at large has recently been acknowledged by the use of the term Disneyization.

Carefully read **Argument A** and **Argument B** (opposite) relating to Disneyization before attempting the task below.

Task:

Use your knowledge of theoretical approaches and key concepts to evaluate the contrasting views of Disneyization expressed by Argument A **and** Argument B. (40 marks)

Argument A

This country - and almost every other country - is becoming a giant theme park modelled on the likes of Disneyland. Shopping malls, holiday resorts, leisure centres, fast food restaurants have all copied the Disney approach in order to maximise profitability.

Everywhere we go we find the same 'themed' retail outlets, the same merchandising based on corporate brands and logos. Employees dress up in the company colours and address everybody, no matter what age, as if we were all children.

Argument B

The main point to understand about Disneyland theme parks is that people love them. It's not surprising that other places and cultural practices have been modelled on the same principles: safe, wholesome enjoyment in a bright, clean environment. Whether watching sports events, shopping, going on holiday or visiting a theme park we appreciate the comfort and predictability of the Disneyized experience. We like the familiarity, the welcoming smile and the playful atmosphere. They make us feel good about ourselves. It is reassuring to know that these qualities can be found in places all over the world.

| Level | Descriptor |
|----------------------|---|
| 4 | Likely to explore and/or challenge theoretical positions. |
| (31 - 40 marks) | Responses at this level fully engage with the stimulus material, recognising contrasting and comparative elements. There is clear and convincing evidence of an evaluative approach; this evidence may be biased towards the effective use of practical examples or towards cogent argument. Theoretical and conceptual material is confidently applied in the context of the task. |
| 3 (21 - 30 marks) | Likely to demonstrate a firm grasp of the contrasting points of view as exemplified by the two arguments. Conducts a reasonably wide-ranging and well-informed discussion around the issues. May focus on the variety of contexts suggested in the two arguments. |
| | These sound responses demonstrate an awareness of issues raised by the stimulus material. There is some evidence of an evaluative approach which may focus on either argument or practical examples. Some theoretical perspectives are applied relevantly and there is evidence of an ability to approach the task at a conceptual level. |
| 2 (11 - 20 marks) | Likely to work through the given texts in a straightforward way with limited evaluation. |
| | At this level, responses tend towards description rather than analysis or evaluation. Perspectives and/or key concepts are likely to feature in the range 16-20, but application of these in the range 11-15 is likely to be limited, inappropriate or based on misunderstanding of basic principles. |
| 1 (1-10 marks) | Candidates respond superficially and/or insubstantially to the invitation in the question, typically by rewording the question. |
| | Little understanding of the arguments put forward in the stimulus material is evident here. Conceptual material is either absent, severely limited or totally inappropriate in its application. The range 1-5 includes those accounts which are too short to constitute a serious response. |
| 0 | No relevant response. |

Section B

The **Cultural Sites** referred to in this section are: Spaces and Places, Fictions and Objects of Desire.

Question 2

Through a detailed analysis of cultural products and/or cultural practices, demonstrate your understanding of the relationship between **two** of the three cultural sites. (40 marks)

| Level | Descriptor |
|----------------------|---|
| 4 (31 - 40 marks) | Likely to explore and/or challenge theoretical positions. Thorough and contrasting analysis. |
| | Products and/or practices chosen are thoroughly understood and analysed. Responses demonstrate an informed awareness of the two cultural sites as well as relationships between them (the intersection). Suitable examples and discussed in a response which draws widely and convincingly on key concepts and clearly contrasting theoretical perspectives. However, the systematic and comprehensive application of all perspectives and key concepts is not expected. |
| 3 (21 - 30 marks) | Likely to focus on "analysis" as a way of exploring the "relationship between two () sites". |
| | A competent analysis of contrasting products and/or practices contributes to a convincing demonstration of an understanding of the relationship between cultural sites. Both of the relevant cultural sites are featured. The discussion uses theoretical perspectives and key concepts convincingly. |
| 2 (11 - 20 marks) | Likely to focus on what was learnt rather than what was understood. Likely to come to easy conclusions without arguing through the case. Unfounded assertions. |
| | Offers analyses of products and/or practices with limited consideration of the contribution these make to an understanding of the relationship between sites. Grasp of key concepts may be vague or incomplete. In the upper half of the level there is likely to be some attempt to apply perspectives and/or concepts but in the range 11-15 these may be limited or inappropriate in their application. Limitations in theoretical understanding may be compensated by the quality of descriptive examples, or vice versa. |
| 1 (1-10 marks) | Uncritical explanation of the question. Little else offered. |
| (1-10 marks) | Examples may be present but flawed. Very limited conception of the relationship between the cultural sites (intersection). Conceptual material is either absent, severely limited or totally inappropriate in its application. The range 1-5 includes those accounts which are too short to constitute a serious response. |
| 0 | No relevant response. |

Question 3

Discuss the significance of discourse and/or mode of address in relation to **one** of the three cultural sites. (40 marks)

| Level | Descriptor |
|----------------------|--|
| 4 (31 - 40 marks) | Likely to explore and/or challenge theoretical positions (eg establish criteria for evaluation). |
| | Clear, confident understanding of <i>discourse and/or mode of address</i> in the context of a chosen cultural site. In addition, theoretical perspectives and further key concepts are incorporated into well-informed, convincing explanations. Responses are likely to be well illustrated with telling examples of cultural practices and/or cultural products. |
| 3 (21 - 30 marks) | Likely to lead with a thorough exploration of "discourse and/or mode of address" as a key concept(s) and to relate this to the chosen site. Concepts are likely to be used as analytical/interpretive tools. |
| | Makes a reasonable attempt to explain the significance of <i>discourse and/or mode of address</i> with references to theoretical perspectives and further key concepts. Responses are likely to be illustrated with appropriate examples of cultural practices and/or cultural products. Some awareness of the competing explanations of the roles of discourse/mode of address. |
| 2 (11 - 20 marks) | Likely to offer evidence of study of a specific site and then to attempt to engage with "discourse and/or mode of address" in this context. |
| | Some understanding is evident of the chosen cultural site but at this level responses may struggle to integrate an explanation of key concepts in this context. There may be some limitations in the understanding of discourse/mode of address. In the upper half of this level, the suitability of practical examples may compensate for conceptual knowledge, but in the range 11-15 anecdotal, vague or inappropriate evidence is likely to predominate. |
| 1 (1-10 marks) | Limited response to question, which results in unsupported assertions. |
| | In the upper part of the range (6-10) there is some attempt to engage either with or with a legitimate cultural site or with the key concepts indicated by the question. Conceptual material is either absent, severely limited or totally inappropriate in its application. The range 1-5 includes those accounts which are too short to constitute a serious response. |
| 0 | No relevant response. |

Question 4

0 4

Using contrasting examples show how **spaces and places** can generate different meanings. (40 marks)

| Level | Descriptor |
|----------------------|--|
| 4 (31 - 40 marks) | Likely to explore and/or challenge theoretical positions. |
| | Examples chosen are apposite and clearly contrasting. These case study examples, as well as conceptual material, thoroughly understood and integrated into a well informed discussion. There is clear evidence of an ability to read critically in relation to examples of spaces and places. |
| 3 (21 - 30 marks) | Likely to focus on the issues of the question: the relationships between "spaces and places" and "meanings". |
| | At this level responses are able to engage at a conceptual level but the implications of the question may not be fully grasped. Examples of spaces and places are thoroughly explored with clear evidence of the candidate's ability to 'read' such texts. There is an attempt to explore the notion that spaces and places generate meanings but responses may struggle to identify <i>different</i> meanings, particularly in the lower half of the level. |
| 2 (11 - 20 marks) | Likely to focus on specific examples of spaces and places, which have formed the basis of their preparation for this examination. |
| | At this level, responses are likely to offer generalised readings of examples with only limited consideration of the <i>meanings</i> . For marks in the upper part of the level (16-20) there should normally be some attempt to deploy relevant concepts. In the range 11-15, description is likely to predominate over analysis. |
| 1 (1-10 marks) | Responses lack any real understanding of the terms of reference of the question. Likely to focus exclusively and anecdotally on personal experience. |
| | Conceptual material is either absent, severely limited or totally inappropriate in its application. The range 1-5 includes those accounts which are too short to constitute a serious response. |
| 0 | No relevant response. |

Question 5

0 5

"A culture would be nothing without its fictions." Consider this view of the contribution that **fictions** make to the communication of culture. (40 marks)

| Level | Descriptor |
|----------------------|---|
| 4 (31 - 40 marks) | Likely to explore and/or challenge theoretical positions. |
| | Key concept implied by the question, particularly <i>narrative</i> and <i>ideology</i> , are thoroughly understood and explored in the context of the question. The discussion is well informed by contrasting theoretical approaches and well illustrated by apposite examples. There is a clear focus on the contention of the quotation. Ideas are supported by evidence and argument. |
| 3 (21 - 30 marks) | Likely to use key concepts and theoretical approaches appropriately. Discussion includes references to theories and theorists. |
| | Examples are relevant and appropriate. Well-informed discussion, with some attempt to engage directly with the implications of the quotation. However, in the lower half of the level responses may restrict themselves to a limited interpretation of this quotation. |
| 2 (11 - 20 marks) | Likely to identify specific examples and use them as a starting point for a discussion or use generalised examples to conduct an exploration of fictions with limited acknowledgement of the specificity of the question. Likely to focus on examples rather than arguments. |
| | Some understanding of 'fictions' as a cultural site and of the relationship between selected examples, probably at a personal level. |
| 1 (1-10 marks) | Struggles to understand what the question demands. |
| | Conceptual material is either absent, severely limited or totally inappropriate in its application. The range 1-5 includes those accounts which are too short to constitute a serious response. |
| 0 | No relevant response. |

Question 6

0 6

"We don't really desire objects at all; we desire the status that objects give us." Do you agree with this view of **objects of desire**? (40 marks)

| Level | Descriptor |
|----------------------|---|
| 4 (31 - 40 marks) | Likely to explore and/or challenge theoretical positions. |
| (or romand) | The implications of the statement are thoroughly understood and explored. The relationship between objects of desire and status (or status hunger) is thoroughly understood. Convincing arguments and explanations are well supported by evidence. Answers reach a clear conclusion in response to 'do you agree'. |
| 3 (21 - 30 marks) | Likely to lead with the key idea of "status" in relation to objects of desire. Evidence of reasonable level of theoretical understanding. |
| | Responses at this level demonstrate a good understanding of 'objects of desire' as a site for the study of cultural products and practices. Well-informed discussions draw on a range of relevant case studies/examples. Some evidence is provided to suggest an understanding of different theoretical approaches/theorists. |
| 2 (11 - 20 marks) | Likely to lead with the experiences of products and practices and work back towards the question with broad, generalised examples. |
| | Some understanding of 'objects of desire' as a cultural site is evident here. For the marks in the upper part of the level (16-20) there are relevant references to status (or status symbols). Discussion may be one-sided rather than balanced in its assessment of the view expressed in the question. In the range 11-15, description is likely to predominate over analysis. |
| 1 (1-10 marks) | Likely to focus anecdotally on personal experience. Struggles to cope with the demands of the question. |
| | Conceptual material is either absent, severely limited or totally inappropriate in its application. The range 1-5 includes those accounts which are too short to constitute a serious response. |
| 0 | No relevant response. |

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