



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

General Studies A

Unit GSA6

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Unit 6

(GSA6 Society, Politics and the Economy)

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** Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.
- AO3** Marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.
- AO4** Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge and of the relationship between them, appreciating their limitations.

All mark schemes will allocate a number or distribution of marks for some or all of these objectives for each question according to the nature of the question and what it is intended to test.

Note on AO2

- In all instances where quality of written communication is being assessed this must take into account the following criteria:
- select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and complex subject matter;
- organise relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate; and ensure text is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate, so that meaning is clear.

Note on AO4

This is a new element in General Studies specifications. In the past, there has been a focus on the knowledge of facts, and the marshalling of evidence – on what might be called ‘first-order’ knowledge. This is still fundamental; but AO4 is about understanding what counts as knowledge; about how far knowledge is based upon facts and values; and about standards of proof.

By ‘different types of knowledge’ we mean *different ways of getting knowledge*. We might obtain knowledge by fine measurement, and calculation. This gives us a degree of certainty. We might obtain it by observation, and by experiment. This gives us a degree of probability. Or we might acquire it by examination of documents and material remains, or by introspection – that is, by canvassing our own experiences and feelings. This gives us a degree of possibility. In this sense, knowledge is a matter of degree.

Questions, or aspects of them, which are designed to test AO4 will therefore focus on such matters as:

- analysis and evaluation of the nature of the knowledge, evidence or arguments, for example, used in a text, set of data or other form of stimulus material;
- understanding of the crucial differences between such things as knowledge, belief or opinion, and objectivity and subjectivity in arguments;
- appreciation of what constitutes proof, cause and effect, truth, validity, justification, and the limits to these;
- recognition of the existence of personal values, value judgements, partiality and bias in given circumstances;
- awareness of the effects upon ourselves and others of different phenomena, such as the nature of physical, emotional and spiritual experiences, and the ability to draw upon and analyse first-hand knowledge and understanding of these.

GENERAL MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION A

Level of response	Mark range	Criteria and descriptors: knowledge, understanding, argument, evaluation, communication
LEVEL 3	7-8 (-9)	A good to comprehensive response demonstrating overall grasp of the range and nature of issues; knowledge and understanding of key principles and evidence; interprets and illustrates arguments coherently and convincingly with fluency and accuracy.
LEVEL 2	4-5-6	A modest to quite good attempt showing some competence and grasp of the issues; some understanding and realisation of key principles; moderate arguments and exemplification; reasonable clarity and accuracy of expression.
LEVEL 1	1-2-3	A bare to limited response showing uncertain grasp, knowledge and understanding; lack of clarity of argument and little appropriate exemplification; weak expression.
LEVEL 0	0	No valid response or relevance to the question.

Approximate distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Section A.

Question Numbers	1	2	3	4	AO marks FOR Section A
Assessment Objectives AO1	1	1	1	1	4
AO2	1	1	1	1	4
AO3	3	-	3	3	9
AO4	4	6	4	4	18
Total marks per Question	9	8	9	9	35

Note: It is the questions themselves which are designed to elicit the range of response appropriate to the assessment objectives for each question. Examiners are required to assign each of the candidates' responses to the most appropriate level according to **its overall quality**, then allocate a single mark within the level.

A2 UNIT 6 CASE STUDY SUMMARY OF EXTRACTS JUNE 2003**A Selected Statistics on Crime****Table 1**

Although the overall incidence of crime has reduced over the period 1999-2001 by 2.5%, reflected in most of the categories shown, crimes of violence against the person and robberies have increased by 4.7% (repeating a trend apparent over previous years).

Table 2

Of the 475,000 people cautioned or found guilty for an indictable offence, 45% were males aged between 16-24 and 16% were boys aged 10-15. 40% of the offences were for theft or handling stolen goods, and 18% were drugs offences. Women were responsible for less than 20% of these offences.

Table 3

The most common form of sentence is some form of Community Service (30%), closely followed by a fine or imprisonment (25% each).

Table 4

The number of prison sentences between 1990 and 2000 has almost doubled, but the trend has been for shorter sentences less than 12 months.

Table 5

The overall detection rate of notified crimes can be regarded as low at 24%. Of those listed the lowest detection rate is for thefts from vehicles (only 6%), and several others – robbery, theft of vehicles, burglary and criminal damage are also well below the average. This comes over as a depressingly and frustratingly low rate of success.

Table 6

Indicates that half of all robberies take place in 20 towns or cities in England, possibly reflecting most of all urban deprivation as a key factor in the cause of crime. Many of the robberies, plus the increase in this category of crime, can be attributed to the theft of mobile phones from young people, easy targets on both counts. (See Extract C).

Table 7

Of the Government's target figures for crime reduction, car crime and burglary seem to be on track, but robbery has continued to grow, again largely attributable to the increase in street crime, including the theft of mobile phones. (See Extract C).

B Robbery statistics inflated by liars

Crime statistics are not wholly reliable for a variety of reasons and one example is given here, although the sample is small. Another key issue is that crime recorded by the police is only a fraction of actual crime. Increasingly national statistics are based on British Crime Survey data rather than recorded crime.

C Mobile phone thefts from children

Huge increase, particularly from young people under 16 in deprived urban areas.

Manufacturers could help to solve the problem; other responses, such as ‘bombing’ not very effective; loss often not reported.

Mobile phones and young people are easy targets, typically male-on-male, black-on-white, teenage gang-type crime.

Fairly obvious reasons: small, fairly valuable, easy spotted and resold, highly desirable, but could reach saturation point.

D Survey of new powers to tackle youth crime

Uncertainty over whether youth crime is going up or down; some initiatives are seen as effective, others not.

- reduce time to bring young offenders to court – slow to implement but has happened
- local curfews – not introduced
- anti-social behaviour orders – now being issued and considered to be effective
- final warning instead of caution – effective
- intensive supervision – tagging better than locking-up
- parenting orders to improve skills of parents – considered to be working
- referral orders – pilot scheme deemed to be successful
- detention and training orders (‘short, sharp shock’ for persistent young offenders) – success not clear
- youth inclusion programmes targeting potential offenders – working
- on-the-spot fines to combat ‘yob-culture’ – never got off the ground
- action plan order – working
- withdrawing child benefit – still on the drawing board
- voluntary presence of police in schools to break link between truancy and increased teenage street crime – figures quoted to support this. Generally welcomed, but take-up, funding and recruitment issues uncertain.

E UK Jail Numbers

Considers implications of UK policy to increase number of prison sentences and the link between these and crime levels in the western world.

SECTION A**1 What are the key features of the data in Extract A?****9 marks**

Points which may be made include:

- Although the overall incidence of crime has reduced over the period 1999-2001 by 2.5%, reflected in most of the categories shown, crimes of violence against the person and robberies have increased by 4.7% (repeating a trend apparent over previous years). **(Table 1)**
- Of the 475,000 people cautioned or found guilty for an indictable offence, 45% were males aged between 16-24 and 16% were boys aged 10-15. 40% of the offences were for theft or handling stolen goods, and 18% were drugs offences. Women were responsible for less than 20% of these offences. **(Table 2)**
- The most common form of sentence is some form of Community Service (30%), closely followed by a fine or imprisonment (25% each). **(Table 3)**
- The number of prison sentences between 1990 and 2000 has almost doubled, but the trend has been for shorter sentences less than 12 months. **(Table 4)**
- The overall detection rate of notified crimes has fallen to 24% (1% less than the previous year). Of those listed the lowest detection rate is for thefts from vehicles (only 6%), and several others – robbery, theft of vehicles, burglary and criminal damage are also well below the average. This comes over as a depressingly and frustratingly low rate of success. **(Table 5)**
- Indicates that half of all robberies take place in 20 towns or cities in England, possibly reflecting most of all urban deprivation as a key factor in the cause of crime. Many of the robberies, plus the increase in this category of crime, can be attributed to the theft of mobile phones from young people, easy targets on both counts. **(Table 6) (Also Extract C)**
- Of the Government's target figures for crime reduction, car crime and burglary seem to be on track, but robbery has continued to grow, again largely attributable to the increase in street crime, including the theft of mobile phones. **(Table 7) (Also Extract C)**

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment. The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria.

Wholly generalised comments on the tables rather than the data should not receive many marks (i.e. Level 1).

For a full mark to be scored, points or comments should contain more than one dimension, or be developed or qualified in some appropriate way.

2 Explain why statistics on crime, such as are presented here by the Government and in the press, should be treated with caution.

8 marks

Crime statistics or people's use of them may not be wholly reliable for a variety of reasons:

- as argued in Extract B, people may not always tell the truth and may be seeking to make a false insurance claim;
- the sample on which the Coventry police's argument is based is very small and may not be reliable on this basis. This could be a good example of how statistics may be (ab)used for partial reasons – in this case to suggest that actual crime rates can be overstated. The police might well have an interest in playing down the amount of crime committed in their area);
- crime recorded by the police is estimated to be only a fraction (60%?) of actual crime committed, as many crimes are not reported to the police;
- methods of counting and recording crime change from time to time. A major revision took place in 1998, for example, in the recording of violent crime focusing on the victim rather than the offender, with the result that the number of recorded incidents virtually doubled in one year;
- there are alternative national statistics based on British Crime Survey data rather than crime recorded by the police. These show much higher rates of crime, of the order suggested above;
- policy on pursuing particular offences may change according to local targets and/or political imperatives, e.g. reduced use of stop and search powers;
- both the press and politicians may have an interest in talking up or playing down the significance of crime figures for particular purpose.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment. The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria.

3 Suggest reasons for the relative success or failure of the initiatives for dealing with teenage crime described in Extract D.

9 marks

Measures which seem to have worked or be working:

- reduce time to bring young offenders to court
- final warning instead of formal caution
- intensive supervision – tagging etc better than locking-up
- parenting orders to improve skills of parents
- referral orders to make reparations
- action plan orders
- youth inclusion programmes targeting potential offenders.

Uncertain:

- basing police in schools with high rates of truancy
- anti-social behaviour orders.

Measures deemed or likely to be less successful:

- detention and training orders ('short, sharp shock' for persistent young offenders)
- local curfews (not implemented?)
- on-the-spot fines to combat 'yob-culture'
- withdrawing child benefit.

A common thread running through the schemes which appear to be more successful is the attention paid to the needs of the individual, whereas the less successful measures have a punitive element. A Level 3 response might be expected to contain some such observations. It will be interesting to see what candidates make of the proposal to introduce police into schools.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent reason, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment. The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria.

4 Using information from the extracts and your own knowledge, discuss what considerations should be taken into account in the sentencing of offenders.

9 marks

Points which may be made include:

- nature and severity of the crime
- intention at the time the crime was committed
- mental state and other circumstances of offender
- past record of offender
- to protect public
- likelihood of crime being repeated
- appropriateness of the sentence (to fit the crime)
- to see justice done and punish wrong-doing (retribution)
- to deter others
- to remove cause and rehabilitate.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment. The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria.

GENERAL MARK SCHEME FOR A2 ESSAYS

The essay questions in General Studies A are designed to test the four assessment objectives (see INTRODUCTION above) as follows:

AO1 – 6 marks AO2 – 5 marks AO3 – 7 marks AO4 – 7 marks **Total – 25 marks**

Each answer should be awarded two separate marks, comprising a mark out of 20 for content (Assessment Objectives 1, 3 and 4) and a mark out of 5 for communication (Assessment Objective 2).

The mark for content should be awarded on the basis of the overall level of the candidate's response in relation to the following general criteria and descriptors for each level.

Levels of response	Mark range	Criteria and descriptors for Assessment Objectives 1, 3 and 4: knowledge, understanding, argument and illustration, evaluation.
LEVEL 4	16 – 20 (5)	Good response to the demands of the question: sound knowledge of material (AO1); clear understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); valid arguments and appropriate illustrations, coherent conclusion (AO3).
LEVEL 3	11 – 15 (5)	Competent attempt at answering the question: relevant knowledge (AO1); reasonable understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); some fair arguments and illustrations, attempt at a conclusion (AO3).
LEVEL 2	6 – 10 (5)	Limited response to the demands of the question: only basic knowledge (AO1); modest understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); limited argument and illustration, weak conclusion (AO3).
LEVEL 1	1 – 5 (5)	Inadequate attempt to deal with the question: very limited knowledge (AO1); little understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); little or no justification or illustration, inadequate overall grasp (AO3).
LEVEL 0	0	No response or relevance to the question

The mark for communication (AO2) should be awarded using the following scale and criteria.

5 marks	Clear and effective organisation and structure, fluent and error-free expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 marks	Clear attempt at organisation and structure, generally fluent and accurate expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 marks	Some organisation and structure evident, variable fluency, occasional errors in expression, punctuation and grammar.
2 marks	Limited organisation and structure, little fluency, a number of errors in expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 mark	Lacking organisation, structure and fluency, frequent errors in expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
0 marks	No response

Note: A totally irrelevant response (Level 0) should also receive 0 marks for communication. A brief and inadequate response (Level 1) should be awarded not more than 2 marks and a limited response (Level 2) normally not more than 3 marks for communication. Responses at Level 3 and 4 for content may be awarded up to 5 marks for communication.

SECTION B**5 Discuss both the case for and against the introduction of identity cards for United Kingdom citizens.**

Explain why you would be in favour of or against such a step.

The question is effectively in three parts and candidates are required to discuss arguments for and against ID cards and to explain their own point of view on the issues. They may choose to do this in three separate sections or present a more synthesised, integrated response. Sufficient attention must be paid to all three aspects for marks at level 4.

Possible arguments FOR

- evidence of ID is already required to gain access to many facilities and services and only a small extension of existing requirements for a substantial number of people
- single ID card could cover several useful functions in one and would be more convenient than a hindrance to most people
- criminal and terrorist activity more to be feared than abuse of ID card by police and others
- would act as an inhibiting factor to anyone wanting to use anonymity or confusion to cover anti-social activity
- why should people who have nothing to hide object to assisting the authorities?
- widespread use of CCTV now accepted, why not ID card?
- tracking of movement and activities already possible through use of credit cards
- many EU countries operate ID cards without infringing human rights and in almost all European countries citizens are required to register where they live (although only France requires compulsory ID papers within EU (Switzerland also outside EU?)).

Possible arguments AGAINST

- invasion of privacy; enables tracking of movements and activities; crucial step towards ‘big brother’ state
- all should have right to freedom of movement and to social anonymity if they wish
- apart from WWII we have managed satisfactorily without ID cards so far
- may be a small extension to existing requirements to prove ID, but compulsory production on demand implies presumption of guilt and represents a significant threat to existing philosophy of life and traditional social/political belief
- gives police unprecedented power to interfere in daily lives and would exacerbate relations between police and public, largely based on co-operation
- basic right to demonstrate/protest against actions of the state could be undermined
- systems to produce, maintain and operate cards open to abuse and cards will be lost, stolen and forged
- ID cards largely ineffective and irrelevant in controlling crime, terrorism and illegal immigration.

There may well be other valid arguments and these should be given equal credit.

In explaining their point of view candidates must give appropriate arguments and reasons to justify their position. Candidates may introduce appropriate historical references to the abuse of ID papers in fascist and communist states and should be given credit for this, provided that they are not overdone and are shown to be relevant to current circumstances.

6 Discuss the causes and effects of the non-medicinal use of drugs.**Suggest what should be done to alleviate the problems they produce.**

The question has three elements – the causes and effects of drug use and what should be done to alleviate the problems. Candidates are asked to show their knowledge and awareness of a wide range of possible causes and effects and also to give their ideas and opinions about how to solve an increasing social problem which has been frustrating government, the police and other agencies for several decades. Stronger candidates will recognise that the causes and effects are complex and multi-faceted, and that dealing with the problems has proved pretty intractable. They may argue different cases for different drugs. They should not expect to satisfy us with easy and instant solutions.

Causes may include:

- exposure in family, friends, peer group
- chemical/biological, genetic pre-disposition (but not certain even when exists)
- psychological, sensation seeking/risk taking, combat low self-esteem
- makes you feel better if not able to control own mood, makes up for lack, loss
- after-effect is to feel worse, causes altered pleasure threshold in some, unable to resist withdrawal symptoms.

Effects:

- damage to physical and psychological health
- adverse impact on families, relationships, careers, workforce and the economy in general
- crime carried out by addicts (soliciting, shop-lifting, burglary, street robbery – up to 80% of crime in some inner city areas is estimated to be drug-related)
- cost to the NHS and social services.

Tackling the problems:

- punitive approach (harsher penalties for drug trafficking and dealers, confiscation of property, greater resources both technical and in personnel for the detection and seizure of illegal drugs)
- preventive approach (better education on the dangers of drug use, more resources to help young people use their leisure time wisely, more resources for inner city improvement and job creation, more resources for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts)
- further reclassification/legalisation of drugs.

Arguments for decriminalisation may focus on the supposed benefits, medical or otherwise of ‘soft drugs’ and on government resources that are ‘wasted’ which could otherwise be targeted on the fight against much more dangerous drugs. Holland might well figure here as illustration of a more relaxed or enlightened approach to so-called recreational drugs, and cannabis in particular might well be compared favourably with alcohol or nicotine.

Arguments against decriminalisation may dispute claims that class B or C drugs are largely harmless in their physical and psychological impact and may see drugs like cannabis or ecstasy as stepping stones to the use of harder substances like heroin and cocaine. The best answers are likely to come from candidates who are not only well informed but who can produce responses which are thoughtful, wide-ranging, balanced and above all realistic.

7 What are the factors and considerations that contribute to our notions of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ and the way that we behave both individually and in groups?

To what extent is it possible for differences of opinion to be tolerated?

There are two clear parts to this question, of which the first is likely to be the major element. The range of factors and considerations is potentially quite wide and is likely to include:

- codes adopted by societies or groups through religious belief and enshrined in holy writings;
- the relationship between these and the legal code;
- the roles played by parents and the family, the education system; the values and behaviour of peers and social groups; and
- those shaped by politicians, other social leaders, the media and so on.

In an alternative approach candidates may endeavour to explore our acquisition of values and exercise of choices on a more philosophical level: e.g.

- through the identification of actions which promote the general good and quality of life, or
- the survival of individuals or the species, and the limitation of those which may cause harm.

Stronger candidates may recognise the tension between absolute and relative values, and seek to explore the extent to which it is possible to say, for example, that killing is always wrong, or whether in certain circumstances it may be less than another evil.

Some aspects of behaviour fall within the control of the law, and others, on a more personal level perhaps, may be deemed to be a matter of concern only to the individual(s) concerned. The second part of the question requires a philosophical approach where quality of thought and argument should be given credit, possibly over and above the number of points made. In democratic societies there tends to be an entitlement to or acceptance of certain rights/freedoms: e.g.

speech, movement, assembly
 fair trial and to be presumed innocent until proved guilty
 privacy, to withdraw labour, and to the protection of personal property
 protection against discrimination, arbitrary arrest

and an acceptance of differences of opinion and values up to a point. It is often argued that tolerance of such differences brings richness and cultural variety to a society.

There is probably an unresolvable issue about the balance to be struck between freedom of action and restrictions on behaviour in public and private society, revolving around the extent to which freedoms claimed by some individuals or groups may impinge on the liberty or rights of others. For example, supporting the concept of freedom of speech requires you to allow the expression of ideas which you may find personally abhorrent. Awareness of this tension will again be worth credit.

Credit should be given throughout for the ability to provide illustrations and examples to support arguments and points.

8 In general terms it is British government policy to grant overseas aid only to those developing countries that promote ‘good government’.

What do you think should be the main features of ‘good government’?

To what extent is the policy a fair and legitimate one?

There are two clear questions here and both must be answered in some detail for high marks.

What is ‘good government’ might be described as:

- promoting social, economic and political health and well-being
- ensuring that people are fed, provided with medical services, given a basic education and opportunities for employment
- guaranteed basic civil rights and freedoms
- capable of being held to account by open elections and being subject to independent judicial and constitutional processes.

Fair and legitimate policy:

- stronger candidates might well question what ‘fair and legitimate’ means in this context
- some might perceive a distinction between short-term ‘crisis’ aid for humanitarian purposes and longer term assistance for economic and social development and argue the case for one, but not the other
- some might question whether it is right to impose our concept of what is ‘good’ government on other countries in return for aid and argue that both short and long-term aid should be unconditional on moral grounds
- others may see it more crudely in terms of ‘friends’ and ‘enemies’, and why should we assist regimes which do not support or would attack ‘our’ values?

Although the second question is a direct one, it would be quite possible for (stronger?) candidates to argue more than one case in a balanced way as long as they justify their views.

Approximate distribution of Assessment Objective marks across Unit 6

Question Numbers		Section A				Section B	AO marks per Unit
		1	2	3	4	5-8	
Assessment Objectives	AO1	1	1	1	1	6	10
	AO2	1	1	1	1	5	9
	AO3	3	-	3	3	7	16
	AO4	4	6	4	4	7	25
Total marks per Question		9	8	9	9	25	60