



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 6761

Specification A

GSA4 Culture, Morality, Arts and Humanities

Mark Scheme

2006 examination - June series

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.

Unit 4 Question 1 (GA4F French)

This component is an objective test for which the following list indicates the correct answers used in marking the candidates' responses.

1.1	D	1.11	C
1.2	B	1.12	A
1.3	C	1.13	C
1.4	A	1.14	A
1.5	C	1.15	B
1.6	B	1.16	D
1.7	A	1.17	D
1.8	D	1.18	B
1.9	C	1.19	B
1.10	D	1.20	A

Unit 4 Question 1 (GA4G German)

This component is an objective test for which the following list indicates the correct answers used in marking the candidates' responses.

1.1	B	1.11	C
1.2	C	1.12	C
1.3	B	1.13	A
1.4	A	1.14	D
1.5	D	1.15	B
1.6	D	1.16	A
1.7	A	1.17	D
1.8	A	1.18	C
1.9	C	1.19	D
1.10	B	1.20	B

Unit 4 Question 1 (GA4S Spanish)

This component is an objective test for which the following list indicates the correct answers used in marking the candidates' responses.

1.1	B	1.11	D
1.2	A	1.12	C
1.3	D	1.13	C
1.4	B	1.14	B
1.5	C	1.15	A
1.6	B	1.16	C
1.7	A	1.17	A
1.8	C	1.18	B
1.9	D	1.19	D
1.10	A	1.20	D

Unit 4 Question 2 (GSA4/2 Culture, Morality, Arts and Humanities)

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

In previous General Studies syllabuses, there has been a focus on the knowledge and understanding of facts (AO1), and the marshalling and evaluation of evidence (AO3) – on what might be called ‘first-order’ knowledge. AO4 is about understanding what *counts as knowledge*; about how far knowledge is based upon facts and values; and about standards of proof – what might be called ‘second-order’ knowledge.

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 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.

Level 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 accurate 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.

2.1 Karl Marx’s view that ‘religion is the opium of the masses’ implies that organised religion can be used to control and restrict the behaviour of ordinary people.

Discuss the validity of this opinion in the modern world.

The famous and controversial Marx statement has been amplified a little to offer some direction for those candidates who may not be familiar with its context. Fairly simplistically, the idea is that religion is used by those in power to make people feel better about the distress they experience due to being poor and exploited. It eases the pain of oppressed workers, while justifying the privileged position of those who are in control of their lives, economically and politically. There are vested interests for the educated and privileged in maintaining the status quo.

The intent of the question is to create discussion of the role of religion in controlling and restricting populations. A wide variety of viewpoints are possible here and candidates are asked to say whether they feel that there is a degree of control exercised through religion in the modern world. This may be by offering a framework of morality which limits, for whatever reason, the behaviour of adherents. Religion may be a force in people’s lives whose rules and limitations on behaviour they accept willingly. There may be occasions in a variety of religions where the control may be seen as being too strict for a modern view of human freedoms and rights. Religion may be offering a control of its own against secularisation – in some ways almost an inverse view of Marx’s. In the mid-nineteenth century, especially perhaps in protestant England, the feeling was that the ruling classes were able to manipulate religion as an engine of social control and hierarchy, both from the pulpit and from those mindful of some of the revolution which was happening in the mid century.

We would hope that candidates would realise and be able to discuss the dichotomies of the question - particularly those which involve differences between what a religion may propound and what the state gives as a freedom. There are numerous examples from Christianity and other religions and the extent of the effectiveness of religious control is something which should occupy candidates. There is great scope here for AO4 – a realisation of the limitations of the imposition of particular views is fertile ground. An exploration of the reasons behind various doctrinal standpoints is also very appropriate for AO4 marks.

2.2 Discuss the moral and ethical implications of the right of people to migrate from one country to another.

We are here in the areas of the specification dealing with the *dilemmas and complexity of a multi-faith and pluralist society* and *tolerance*, as well as *the bases for moral and value judgements*.

This can be taken at a number of levels and it is to be hoped that some candidates will find it a meaty question and dare to go into the moral and ethical areas indicated.

They might begin by discussing whether there is an absolute right to movement and indeed whether such a right is universal. It certainly isn't for those who cannot afford to migrate. Then there are different kinds of migration – economic, political, asylum seeking are three obvious ones but there are other reasons to migrate. Joining families, taking up intellectually satisfying employment, health or age reasons are some of the other appropriate areas. Holiday making isn't really an issue and anyone who confines their answer to simple travel is missing the point of migration and therefore of the question.

Some rights to migration are enshrined within law. The rights of European citizens to seek employment elsewhere within the EU, along with proposals to widen the EU's borders are issues. The rights of British passport holders from the Commonwealth is another area where much discussion may arise. Deeper discussion may centre on the implications of immigration within the present uncomfortable religious context but rants will not be rewarded.

Each of the above will bring different moral and ethical dimensions. The usual immigration issues which became a factor in the election campaigns of 2005 may well arise here. It is to be hoped, however, that candidates will have the breadth of vision to consider that freedoms are at the centre of the question, not simply the impact that immigration may seem to have.

Candidates may take any view – so long as it is sufficiently objective, analytical, developed and exemplified – and we must mark according to the quality of the arguments presented.

2.3 Discuss the view that in our materialistic world, artists, musicians and writers make little real contribution to society.

A question open to any interpretation the candidate wishes. There is much that could be deconstructed – is our world materialistic? – does each of these groups make a contribution to society? – what is an artist's (musician's, writer's) contribution to society? – what is meant by a 'real' contribution? – what is a contribution to society? – is it artistic? – pecuniary?

It is to be expected that better answers will consider each of the artistic endeavours cited, and one that concentrates on one area only is likely to be deficient. 'Artists', however, can be interpreted as fine artists or as those from a range of artistic disciplines – quality of argument is important.

Assuming we have a discussion of how materialistic a world this is, there is bound to be a set of value judgements on the matter. These may be from any viewpoint but must stand up to scrutiny for higher rewards. The provocative view that such people make LITTLE real contribution is designed to be tested. It should surely be argued that arts and mammon are regular bedfellows. A great deal of lottery funding, through the Awards for All programme and through other funding arrangements go to enhance artistic projects. The arts are expensive and from community to national groups cost money and presumably their value can be quantified. Can their effect be qualitatively argued? How much do the arts enhance or add value to an individual or group experience?

Writers do offer us an enhancement, for which we pay through book prices. No doubt the astronomical earnings of J.K. Rowling will be trotted out here, but her value can be easily argued in the world that she has created, the money she has put into the economy, the pleasure she has given and the vast numbers of children, especially boys, who have kept up or developed the reading habit.

Music is one of the biggest industries and a force in the British economy. It would be difficult to argue that it has no intrinsic worth and that it (and its performers and composers) lacks real value to society. Similarly, the means of reproducing music is a vast industry with many economic benefits. Candidates must try to argue around societal benefit and not get on to more generalised discussion.

2.4 ‘Sometimes the Arts do not easily cross cultural boundaries.’

Discuss this view with reference to a range of art forms and cultures.

An Aunt Sally of a quotation. Candidates may wish to accept it at face value or to attack it. Those who are more aware will see that some art forms are more universal than others and some cultural boundaries are more of a barrier than others.

An understanding and analysis of what makes a cultural boundary is important. There is a variety of interpretation depending on a cultural definition. It may be that national boundaries define culture for some; religious divides or larger cultural groupings such as ‘East and West’ may be appropriate too. Indeed candidates may well consider there to be a strong boundary between youth and crabbled age and argue that some arts forms are divided into these two areas. Whatever is argued has, as always, to be argued with strong analysis and sensitive exemplification.

Those who accept the quotation will need to define their boundaries clearly and offer arguments which are defensible. Their exemplification is required to be from a range of both genres and cultures. Anything which argues from only one art form is limiting and will not access higher levels. It would be very difficult to argue from only one culture and we could accept two cultures as a range. Wider exemplification may well be more fruitful but someone who argues across a couple of art forms and over the two sides of one perceived boundary could offer a very acceptable essay.

Those who reject the quotation will need similarly careful contextualisation. Those who argue a mixed economy stand a chance of accessing good levels of AO4 as they look at the variety and range of cross-cultural features.

A whole range of guidance could be given here but the question may throw up answers from a huge range so we cannot be prescriptive. Just one caveat - we do ask for an answer on ‘The Arts’, so those who stick to recognised artistic forms – literature, music, painting, architecture, photography, sculpture, dance, film, drama etc. will be rewarded. Those who stray to areas such as sport and martial arts, will, as usual, be deemed to be outside the remit of the question. Those arguing clothing and fashion are nearer the mark but only with a strong artistic input.

2.5 Discuss the criteria which should be considered when deciding why a work of art can be described as a masterpiece?**Illustrate your answer with particular examples from any art form.**

This comes straight from the specification's section 15.3 (Aesthetic evaluation) and has been heavily hinted at in specimen material and teachers' guides. One would hope, therefore, that there are some carefully prepared answers in this area.

What then is a masterpiece?

Candidates will have to offer a range of those attributes which are currently thought to define a masterpiece. Originally, of course, the term referred to the piece which a student Artist would produce to demonstrate that he had sufficient competence to take on students of his own, so denoting his ability as a master. Now the meaning is often used very loosely and we will have to contend with offerings which we may not consider to be masterpieces unless the candidate convinces us that it is so (and that is a part of their task).

Helpful criteria may be set on two planes.

Firstly, quantifiable and objective judgements (based on such matters as technical merit and form, the number of purchases and popularity, production values) are one aspect of a definition of a masterpiece. Candidates should realise that on a second level there is also a more subjective set of criteria. These will cover such issues as novelty and originality, durability, consistency and inspiration. Candidates should be able to argue about subjective issues such as how we can define superior quality, universality, timelessness and that very elusive trait of genius.

We have asked for specific references and here we expect that particular works will be cited. For higher levels titles are not enough. There must be an attempt to argue why particular works are transcendent. It is insufficient to say that the *Mona Lisa* is a masterpiece because her eyes follow you around the room. The whole range of objective and subjective criteria should be brought to bear on each masterpiece – the connections must be made to access higher levels. The use of one example only will only be useful if it demonstrates a whole range of attributes, but it would be possible.

2.6 Examine and evaluate the case for and against censorship of the news media.

You may wish to refer to the Internet, television, radio and newspapers.

The subject of control and censorship is covered in 15.3 of the specification. Here we are referring to broadcasting news in its widest sense of disseminating information through all available channels – electronic or printed, audio or visual.

Candidates are invited to examine both sides of the topic of censorship. Answers which do not address substantially the area of news media are unlikely to access marks above Level 2. They should present arguments and scenarios where censorship might be thought to be appropriate – and if possible extend that beyond the obvious issues of national security to include safeguarding of privacy and the thorny subject of “need to know” or political expediency. Presumably there will be much discussion, as usual, on net nanny controls and the watershed but hopefully some will see beyond that and discuss more drastic measures that could be taken. They are then required to evaluate their case – giving judgements of the validity of their presentation. Without evaluation they are unlikely to reach higher levels. They are also required to argue and evaluate the case for freedom to broadcast news and may wish to point out why such freedoms are thought to be necessary.

There is a whole range of possibility here - they may wish to refer to situations in other places or other times where censorship has been necessary and others where it was dangerous. Good candidates may wish to point to recent legislation and the controls that are already in place. The moral problems thrown up by attempts to prosecute incitement to religious hatred and the minefields of conflicting religious views might be useful material here.

Each medium represented in the prompt will have its own issues. A general essay focussing on a narrow range of issues could have as much validity as one covering all the suggested areas. Candidates might wish to include such obvious factors as controls about sensitive material, political control, watershed and child protection, material which may cause offence (covering issues of religious, gender, political sensitivities), pornography, security, rights and freedoms of the individual (such as the tensions between privacy and freedom of expression, especially for innocent parties in terms of court cases, children of celebrities and similar issues). The focus must remain firmly on the news. Good candidates may recognise that there is a measure of state control in western democracies – through spin, and issues discussed in the Hutton enquiry, for instance. They may well discuss these issues in the light of a lack of such freedoms in other countries and may hold up the BBC as an example of a respected purveyor of news (as, apparently is Al Jazheera).

In any case we are seeking a balanced and valid set of conclusions about censorship. A good essay will explicitly outline the rival cases and will exhibit some subtlety of handling relevant material; a weaker one is likely only to discuss censorship in a more general way or cover one side of the question only.