



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 6761 *Specification A*

GSA4 **Culture, Morality, Arts and Humanities**

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 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.

Unit 4 Culture, Morality, Arts and Humanities

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

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

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

Unit 4 Question 1 (GA4E European Culture)

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

1.1	D	1.16	A
1.2	A	1.17	D
1.3	D	1.18	A
1.4	C	1.19	C
1.5	A	1.20	C
1.6	A	1.21	D
1.7	B	1.22	B
1.8	B	1.23	D
1.9	C	1.24	A
1.10	B	1.25	C
1.11	B	1.26	D
1.12	D	1.27	D
1.13	C	1.28	A
1.14	A	1.29	B
1.15	B	1.30	C

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 'All citizens should uphold the laws of their country.'

'All religious people should obey the rules of their faith.'

Examine these two statements and discuss the extent to which there may be tensions between them.

The essence of this question is very old. At its heart is the 'Render to Caesar' debate, though the context will undoubtedly be seen as modern and referring specifically to some of the tensions faced in the modern world.

Both statements should be examined. An appropriate examination might deconstruct them. The first may produce arguments about the observance of just and unjust laws and the difference between them. The difference between state and moral law might be another area for debate. Inherent in the first statement is a discussion about the responsibilities of citizenship and conformity to a legal system. We might expect a discussion of what the major areas of law are but those who point to areas where upholding the law can be difficult should get near the heart of the question. Notions of unjust laws; politically expedient laws, ill-thought out knee-jerk law making; and even of law which impinges on freedoms could all be examined here.

The second statement should also be examined in detail. The discussion here will probably include the extent to which religious rules should be obeyed – whether they are laws of universal morality such as prohibitions against killing and stealing, or rules of morality imposed by the particular faith, such as dietary laws or rules governing sexual mores. Descriptions and exemplification are essential for the upper levels. The difficulty of following strict religious rules in a free society is another area where comment could be useful.

Discussion about the tensions between the two notions will enter the realms of what is owed to the state by citizens and the religious alike. They are asked to examine the extent to which there are tensions. Obviously many facets of the law would offer no dilemma for the religious believer and these are areas upon which candidates could concentrate. For higher grades it is likely that candidates will be able to point to both areas of tension and areas where the two notions are complementary. Those who concentrate on the tensions only will not have covered the whole question.

If a good case is presented it should be examined on its merits. Candidates may stray into areas which relate to custom rather than a definitive rule of faith. If something is proven to be religious practice, for the purpose of assessment we must be reasonably tolerant that it is the equivalent of a rule of faith, even if not prescribed as such in a scripture. More frivolous customs, however, might need to be approached with some scepticism.

2.2 What do you understand by ‘the truth’?

Discuss by means of examples how some things can be proven to be true and others cannot.

Many students will have pursued philosophical notions of the nature of truth in their 6th form courses. We should expect some informed discussions about the variety of notions of truth.

They are asked to say what they understand by ‘the truth’. Can truth be seen as absolute and universal? Is this true even in the case of mathematics? Is truth a function (or a victim) of such as memory, perception, perspective, prejudice? Does truth depend on cultural values or other differing standpoints of those perceiving it? These are some of the areas we may expect to be considered.

Could truth in a courtroom be totally objective? Presumably it is nearer so in the hands of ‘expert’ witnesses or forensics, but even these are questionable and have been eroded by recent court cases, especially about the deaths of children.

Candidates are asked to discuss ‘by means of examples’ and we should expect some case studies here. Some of those things which can be proven to be true might include those items which are beyond contradiction. For example, if society considers a particular shape to be a cube and offers a definition of a cube which fits the shape exactly and in all circumstances, it could be considered that in truth it is a cube. The more complex and abstract (or emotional) the example, the more doubt can be raised about its truth in all circumstances. There are infinitesimal shades of truth – perhaps the antithesis is belief, where a belief system is believed by adherents to be literally true, but which lacks objective proof. In such a system contrary views deny the ‘truth’ just as strongly.

Empirical truths should be discussed and the place of consensus might also be examined. Better candidates will no doubt examine the difficulty of arriving at totally objective judgements and will be able to extrapolate something of the nature of truth and its limitations (AO4) in a variety of settings.

The best answers are likely to be able to examine the philosophy of truth. There is still room for a high level answer from candidates who do the thinking without real knowledge of the names of the concepts.

2.3 Evaluate the claim that film is now the most important and effective art form.

The claim made above needs careful examination. It implies that there has been a shift in the relative position of art forms at some time in the past and candidates may wish to explore that notion. Given the history of film – more than 100 years – there may be some historical speculation from candidates.

Why should film be more **important** than other art forms?

Possible claims may be its universality, its accessibility, its ability to make (and spend) huge amounts of money, its variety, its appearance in homes on DVDs or televisions, its ability to allow escapism or confront real issues (or any shade in between), or its cultural identity whereby marketing can exaggerate the iconic status of films, characters or stars. Entertainment values are high but beware those who argue along the lines of ‘because it’s part of a good night out’.

Why should film be a more **effective** medium than others?

It could be because it speaks directly to a wide range of viewers in a way that books, music, paintings etc do not. Film has a power to affect. By using special effects and computer generated images film can now present a version of truth far removed from reality and has the power to make such images totally believable. Film’s propaganda potential has long been known and candidates may wish to consider its power to manipulate mass audiences.

The contrary claims of another art form may be argued but the answer must centre on the importance and effectiveness of a rival claimant as compared to film.

One would hope for real identification of films or characters that do these things and not just a passing mention of titles.

2.4 Explain why the study of the arts, such as music, painting, drama or literature, often involves studying the works of great figures from the past.

Discuss whether such study stifles creativity.

The serious study of an arts subject will usually involve the study of past masters. Nobody can, in fact, ignore the historical context of their art form. Musicians will learn, from their earliest practical studies, works already composed by others. Stylistically these will always have to be used to inform future practice. Pop groups do not exist in a vacuum but have indebtedness to earlier styles to some degree – even the most revolutionary of them. The study of compositional styles of the ‘greats’ may be a sterile exercise but it is deemed to be essential before you can fully learn the craft. There has long been an argument that you have to know the rules before you can break them. This could be spurious, but certainly the finding and development of an artistic style is usually an eclectic process.

It may be that candidates will exemplify the work of the usual suspects among conceptual artists (Emin - Maidstone College of Art and Royal College of Art and Hirst - Leeds School of Art and Goldsmiths College) as untouched by the past but both will have experienced influences of past masters in their long training.

Briefly, candidates will have to recognise that the artist, of whatever type, does not exist in isolation and that the rigours of a ‘classical’ upbringing are still considered to be important in teaching would-be artists about structure, style, detail, and all those things which go to make up a recognised piece of art.

The second part of the question asks whether creativity is stifled by such study. Better candidates might ask why this should be the case. There should be a realisation that although the avant-garde may be revolutionary, there are few cases where a style is completely new and radical. There is a fine line here between the artistically fashionable and that art which has more enduring qualities. Those who stay with pastiche, however, are unlikely to reach really creative plateaux. Candidates may argue that those who have studied too deeply are unable to break the bounds of their experience and produce something totally original.

2.5 Discuss why such works as, for example, a Shakespeare play or a Beethoven symphony are regarded as greater art than a soap opera or a piece of popular music.

The specification does warn candidates to be prepared to discuss their ideas on criterion-referencing works of art. In this question the debate between high and low art is exemplified by areas the candidate can use to build their arguments. The particular works referred to are not prescriptive – candidates are asked to comment on the principle whereby acknowledged masterpieces of high culture differ from archetypal representations of low culture.

By using the examples, however, some of the criteria usually offered for great art, such as beauty of expression, complexity of language, profundity, communication, universality, longevity, perfection of form, originality could be explored and – if applied directly to the modern equivalent, probably offer fertile evidence for comparison.

On the other hand, candidates may wish to assert that real comparison is impossible or that the classical examples here do not reflect a different set of criteria – contemporary awareness, deliberate audience retention techniques, marketing, technical and technological aspects, speaking to a particular audience, accessibility – which may apply to their modern counterparts.

There may well be arguments that the modern examples are indeed equivalent to the classical examples. The production team and range of expertise that go into modern productions are immensely talented. The team, for instance, mounting an episode of Coronation Street are just as aware of dramatic techniques (indeed may be said to use the same techniques) as writers of Tudor times. Beethoven produced his pieces alone – not together with whole teams of talented individuals. Some will try to argue this way – we must assess the quality of their arguments.

We are NOT looking for candidates to refer specifically to the works of Beethoven or Shakespeare. The question makes it clear that these are examples only. Hopefully, they will find their own. They need to exemplify and illustrate to offer clarity of argument.

2.6 Examine the rights and responsibilities of comedians and cartoonists to choose the topic of their humour freely.

This question is inspired by events current at the time of setting which will no doubt have been the topic of debate in sixth forms since the problems emerged. The particular event (which candidates will hopefully be able to refer to) was the publication of twelve cartoons, most of which depicted the prophet Muhammad, in the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten on 30th September 2005. Danish Muslim organizations staged protests in response. As the controversy grew, some or all of the cartoons were reprinted in newspapers in 40 other countries. This led to significant unrest around the world, particularly in Islamic countries where the cartoons were seen as at least culturally insensitive or at worst, blasphemous. The conflict simmered for months before it erupted into violent protests, flag burnings and attacks on Danish and other Western embassies in several Muslim countries. Dozens have been killed in the protests.

Danish premier Fogh Rasmussen condemned “attempts to demonise” religious groups and has said that he regrets that Muslims were offended by the drawings, but he has insisted the government cannot – and does not want to – interfere with Denmark’s independent media. Jyllands-Posten has apologised for offending Muslims, but stands by its decision to print the drawings, citing freedom of speech.

The question does not ask for comment on governmental responsibilities, however. It particularly targets the place of humour as a tool for comment and puts the responsibility of choice of material upon those using the humour (comedians and cartoonists). Candidates are asked to realise that alongside a freedom of choice is a degree of responsibility and are asked to discuss this.

There will be discussion (hopefully with examples) of the nature of humour – its effects and its mechanisms. There may be examples of what is an appropriate target and what is beyond the pale, as well as some examination of the grey area between them. An awareness of sensitive issues of race, religion, gender should be present. Candidates may wish to point out where the lines should be drawn in these issues and discussion of the relative sensitivities of, for instance, religious groups should be discussed with a demonstration of appropriate cultural awareness.

Candidates could exemplify from a whole range of publications and comedians; they could offer thoughts on satire, both soft and hard and look at its effect. They should refer to both cartoonists and comedians (we have asked for ‘and’). If their knowledge of cartoons is limited to animated film (The Simpsons or South Park) they could still fulfil this part of the question by reference to relevant material in such satirical programmes.

Beyond that, they can choose a pathway through the question to suit themselves but must concentrate on both rights (freedoms of expression) and responsibilities (to offend or not; to incite intolerance; to keep within laws protecting their victims; their wider responsibility to society in general).

Those who offer a conclusion should have ensured that it fits with the line of argument in their essay. The nature of that conclusion should be rewarded on its merits as a summary of the arguments used.