



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 6766

Specification B

GSB4 Conflict – Resolution

Mark Scheme

2005 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

(GSB4 Conflict - Resolution)

Answers given in the mark scheme are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points will be credited.

Study the source and answer the following three questions.

- 1 Using the source, analyse the nature of the problem and identify the underlying issues. (15 marks)**
- 2 Identify which parties you consider to be responsible for the problem and analyse the extent of their responsibility, explaining why some might be said to be more responsible than others. (15 marks)**
- 3 Explain what measure might be taken in the short-term and the long-term to resolve the problem and evaluate the likely success of these measures. (20 marks)**

A further ten marks will be awarded for communicating in a concise and logical way in an appropriate form. (10 marks)

General Descriptors**(i) Knowledge and Understanding (0-15 marks)**

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the candidate's knowledge of the situation, and understanding of the problem.

- 11-15 the focus is clear and well-chosen; knowledge is thorough and comprehensive; and the problem is evidently well understood.
- 6-10 the focus is less clear; knowledge is adequate for the task in hand; and the problem is quite well understood.
- 1-5 the focus is unclear; too little is known about the situation; and understanding of the problem is limited.
- 0 no relevant knowledge and understanding.

(ii) Critical Analysis(0-15 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the candidate's understanding of the different interests involved, and appreciation of the limits of each in terms of their knowledge, their beliefs and their interpretation of the facts.

- 11-15 there is thorough understanding of the relative positions of the interest groups and their impact on the situation. There is also clear appreciation of their knowledge, their beliefs, of their interpretation of the facts, and of the limits of their knowledge-base and impartiality.
- 6-10 there is appropriate understanding of the relative positions of the different interest groups and their impact on the situation. There is also some appreciation of their knowledge, their beliefs, of their interpretation of the facts, and of the limits of their knowledge-base and impartiality.
- 1-5 there is little apparent understanding of the relative positions of the different groups and their impact on the situation. There is also little appreciation of their knowledge, their beliefs, of their interpretation of the facts, and of the limits of their knowledge-base.
- 0 no critical analysis or judgement.

(iii) Evaluation and Interpretation

(0-20 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the appropriateness and thoughtfulness of the steps chosen for resolving the problem in an interdisciplinary context.

- 16-20 marshalling of evidence is excellent, and conclusions drawn are highly appropriate; facts and values are well integrated in a very thoughtful resolution of the problem.
- 11-15 evidence is well marshalled, and appropriate conclusions are drawn; data, concepts, and opinions are quite well integrated; the resolution suggested is an appropriate one.
- 6-10 adequate evidence is marshalled, and conclusions are drawn; there is some confusion of factual matter and opinion; the resolution suggested is partly appropriate.
- 1-5 little evidence is presented, and conclusions are limited; evaluation is limited, and indistinguishable from factual matter; resolution of the problem is questionable or absent.
- 0 no relevant evaluation or conclusion.

(iv) Communication

(0-10 marks)

In awarding marks in this section, examiners should be concerned with the clarity and accuracy of communication and with the logical progression of ideas.

- 8-10 the language used is in an appropriate register; ideas and information are organised in a well-structured, logical way; there are few errors, if any, of punctuation, spelling and grammar.
- 4-7 the language used is mostly appropriate and generally clear; links between ideas and information are for the most part clear and adequately structured; there are some errors of punctuation, spelling, and grammar, but these do not hinder communication.
- 1-3 the language used is mostly imprecise or inappropriate; links between ideas and information are not always clearly made though there is some structure; there are errors of punctuation, spelling, and grammar, some of which may obscure points made.
- 0 no relevant knowledge and understanding.

Specific Descriptors

- 1
- (a) Dalton and Johnson both drank to excess on the night of the accident, increasing the likelihood of an incident occurring.
 - (b) Dalton drove back to Johnson, even though he knew he was over the drink-driving limit.
 - (c) The police did not respond to the call reporting Johnson to be drunk and disorderly.
 - (d) The club allowed Dalton and Johnson to drink to excess.
 - (e) In releasing Dalton early, the court could be said to be minimising the punishment/dangers of drink-driving or, worse, to be condoning drink-driving.
 - (f) The decision to release Dalton could be perceived to weaken the court system. The six-month sentence was deemed to be an appropriate punishment and should stand, regardless of personal circumstances.
 - (g) There is a possible link between alcohol abuse and cancer of the liver. If the cancer was as a result of Dalton's drinking, it could be argued that he did not deserve to be released early. Dalton could be said to be using his medical condition as a means of reducing his sentence.
 - (h) There is the moral dilemma of whether to release a dying man or to insist that a punishment is served. It could be said to be inhumane to deny the treatment. The punishment was a prison sentence, not an early death.
 - (i) Johnson's family were unhappy with Dalton's release. They may not have thought that justice had been done.
 - (j) The law permits a certain level of alcohol in the blood. This might lead people to believe they are within tolerance.

(15 marks)

- 2
- (a) Dalton was responsible for Johnson's death. Dalton knew he was over the drink-drive limit, yet he still drove his car back to Johnson, breaking the law and putting himself and others at risk.
 - (b) If Dalton had been a real friend to Johnson, he would have given him a lift home.
 - (c) Johnson was responsible for the accident. He was drunk, staggering in the road and causing a danger to others.
 - (d) Mrs Dalton could have stopped her husband from driving back to Johnson. She knew he was over the alcohol limit, otherwise she would not have driven him home from the club.
 - (e) The club was responsible as it let customers drink to excess.

- (f) The police had a responsibility to follow up the report that Johnson was drunk and disorderly. The accident could have been avoided.
- (g) When the original sentence was passed, the judge should have taken into account Dalton's medical condition.
- (h) The judge had a responsibility to reach sound judgements and give appropriate punishments.
- (i) The Appeal Court judge was responsible for overturning the decision of the original court. In making a special case, the judge laid himself open to criticism.

(15 marks)

3 Short-term – this case

- (a) Dalton could be made to serve the full sentence, receiving whatever treatment is available in the prison hospital.
- (b) Dalton could be allowed to receive specialist treatment, but be returned to the prison to complete his sentence after treatment.
- (c) Dalton's case could be used to publicise the dangers of drink driving.
- (d) A formal warning could have been given by the Licensing Authority to the Club licensee.

Long-term – similar cases

- (e) Courts could pass tougher sentences on drink-drivers to discourage others from drinking and driving.
- (f) The alcohol limit for drivers could be lowered or a zero tolerance policy on alcohol introduced.
- (g) The police could improve their response-time to reported incidents.
- (h) Special arrangements could be made for prisoners with serious illnesses so that they could receive necessary treatment whilst serving their sentence.
- (i) The Government could control the licensing of clubs more strictly.
- (j) More educational campaigns are needed on the dangers of drink-driving/binge drinking.

(20 marks)

Approximate distribution of Assessment Objective marks across Unit 4

Questions	((i) (ii) (iii))	(Comm)	
AO1	15		
AO2		10	
AO3	20		
AO4	15		
Total marks	50	10	60