



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 6766

Specification B

GSB6 Space – Time

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 6

(GSB6 Space – Time)

Answers given in the mark schemes are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points must be credited, even if they do not appear in the mark scheme.

SECTION A

Marks for answers in this Section should be awarded in the following bands:

Band	Marks	
1	33 – 40	A very good response showing understanding of the source, and of the issues, and of the possibilities and limitations of different approaches to the subject. Information of a specific kind from within and beyond the source is analysed critically. The argument is well structured and balanced; facts, opinions and values (implicit and explicit) are clearly distinguished and weighed. The conclusion is valid and thoughtful. Expression is clear and logical with no significant errors of style or grammar.
2	25 – 32	A good response showing understanding of the source and of the issues. Some attempt is made to combine information and examples from the source and from elsewhere. The argument is quite well structured and balanced. Facts, opinions and values are recognised as such. The conclusion is mostly valid. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, with few errors of style and grammar.
3	17 – 24	A competent, average response showing some understanding of the source, but one that is largely dependent on it. Evidence is moderately well marshalled in an argument that may lack structure and balance, and that may generalise. An adequate attempt is made to distinguish between fact and opinion and to reach a conclusion. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, although there may be some carelessness in style and grammar.
4	9 – 16	A limited response showing little understanding of the source. No other information is drawn on. Evidence is loosely marshalled in an argument that lacks structure and balance. Only a limited attempt is made to separate fact and opinion, and to come to a conclusion. Expression is unclear and there is inaccuracy in style or grammar.
5	1 – 8	A response that barely addresses the issues; that shows little or no understanding of the source. If there is other information it is of doubtful relevance. There is more assertion than argument, and no attempt is made at evaluation, summary, or conclusion. Clarity and accuracy are seriously impaired by significant errors in style, expression and grammar.
6	0	No response, or no relevant points.

Answers given in the mark scheme are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points must be credited, even if they do not appear in the mark scheme.

Examiners are reminded that all questions in the Unit are synoptic in nature and offer candidates the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge, understanding and skills acquired throughout the A-level course.

SECTION A

1 Read Source A and answer the following question.

In the past, there were huge inequalities and little regard for human rights.

Should we judge the people of the past on the basis of their:

- **beliefs**
- **laws**
- **social structures**
- **treatment of each other;**

and how might we be judged on a similar basis?

(40 marks)

Candidates might say we should, in that:

- they were superstitious, believed in witchcraft, etc.
- they traded in slaves, kept armies of underpaid servants, etc.
- they meted out harsh punishments for offences, like trespass, petty theft, etc.
- they allowed the disparity between grinding poverty and untold wealth.

They might say we should not, in that:

- they were subject to the vagaries of the weather, and mere survival was the priority for many
- they believed everything was subject to the divine plan
- their behaviour was justified in terms of contemporary thought-forms
- we cannot expect them to have shared our quite modern view about human rights.

They might think we can be judged in that:

- (a) we allow inequalities for which we do not claim divine sanction
- (b) it is still the case that there is homelessness and poverty
- (c) there is still strong correlation between relative poverty and crime and imprisonment
- (d) we imprison record numbers of offenders
- (e) we are fabulously wealthy compared with most people in the world.

- Band 1 Answers will give *convincing* reasons for deeming it appropriate or inappropriate to judge the past, and will give more space to probing *particular* political etc. ways in which we might be judged; the whole is an *argument* which comes to a conclusion and is aware of the issue of cultural relativism.
- Band 2 Answers will address both questions quite convincingly and will ground judgements of the present on *some particular* aspects of what might be called ‘progress’ or ‘social injustice’. There is some appreciation of the difficulties of making cross-cultural comparison.
- Band 3 Answers will be rather *generalising*; there may be some problem of imbalance between the two questions, but both are understood, and there is some relevant assessment of how far our age is more or less blameworthy; expression may begin to weaken in the lower half of the band, and reliance on the source increase.
- Band 4 Answers will show signs of *misunderstanding* either or both questions; there may be reliance on the source, and a casting about for evidence of present-day turpitude; answers will be poorly expressed and, perhaps, brief

(40 marks)

SECTION B

Marks for questions 2 and 3 should be awarded in the following bands:

Band	Marks	
1	33 – 40	A very good response showing understanding of the sources, and of the issues, and of the possibilities and limitations of different approaches to the subject. Information of a specific kind from within and beyond the sources is analysed critically and synoptically. The argument is well structured and balanced; facts, opinions and values (implicit and explicit) are clearly distinguished and weighed. The conclusion is valid and thoughtful. Expression is clear and logical with no significant errors of style or grammar.
2	25 – 32	A good response showing understanding of the sources and of the issues. Some attempt is made to combine information and examples from the sources and from elsewhere, synoptically. The argument is quite well structured and balanced. Facts, opinions and values are recognised as such. The conclusion is mostly valid. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, with few errors of style or grammar.
3	17 – 24	A competent, average response showing some understanding of the sources, but one that is largely dependent on them. Evidence is moderately well marshalled in an argument that may lack structure and balance, and that may generalise. An adequate attempt is made to distinguish between fact and opinion and to reach a conclusion. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, with some carelessness in style or grammar.
4	9 – 16	A limited response showing little understanding of the sources. No other information is drawn on. Evidence is loosely marshalled in an argument that lacks structure and balance. Only a limited attempt is made to separate fact and opinion and come to a conclusion. Expression is unclear and there is some inaccuracy in style or grammar.
5	1 – 8	A response that barely addresses the issues; that shows little or no understanding of the sources. If there is other information it is of doubtful relevance. There is more assertion than argument, and no attempt is made at evaluation, summary, or conclusion. Clarity and accuracy are seriously impaired by significant errors in style, expression and grammar.
6	0	No response, or no relevant points.

Answers given in the mark scheme are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points must be credited, even if they do not appear in the mark scheme.

Answer either Question 2 or Question 3.

2 Read Sources B and C and answer the following question.

How confident can we be that co-operation in space research (Source B) and competition in the development of communications technology (Source C) can really ‘improve the lives’ of people?

(40 marks)

They can improve our lives in that:

- (a) co-operation between nations must be a good thing
- (b) competition can sharpen efficiency
- (c) there will be all sorts of spin-offs from space research, perhaps in the field of communications technology
- (d) as the world is more of a global village so we are less tolerant of gross inequalities and infringement of international conventions
- (e) e-mail and mobile telephony have done much to facilitate daily interactions.

They cannot improve lives in that:

- (n) space research cannot feed the hungry
- (o) it is a massive distraction from all that we could be doing to add quality to Earth-bound lives
- (p) advanced telecommunications are for the mobile, fashionable, capitalist minority; they leave many of us behind
- (q) space research and GSM technology are really all about global big business, not social justice
- (r) instant availability and communicability are as likely to cause stress as to improve the quality of life.

Band 1 Answers will probably make points on both sides of the argument, but they will argue convincingly and draw on information from beyond the sources to do it; there will be well-chosen, specific instances of improvement or unrelatedness.

Band 2 Answers will recognisably argue either way or both ways, and there will be some awareness of what space and telecommunications R & D can or cannot do to improve lives – some specificity from elsewhere than the sources.

Band 3 Answers will be rather source-dependent – there will not be other material – and they may be generalising; there is understanding and broad support for a case, but it is not altogether convinced or convincing; expression may weaken in the lower half of the band.

Band 4 Answers will show signs of misunderstanding, both of the question and of how it might appropriately be answered; the source is raided for inspiration, since there is nothing else on offer; expression may be poor, and the response brief.

(40 marks)

3 Read Sources D and E and answer the following question.

Source D recommends that tourists walk in London or use public transport, and Source E describes a mapping of London's cultural diversity.

What is there to celebrate or complain about where living or working in London, or any other town or city, is concerned?

(40 marks)

Candidates might celebrate:

- (a) the excitement of there being restaurants, bars, cinemas, clubs, galleries near at hand
- (b) the buzz of culturally diverse amenities, festivals, customs, concerts
- (c) the ready availability of transport at all hours of the day and night
- (d) the choice of schools, shopping facilities, doctors and other professionals and tradespeople
- (e) the public parks, squares, modern architectural spaces, striking buildings.

Candidates might complain about:

- (n) the noise, stress, impersonality of crowds, traffic, and polluted air, and litter and graffiti
- (o) crowded, often late, and expensive public transport and the daily crushing commute
- (p) the downside of diversity; diffuseness, the danger of alienation, and the loss of the familiar
- (q) the loneliness of city life; the company of strangers, the feelings of personal insignificance
- (r) the impossibility of breathing fresh air, of 'getting away from it all'; high rise and low spirits.

Band 1 Answers will make points on both sides of the argument but commit, convincingly to one point of view that is illustrated in a lively and specific way; there is evidence of personal engagement, and there are non-source examples.

Band 2 Answers may make a less successful overall case, but there is thoughtfulness, and the case is illustrated with specific examples from beyond the sources.

Band 3 Answers will be rather source-dependent; there is unlikely to be other material; they will be generalising and rather obvious in the points that they make; there will be clear understanding, but less convincingness.

Band 4 Answers will show signs of misunderstanding, both of the question and of how it might appropriately be answered; there is no specificity that is not suggested by the source; expression is weak, and the response may be brief.

(40 marks)

Distribution of Assessment Objective marks across Unit 6

Question Numbers		1	2/3	AO marks per unit
Assessment Objectives	AO1	11	11	22
	AO2	5	5	10
	AO3	14	14	28
	AO4	10	10	20
Total marks per Question		40	40	80