



General Certificate of Education

General Studies 5766

Specification B

GSB2 Power

Mark Scheme

2008 examination - January 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 © 2008 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 2**(GSB2 Power)**

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 stimulus, of the issues, and of the task. Information of a specific kind from within and beyond the stimulus is analysed critically. The writing is well structured and balanced; facts, opinions and values (implicit and explicit) are clearly distinguished and weighed. Expression is clear and logical with no significant errors of style or grammar.
2	25 – 32	A good response showing understanding of the stimulus, of the issues, and of the task. Some attempt is made to combine information and examples from the stimulus and from elsewhere. The writing is quite well structured and balanced. Facts, opinions and values are recognised as such. 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 stimulus, but one that is largely dependent on it. Evidence is moderately well marshalled in writing 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 stimulus. No other information is drawn on. Evidence is loosely marshalled in writing that lacks structure and balance. Only a limited attempt is made to separate fact and opinion and to come to a conclusion. There is a lack of clarity, and inaccuracy in style, expression and grammar.
5	1 – 8	A response that barely addresses the issues; that shows little or no understanding of the stimulus. 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.

1 Read the passage opposite about 'TV addiction'. It is Wade Rowland's view that television can be as addictive as a drug.

Draw on your own and others' experience of watching television to write an essay in which you agree or disagree with Rowland's view.

(40 marks)

Candidates might add to Rowland's case that:

- (a) the amount of time spent watching TV is evidence enough of addiction
- (b) in many households the TV is on even when no-one is watching it.

Or they might argue that:

- (n) watching BBC channels is less addictive, there being no commercial advertising
- (o) viewers are more selective in their choice of programmes to watch than Rowland suggests
- (p) the 'couch potato' is a sad case, but only a small minority of viewers come into this category
- (q) the average number of hours of TV-watching is probably inflated by the habits of the old and housebound
- (r) those addicted to TV are probably those whose work is least stimulating and whose education is most limited
- (s) there may be more risk in being addicted to internet blogging and online gaming.

Band 1 Answers will evidence close reading of the stimulus: they will endorse it, or take issue with it, in quite specific ways, drawing on experience and observation in the construction of a convincing, well-informed argument – balanced or not.

Band 2 There will be some information and experience-based illustration from beyond the stimulus. A worthwhile attempt is made to assess whether 'addiction' is the appropriate term to use; it is reasonably coherent, and there is likely to be a conclusion.

Band 3 Answers may well be something of a commentary on the stimulus, and experience drawn on may not be altogether relevant to the question of addiction. They may be generalising, and expression may weaken in the lower half of the band.

Band 4 There is some misunderstanding of the stimulus, and answers are rather about watching TV than about addiction to it. There may be anecdote; but it contributes little to an argument that answers the question as asked.

Band 5 Answers are likely to be brief, and content inappropriate. There is obvious misunderstanding of the stimulus and/or the task.

(40 marks)

SECTION B

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

Band	Marks	
1	25 – 30	A very good response, showing awareness of issues and usually going beyond a discussion of examples given in the question. Facts, concepts and opinions are well selected, interpreted and integrated in a balanced argument that is furnished with well chosen examples. These are evaluated critically and perceptive conclusions are drawn. Expression is clear and logical with no significant errors of style or grammar.
2	19 – 24	A good response, in which some attempt is made to draw on relevant knowledge. Evidence with apt examples is effectively marshalled in an argument that is structured and that recognises the difference between fact and opinion. Valid conclusions are drawn. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate with few errors of style or grammar.
3	13 – 18	A competent, average response, which draws on knowledge that is mostly relevant. Evidence is moderately well marshalled in an argument that recognises some distinction between fact and opinion, but it may be cue-dependent and generalising. Expression is reasonably clear and accurate, although there may be some carelessness in style or grammar.
4	7 – 12	A limited response showing little understanding of the question, and dependent on cues. Some knowledge is drawn on, but evidence is only loosely marshalled in an argument that lacks structure and recognises little distinction between fact and opinion. Examples are few, inapt, or missing. Expression is unclear and there is inaccuracy in style or grammar.
5	1 – 6	A very limited response, that draws on scant knowledge and this is of doubtful relevance. There is more assertion than argument and no distinction is made between fact and opinion. No examples are given to support the answer and no real conclusion is drawn. Clarity and accuracy are seriously impaired by significant errors in style or grammar.
6	0	No response, or no relevant points.

2 Our system of voting in the UK normally gives a lot of power to one party – and, in particular, to the leader of that party – sometimes for many years.

Discuss the view that, if we are to be a democracy, we should place more limits on government power.

You might consider in your answer:

- the effect of public opinion
- the media as a check on the government
- the role of the opposition
- whether there can ever be real democracy.

(30 marks)

Candidates might argue that:

- (a) the system of voting should be reformed so that Parliament is more representative of the electorate
- (b) public opinion should be sounded by a government-commissioned body so as to inform parliamentary debates
- (c) the quality press and broadcast news media are an effective check on government
- (d) the House of Lords should be abolished, or peers should be elected and the upper house be given more power
- (e) Parliament should be less adversarial; more accessible to the public; more accountable to a written constitution
- (f) the party leader should be subject to periodic re-election by the party, or to direct election by the voters
- (g) 'real' (direct) democracy is probably impractical; but measures should be taken to guard against elective dictatorship.

Band 1 Answers will show knowledge and understanding of the present system of voting, and have a firm grasp of what reforms would be *democratic* and *practicable*. The argument is furnished with specific examples; it has shape; and a convincing conclusion.

Band 2 Answers will have some understanding of the status quo and will make a reasonable case for reform. There will be some specific ideas beyond those suggested by the cues, and some feel of an overall case.

Band 3 There will be little knowledge beyond the fairly obvious, and beyond what is deducible from the cues. There is understanding, but the case made is of a cue-driven and generalising kind. The lower half of the band may be characterised by weaknesses of expression.

Band 4 Here there is some evidence of a misunderstanding of the question and of the cues. Answers will struggle to make a case, uncertain of what reform might be in order, and what would count as democracy. They may be short and indifferently expressed.

Band 5 Answers are wayward and seriously inadequate. There is little or no understanding of the present system and of how it might be reformed in the interests of democracy.

(30 marks)

3 Anita and Gordon Roddick opened the Body Shop in Brighton in 1976. Now it has 2000 stores in 54 countries, and has been sold to L'Oréal, the French cosmetics company.

How far does it matter that companies are bought and sold, like their products?

You might consider in your answer:

- **the interests of the employees**
- **the effects on prices in the shops**
- **the motives of bosses and shareholders**
- **whether there might be ethical concerns.**

(30 marks)

Candidates might argue that:

- (a) a company might not stick by its founding principles in a corporate merger
- (b) merged companies might lose their special identity and the loyalty of their customers
- (c) many companies retain their identity in a merger and the customer is scarcely aware that it is part of a group
- (d) mergers almost inevitably mean that there will be employees who will lose their jobs; others may suffer culture-shock
- (e) the bigger the company, the bigger the capital, and the more money there is to invest
- (f) familiar products may disappear in the interests of 'rationalisation', familiar stores are re-branded, or close
- (g) market values are all too often get-rich-quick and monopolistic, for all the talk of competitiveness, free trade, and consumer choice.

Band 1 Answers will refer to other mergers/takeovers than the Body Shop, and understand the principles behind their being undertaken. They will argue coherently for or against 'market rationalisation', or take a balanced view. Either way, answers will be well-informed, well-shaped, and convincing.

Band 2 Answers will show understanding of some of the reasons why companies are bought and sold, and be able to instance one or more cases. The cues are picked up intelligently, and there is some convincing discussion of market values in an argument that comes to a conclusion.

Band 3 Cues will be dutifully picked up, and there will be comment on the Body Shop case that may smack of economic patriotism. There is some understanding of the motives of buyers and sellers, but answers will be generalising and less than convincing. Expression may weaken in the lower half of the band.

Band 4 The task may not be understood, and the cues only taken up in part. Discussion is ill-informed, probably one-sided, and rather brief. Probably only negative motives are imputed on all sides. Expression may be weak.

Band 5 There is little understanding of the terms in which a relevant answer might be given. Takeovers and mergers are assumed to be a 'bad thing', but no reasons are developed. Answers are seriously inadequate.

(30 marks)

Distribution of Assessment Objective marks across Unit 2

Question Numbers	1	2 / 3	AO marks per unit	
Assessment Objectives	AO1	5	5	10
	AO2	5	5	10
	AO3	15	10	25
	AO4	15	10	25
Total marks per question	40	30	70	