

Version 1.0: 0810



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

GENERAL STUDIES

GENB3

Unit 3 Power

Mark Scheme

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 © 2010 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.

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** Marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.
- AO3** Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge appreciating their strengths and limitations.
- AO4** Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

- Candidates will often perform at a uniform level across the four Assessment Objectives. Sometimes, though, their performance will be uneven across the AOs.
- The mark awarded for a response should reflect the relative weightings of AOs for the unit (see below).
- **Thus, for Unit 3, the ability to marshal evidence and draw conclusions [AO2] is the primary determinant of the level (1 to 5) to which a response is allocated.**
- Knowledge and understanding [AO1] will lend or withdraw support for the allocation.
- Whether fact and opinion are distinguished [AO3], and whether communication is clear and accurate [AO4] have equal weight, and should determine the mark within the level.
- **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.**

Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 3

Question Numbers		Q1(a)	Q1(b)	Q2/3	Total marks
Assessment Objectives	1	5	5	10	20
	2	7	7	14	28
	3	4	4	8	16
	4	4	4	8	16
Total marks per Question		20	20	40	80

01 Read Texts A and B and argue that power is best exercised by those who are not accountable to the public.

(20 marks)

Points that might be made:

- scientific progress can be hindered by populist considerations
- experts standing for election may lose to less able but more popular figures
- the public may not have the knowledge necessary to judge the work of experts
- sometimes secrecy is vital, as in the development of weapons for defence
- accountability takes time and can delay progress
- vocal minority interests can prevent changes beneficial to the majority.

Level 1 (17 – 20 marks)

- a very good response showing a keen awareness of how those with power can be hindered by having to explain themselves; both the task and the texts are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given, from beyond the texts provided, considering other types of research and/or decision making [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the ways in which power is exercised and the benefits of being able to act without constraints [AO3]
- communication is clear and accurate and the argument is well structured and comes to a convincing conclusion [AO4].

Level 2 (13– 16 marks)

- a good response showing awareness of the ways in which decisions are made and justified; task and texts are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given, possibly from other areas of politics or science, indicating how research advances and progress is made [AO2]
- there is analysis of the ways in which power is exercised and secrecy is beneficial [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate and structure is reasonably logical with an attempt at an overall conclusion [AO4].

Level 3 (9 – 12 marks)

- a competent, generalising response, showing some awareness of the ways in which decisions are made; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, probably from similar or historical areas or taken directly from the texts, but with little or no interpretation; nevertheless the task is understood and there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to the ways in which secrecy can be beneficial, but there may be little distinction between fact and opinion over the issue of being 'best exercised' [AO3]
- there are likely to be errors in the language used, but these should not impair communication; the response has some structure but probably lacks a considered conclusion [AO4].

Level 4 (5 – 8 marks)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the ways in which different groups arrive at decisions; there may be misunderstanding of texts and the task [AO1]
- examples from beyond the text are absent or poorly chosen and there is little evidence of any argument or structure [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of the task or of the issue of 'best exercised' and there is little or no distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- errors of language may begin to impair communication; there is little structure and the response may be brief [AO4].

Level 5 (1 – 4 marks)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue and of texts and task [AO1]
- assertions have no supporting examples and there is no clear line of argument [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of the exercise of power or of the facts that might support such a case [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired; the response may be very brief [AO4].

(0) No response, or no relevant information.

02 Read Texts C and D and argue that existing checks on the power of non-elected UK institutions are sufficient to safeguard the public interest.

(20 marks)

Points that might be made:

- the internet is accessible to most and makes complaining easy
- major institutions are bound by checks and balances written into law to prevent abuse
- interested parties, such as journalists and whistleblowers, can investigate and expose corruption
- the public has the right to vote and to protest and draw attention to perceived malpractice
- people in positions of power can be punished or removed if they offend
- regulatory bodies and watchdogs exist to monitor institutions, companies and other organisations and have extensive powers.

Level 1 (17 – 20 marks)

- a very good response showing a keen awareness of the checks in place and how they can be used; both the task and texts are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given, from beyond the texts provided, revealing how checks exist and operate in practice [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the checks and how effective these are [AO3]
- communication is clear and accurate and the argument is well-structured and comes to a convincing conclusion [AO4].

Level 2 (13 – 16 marks)

- a good response showing awareness of the existence of checks and how they might be used; both the task and texts are clearly understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given, showing how checks are placed on institutions and how they operate [AO2]
- there is analysis of the checks that exist and how these work to prevent abuse [AO3]
- communication is mostly clear and accurate and structure is reasonably logical, with an attempt at an overall conclusion [AO4].

Level 3 (9 – 12 marks)

- a competent and generalising response showing awareness of the checks and how they work; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, probably taken directly from the texts, but with little or no interpretation; nevertheless, the task is understood and there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to checks and their operation, but there may be little distinction between fact and opinion over this issue [AO3]
- there are likely to be errors in the language used, but these should not impair communication; the response has some structure but probably lacks a considered conclusion [AO4].

Level 4 (5 – 8 marks)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the operation of checks; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- examples from beyond the text are absent or poorly chosen and there is little evidence of any argument or structure [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of those checks that are in place even in reference to the texts and there is little or no distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- errors of language may begin to impair communication; there is little structure and the response may be brief [AO4].

Level 5 (1 – 4 marks)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue and of the texts and task [AO1]
- assertions have no supporting examples and there is no clear line of argument [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of the nature of checks or the facts that might support a case [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired; the response may be very brief [AO4].

(0) No response, or no relevant information.

03 'People working in the public interest may sometimes need to take risks and bend the rules.'

How important are ethical considerations for those who work in the public interest?

(40 marks)

Points that might be made:

- different jobs have different requirements; deception could lead to effective journalism, but be unacceptable in politics
- it is important that the public can trust those working on their behalf
- scientific progress may offend the morals of some but end up providing life-saving advances for others
- when dealing with weaponry, it is difficult to be ethical when the object is to devise instruments of death
- those working in the public interest have a responsibility to make fair decisions that benefit the majority
- in order to expose corruption, it is sometimes necessary to deceive those believed to be corrupt
- if those in power act unethically, it could encourage others to believe they can justify their own unethical activities.

Level 1 (33 – 40 marks)

- a very good response, showing keen awareness of ethical issues and how they affect those in the public eye; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the sources and use is made of the texts, supporting the argument and leading to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the difference between various groups covered by the question and how circumstances might alter beliefs [AO3]
- communication is clear and accurate; the argument is well structured and comes to a conclusion [AO4].

Level 2 (25 – 32 marks)

- a good response, showing awareness of ethical issues and the impact these might have on those acting in the public interest; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given and use is made of one or more of the texts; these are analysed and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is analysis of how different groups might behave differently; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate, the structure is reasonably logical and an attempt is made to come to a conclusion [AO4].

Level 3 (17 – 24 marks)

- a competent, generalising response, showing some awareness of the role of ethics and how people might be affected; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, probably taken directly from the texts with limited interpretation; there may be an over-reliance on these text-led examples, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is recognition of the way in which different groups behave differently, but this tension may not be convincingly resolved and there is a failure to distinguish fully between fact and opinion [AO3]
- there are errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure but may lack a convincing conclusion [AO4].

Level 4 (9 – 16 marks)

- a limited response, showing little awareness of the difference between different groups; there may be misunderstanding of the texts or task [AO1]
- examples may be poorly chosen or absent, and there may be an over-reliance on the texts; there is little sense of an argument being constructed [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown and there is probably little distinction between fact and opinion on the importance of ethical considerations [AO3]
- errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure and the response may be brief [AO4].

Level 5 (1 – 8 marks)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue and of the texts and task [AO1]
- assertions are given no support in examples and there is no clear line of argument and no conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of what is meant by ethical considerations [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) No response, or no relevant information.

04 Investigative journalists sometimes entrap those in power; some entertainers offend audiences.

Should those in the media be allowed to deceive and offend in the pursuit of news and entertainment?

(40 marks)

Points that might be made:

- journalists can uncover sleaze and corruption
- it is dubious whether exposing the private lives of those in the news is of value
- media exist to inform, educate and entertain and we all have different interpretations of these three areas
- those in the media need to make money to survive and this means providing what the public wants
- we can all complain and the media must take note or lose support
- the media are an important fourth estate helping to place checks on those in power
- in some sectors of the media, power is concentrated in the hands of a few owners and is open to being abused
- the media can influence and create opinion.

Level 1 (33 – 40 marks)

- a very good response, showing keen awareness of the tension between the need for freedom of expression and danger of this being taken advantage of; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the sources and use is made of the texts, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the conflict between the needs of the media and the rights of individuals within society [AO3]
- communication is clear and accurate; the argument is well structured and comes to a conclusion [AO4].

Level 2 (25 – 32 marks)

- a good response, showing awareness of the essential problem of the rights of the media to investigate and how this conflicts with concerns about the impact on society as a whole; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given of how the media act, these are analysed and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the tension between the role of the media and the rights of individuals; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate, the structure is reasonably logical and an attempt is made to come to a conclusion [AO4].

Level 3 (17 – 24 marks)

- a competent, generalising response, showing some awareness of the problem of the media using and abusing their position; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there may be examples, probably taken directly from the texts with limited interpretation; there may be an over-reliance on the texts but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is recognition of the tension between the need to inform and the need to entertain, but this tension may not be convincingly resolved and there is a failure to distinguish fully between fact and opinion [AO3]
- there are errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure but may lack a convincing conclusion [AO4].

Level 4 (9 – 16 marks)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the tension between the rights of the media and their responsibilities; there may be misunderstanding of the texts or task [AO1]
- examples may be poorly chosen or absent, and there may be an over-reliance on the texts; there is little sense of an argument being constructed [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown and there is probably little distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure and the response may be brief [AO4].

Level 5 (1 – 8 marks)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue and of the texts and task [AO1]
- assertions are given no support in examples and there is no clear line of argument and no conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of the rights of the media and/the rights of individuals [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) No response, or no relevant information.