

Final



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2013**

**General Studies B
(Specification 2765)
Unit 4: Change**

Final

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 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 4, the ability to marshal evidence and draw conclusions [AO2] is the primary determinant of the level (1 to 4) 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 4

Question Numbers		Q1	Q2/3	Total marks
Assessment Objectives	1	10	10	20
	2	14	14	28
	3	8	8	16
	4	8	8	16
Total marks per Question		40	40	80

SECTION A

01 There is conflict between those who favour modernist architecture and those who prefer buildings in more traditional styles (Text A).

Does it make sense, from:

- **social**
- **aesthetic**
- **technological**

points of view, to go on designing buildings inspired by architectural styles of the past?

(40 marks)

Indicative content:

From a **social** point of view:

- *Traditional* buildings are those that many people like best, feel most comfortable in and adapt to their changing purposes.
- *Modern(ist)* buildings are those they may prefer to work in, do their shopping in, and use for many practical purposes.

From an **aesthetic** point of view:

- *Traditional* buildings, when built of local materials, fit in best with existing buildings; they are built on a human scale to be pleasing to the eye.
- *Modern(ist)* buildings work well when clustered with others in newly-developed locations of high-population density and modern infrastructure.

From a **technological** point of view:

- *Traditional* buildings, built of brick, wood, stone have lasted well and can be re-equipped with modern wiring, sanitation and other services
- *Modern(ist)* buildings are more suitable for today's ICT requirements, and the need for flexible internal spaces; they are likely to be more energy-saving and sustainable.

Any other valid points should be credited.

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 5

Level Mark Scheme for Question 01

Level 1 (40 – 31 marks)

- A very good to good response showing keen awareness of implications of building in traditional or modern styles, in all dimensions; text and task are understood [AO1]
- There are specific examples of buildings, and of the demands on buildings, in both styles, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- There is critical analysis of different points of view, and well-based judgement; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (30 – 21 marks)

- A good to fair response showing understanding of the issues arising from our preferences for traditional or modern buildings; text and task are understood [AO1]
- There are specific non-text examples of buildings and their suitability for the demands we make of them, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- There is understanding of the values that might be in play, and of how they might be weighed; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (20 – 11 marks)

- A fair to weak response showing some general awareness of the issues arising from our preferences for traditional or modern buildings; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- It is unlikely that there will be specific non-text examples of buildings traditional or modern; there may be too much quotation, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- There may be little reference to underlying values, and little distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- There are errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (10 – 1 marks)

- A weak to poor response showing little understanding of the text or data, or of the thrust of the question [AO1]
- There may be too much quotation from the text, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- Limited understanding is shown of what values might be served or compromised by one point of view or the other, and of the distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

(0) No response or no relevant information.

SECTION B

EITHER

02 Amnesty International's campaign to abolish the death penalty began back in 1977 (**Text B**); House of Lords reform (**Text C**) has been talked about for over a century.

Are significant changes in public policy bound to take as long as they do, and may this be a good thing?

(40 marks)

Indicative content:

Significant changes in public policy are bound to take time, because:

- debate and consultation are vital to the workings of democracy
- people disagree for perfectly legitimate reasons
- shifts in public opinion take place over generations as technologies change
- change may have to take account of deep-rooted cultural and moral values.

They are not bound to take time because:

- war or natural disaster may precipitate change
- sudden global events may disturb the *status quo*
- revolutions usher in new regimes
- strong leaders can initiate dramatic change.

It is good that change takes time, because

- it gives policy-makers the opportunity to reflect on the potential consequences of change
- gradual change stirs up less opposition from the conservative
- it has a better chance of being prepared for, and then of bedding down.

It is not good that it takes time, because:

- justice deferred is justice denied
- unreformed institutions are often inefficient, even oppressive
- desperate ills sometimes require desperate remedies, for which the afflicted should not have to wait.

Any other valid points should be credited.

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 6

Level Mark Scheme for Question 02

Level 1 (40 – 31 marks)

- A very good to good response showing keen awareness of the impetus towards and the constraints on changes in public policy; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of changes in public policy that have or have not taken place, that support the argument and that lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- There is critical analysis of the significance of policies and of values that might be appealed to; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (30 – 21 marks)

- A good to fair response showing awareness of why significant change might take time; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- One or more non-text examples are given of contexts in which changes in policy are enabled or frustrated, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- There is understanding of the values that may underpin judgements in either direction; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear, and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (20 – 11 marks)

- A fair to weak response showing some general awareness of why it takes time to effect change; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- There is little reference to material from beyond the texts, and no development; but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- There is reference to underlying values, but there is little distinction made between fact and opinion [AO3]
- There are errors in the language, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (10 – 1 marks)

- A weak to poor response showing little awareness of why social policy change might take time; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- No concrete examples are given of changes in public policy; there is text-dependence and little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- Limited understanding is shown of the play of values affecting change, or of what facts or opinions might be in play [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

(0) No response or no relevant information.

OR

03 We seem to have a strong faith in technological fixes (Text D), as well as a readiness to take on high levels of debt (Text E).

Are we the victims of misplaced optimism where the future is concerned?

(40 marks)

Indicative content:

Optimism is a good thing inasmuch as:

- nothing ventured nothing gained: if we didn't strive, we'd not improve
- as circumstances change we have no choice but to seek new answers to new problems
- optimism is a healthier, more energising and productive state than pessimism
- history gives us some grounds for believing that problems do have solutions if we apply our minds to them.

On the other hand, the optimism may be misplaced, because:

- some of our supposed 'fixes' have rebounded on us
- it is an illusion that we make 'progress': that for every problem there is a solution
- there is no precedent for the specific circumstances in which we now find ourselves
- we cannot have what we cannot pay for: we are mortgaging the planet on which we live.

Any other valid points should be credited.

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 9

Level Mark Scheme for Question 03

Level 1 (40 – 31 marks)

- A very good to good response showing keen awareness of the threats and opportunities arising from optimism; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- Well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of positive and negative outcomes from optimism, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- There is critical analysis of different points of view where optimism about the future is concerned; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (30 – 21 marks)

- A good to fair response showing awareness of the problems of identifying what is enterprising and what is foolhardy; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- One or more non-text examples are developed of positive and/or negative outcomes from optimism, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- There is understanding of the values underlying optimistic/pessimistic outlooks; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- Communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (20 – 11 marks)

- A fair to weak response showing some general awareness of what might justify optimism or not; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- There may be undeveloped reference to material from beyond the texts; but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- There is reference perhaps to underlying values, but there may be little distinction made between fact and opinion [AO3]
- There are errors in the language used, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (10 – 1 marks)

- A weak to poor response showing little awareness of why optimism might or might not be misplaced; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- There is unlikely to be any non-text example of misplaced optimism, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- Limited understanding is shown of what relevant ideals or values might be, and of the distinction between fact and opinion [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

(0) No response or no relevant information.