



---

A-LEVEL

# General Studies B

Unit 4 (GENB4) Change

Mark scheme

---

2765

June 2015

---

Version 0.3 Post Standardisation

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## GENB4: CHANGE

### 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.**

Approximate distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 4 (**GENB4**)

Question numbers	Q1	Q2/3	Total marks
<b>Assessment Objectives AO1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>AO2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>AO3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>AO4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Total marks per Question</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>

### Levels of Response marking

1. It is essential the **whole response is read** and allocated the level it **best fits**.
2. Marking should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising for failure or omissions. The award of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria.
3. Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment objectives** (see above) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response. When deciding upon a mark in a level examiners should bear in mind the relative weightings of AOs (see AO grid above). For example, more weight should be given to AOs 1 and 2 than to AOs 3 and 4.
4. Use your professional judgement to select the level that **best** describes a student's work; assign each of the responses to the most appropriate level according to **its overall quality**, then allocate a single mark within the level. Levels of response mark schemes enable examiners to reward valid, high-ability responses which do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. Length of response should not be confused with quality: a short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability, for example, must be recognised and credited at that level.
5. **Credit good specialist knowledge when it is applied appropriately to the question, but be aware that the subject is General Studies and responses should be addressed to the general reader. Relevant points that are well developed and substantiated should be well rewarded, as should be arguments that are supported with examples, and not just asserted.**
6. **Answers should be assessed at the level that is appropriate to the expected knowledge and skills of a post-16 General Studies student. Avoid applying greater demands to responses on topics that are more closely related to your own specialist knowledge.**
7. Levels of response mark schemes include either examples of possible students' responses or material which students typically might use. *Indicative content* is provided only as a guide for examiners, as students will produce a wide range of responses to each question. The *indicative content* is not intended to be exhaustive and any other valid points must be credited. Equally, candidates do not have to cover all points mentioned to reach the highest level.

### Assessment of Quality of Written Communication (QWC)

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all units where longer responses are required by means of **Assessment Objective 4**. If you are hesitating between two levels, however, QWC may help you to decide.

## Marking methods

All examiners **must** use the same marking methods. The following advice may seem obvious, but all examiners **must** follow it as closely as possible.

1. If you have any doubt about which mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking.
3. **Always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material irrelevant to the question, however impressive it might be.
5. If you are considering whether or not to award a mark, ask yourself... 'Is this student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
6. Read the guidance on the previous page about **Levels of Response marking**, and constantly refer to the **specific Level Descriptors** in the mark scheme.
7. **Use the full range of marks.** Don't hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits them (a maximum mark does not necessarily mean the 'perfect answer') or give no marks where there is nothing creditable.
8. No half marks or bonus marks can be given under any circumstances.
9. The key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Once approved by your Team Leader, do **not** change your standard of marking.

## Marking using QMS+ (red pen on script)

This unit will be marked on the actual script using a red pen. Scripts in your allocation will be posted to you from the school. The marks you award are recorded on the scripts and the marks for each question are entered into the QMS+ software.

1. Mark the full script in red pen.
2. **You must** annotate in the body of the response to acknowledge a creditworthy point.
3. At the end of the response **you must** indicate the level and mark and write a summative comment (see MMS).  
**NB.** Schools/Colleges can request scripts back post results (via Access to Scripts); it is therefore **essential** that the annotation/comments are appropriate, relevant and relate to the mark scheme.
4. Enter the marks for each question in to the QMS+ software.
5. Your assessments will be monitored to ensure you are marking to a consistent standard.
6. Any blank pages in the answer book should be 'ticked' to indicate you have checked the whole booklet for a response.
7. Your administration and meeting deadlines will also be monitored.

---

## **Section A            Level Mark Scheme for Question 01**

### **Level 1 [40 – 31 marks]**

A **very good to good** response

- Text and task are fully understood. All subject domains are covered (AO1)
- Selective critical use is made of information in text and data-set. Original detailed examples are developed as evidence to support a well-made argument (AO2)
- Distinction is made between factual material and personal and others' views and values. Evidence is weighed and judgements are undogmatic (AO3)
- Communication is clear and accurate. There is a certain rhetorical flow to the argument (AO4).

### **Level 2 [30 – 21 marks]**

A **good to fair** response

- Text and task are understood. A 'good' response will cover all, a 'fair' response perhaps two, of the subject domains (AO1)
- There is interpretation of relevant information in text and data-set. New material is developed – in some detail in a 'good' response – to support claims, and there is a conclusion (AO2)
- Some allowance is made for an alternative point of view. There is appreciation of what counts as factual evidence, and what is opinion (AO3)
- Communication is clear and mostly accurate. The question has been effectively answered (AO4).

### **Level 3 [20 – 11 marks]**

A **fair to weak** response

- There is broad understanding of text and/or task in fair responses; some misunderstanding in weak responses. The subject domains may only be referred to (AO1)
- There is some reference to text and/or data-set. There may be new material, but it is undeveloped and it may not contribute to a convincing argument (AO2)
- There may be little distinction made between factual matter and personal opinion. There is little or no sense of what values may be in play (AO3)
- There are errors in the language used but these do not impair communication. The response may be rather loosely structured (AO4).

### **Level 4 [10 – 1 marks]**

A **weak to poor** response

- Text or task or both are largely misunderstood. There is little or no differentiation of subject domains (AO1)
- There is little or no interpretative reference to either text or data-set. No new material is introduced to support claims (AO2)
- No distinction is made between factual claims and opinions. The response is unengaged (AO3)
- Errors of language begin to impair communication. The response is disorganised and/or brief (AO4).

**(0)** No response or no relevant information

## Section A

**0 1** It is generally agreed that there are too few women members of parliament (MPs) at Westminster.

What might be some of the

- historical
- social
- psychological

reasons for this, and how much do you think it matters?

**[40 marks]**

---

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

There are two parts to this question, and candidates – and examiners – should give more or less equal weight to both.

### **Indicative content:**

Candidates might be expected to refer under:

**Historical** reasons, to long-term inequality of employment, civil, and educational opportunities; to the settled view that the woman's place was in the home

**Social** reasons, to the unsociable hours, pressures of parliamentary life; and family and childcare issues

**Psychological** reasons, to a gendered interest in exercising power and participating in adversarial, sometimes noisy, testosterone-fuelled debate.

To the second part of the question, candidates might be expected to refer to what are generally perceived to be women's strengths, interests, concerns; and to how the culture of Parliament might benefit from learning to accommodate them.

Any other relevant points should be credited.

---

## **Section B**      **Level Mark Scheme for Questions 02 and 03**

### **Level 1 [40 – 31 marks]**

A **very good to good** response

- Texts and task are fully understood. There is keen appreciation of the thrust of the question (AO1)
- Material in the texts is implicit in the response rather than explicit. The response is a well-made argument based on original detailed examples (AO2)
- There is depth, there is analysis, and there is reasoning. The response is balanced, and judgement is well-based, or reserved (AO3)
- Communication is clear and accurate. There is a certain rhetorical flow to the argument (AO4).

### **Level 2 [30 – 21 marks]**

A **good to fair** response

- Texts and task are understood. There is engagement with the thrust of the question (AO1)
- There is some reference to one or both texts, but there is new material. This is developed – in some detail in a ‘good’ response – and there is a conclusion (AO2)
- An alternative viewpoint is taken into account. There is some appreciation of the limits of our knowledge (AO3)
- Communication is clear and mostly accurate. The question has been effectively answered (AO4).

### **Level 3 [20 – 11 marks]**

A **fair to weak** response

- There is broad understanding of texts and/or task in fair responses; some misunderstanding in weak responses. Insight may be lacking into the thrust of the question (AO1)
- There is some, underdeveloped new material. In the main, the response draws on one or both texts for its ideas (AO2)
- The response may be opinionated, and opinions may be ill-supported. There is little depth or engagement with values (AO3)
- There are errors in the language used but these do not impair communication. The response may be rather loosely structured (AO4).

### **Level 4 [10 – 1 marks]**

A **weak to poor** response

- Texts or task or both are misunderstood. There is little appreciation of the thrust of the question (AO1)
- The response leans exclusively on one or both of the texts. There is no new material (AO2)
- Opinions are expressed without thought of what might count as evidence. There is no engagement with values (AO3)
- Errors of language begin to impair communication. The response is disorganised and/or brief (AO4).

**(0)** No response or no relevant information.



---

**Section B**

**0 2** In **Text B**, Margrave worries that fans of Jane Austen will object to her (Margrave) ‘taking liberties’ with historical facts. In **Text C**, Lilley claims that climate change is ‘not disputable by facts’.

How certain can we be that we have ‘facts’ about the past and the future?

**[40 marks]**

---

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 8

**Indicative content:**

Candidates might be expected to refer to what it is that historians do – what evidence they have at their disposal, and how they interpret it

(and, perhaps, to whether novelists, dramatists, film-makers may be as insightful, on the basis of the same information, as historians).

They might refer to how the predictions of physical and social scientists are extrapolations from past behaviour, and how far such projections allow for a range of uncertainty.

There might also be reference to how facts are established in one or more disciplines, and to whether there might be different kinds of facts, logical and empirical facts, for instance.

There should also be an awareness of how opinions sometimes masquerade as facts, especially in the context of strongly-held ideologies.

**Note: Responses at Levels 1 and 2 should include both ‘past’ and ‘future’ dimensions.**

Any other relevant points should be credited.

---

**0 3** Economists are researching ways of measuring ‘people’s wellbeing’ (**Text D**); and physicists at CERN are trying to prove theories that are decades old (**Text E**).

How important is it that the general public understands what it is that experts, in any field, are doing?

**[40 marks]**

---

Refer to the **4 Level Mark Scheme** on page 8

**Indicative content:**

Candidates might be expected to refer to the importance of public understanding of what experts do in at least two different disciplines – including one that is not physics or economics.

They should be clear for a **good** mark about why such understanding is important in each case, giving more than one reason, whether this be:

- the investment of tax-payers’ money in research;
- the social/moral implications of experiments;
- the consequences of acting, or not acting, on experts’ predictions;
- civil-rights and political repercussions of expert-led decision-making;
- educational/curricular implications of new findings.

Any other relevant points should be credited.