



General Certificate of Education

General Studies

Specification B

GENB4

Unit 4 Change

Specimen Mark Scheme

This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 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 5) to which a response is allocated.**
- Knowledge and understanding [AO1] will lend or withdraw support for this 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 questions and assessment objectives for Unit 4

Question Numbers		Q01	Q02/03	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

01 Most of the castles built in England have ‘disappeared’. Read Text A and discuss whether we should maintain all, some, or any of the surviving castles.

Consider in your answer:

- **economic**
- **educational**
- **environmental/aesthetic**

reasons why we should, or should not, conserve castles and castle-sites.

(40 marks)

Why we should conserve castles:

- (a) They are an important draw for tourists, and tourism is a major UK industry; many may still be serviceable dwellings
- (b) they illustrate the lives of our forebears who lived in castles, or in their shadow, and what they represented in the polity of the time
- (c) a castle adds much to the fabric and feel of an ancient town or city; it may be a work of art in itself, giving aesthetic pleasure
- (d) we have a responsibility to future generations to conserve what we inherited, and give them the chance to draw their own historian’s conclusions.

Why we should not conserve castles:

- (n) They are an expensive anachronism; even those still lived in are grossly unsuitable in these energy-efficient times
- (o) they may give an over-romanticised view of an often far-from-chivalrous period; ruins are uninformative in comparison with computer simulations
- (p) when does conservation become restoration, and the holding on to the inauthentic – the dinosaur made to look life-like?
- (q) we should be selective in our conservation or non-conservation policies, and concentrate only on those that have present utility or real historical significance.

Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of the issues involved in conservation, and specifically of the implication of conserving those castles listed in the table; text and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given of actual castles, apart from those in the text, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the three or four different sorts of values on which good judgements may be based; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (25-32)

- a good response showing understanding of the source, including the table, and of the issues involved in conserving public and private property; text and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples of castles are given, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of variant values that may 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 (17-24)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the problem of conservation; text and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- it is unlikely that there will be other examples than those in the text; there may be too much quotation, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to economic and other values, but there may be no explanation as to how they might be reconciled, and little distinction of 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 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little understanding of the text or the table, or of the thrust of the question [AO1]
- there may be too much quotation from the source, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of what values may underpin the reasons for conserving or not conserving castles, 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].

Level 5 (1-8)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the text or question [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 values implicit in conservation or non-conservation, and of what facts and opinions may be in play [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) – No response or no relevant information.

02 We have never before been so accountable for our words and actions as on the Internet (Text B); and polls indicate that Muslims in the UK share many of the opinions of non-Muslims (Text C).

How far might the Internet contribute to social integration, in your view?
(40 marks)

The Internet may contribute to integration in that:

- (a) We all have access to it at school and in the workplace; it is a tool which all communities may use and where they meet on common ground
- (b) if prejudice is a product of ignorance, we may hope that tolerance will be fostered by recourse to such a huge uncensored database
- (c) the internet is a medium for all shades of opinion and branches of knowledge; 'balance' is achieved and in the long term, social-cultural integration in a free market of views.

It may not so contribute in that:

- (n) The internet is open to abuse by radicals and extremists, peddling intolerant views that the very freedom of the internet may inadvertently spread
- (o) not everyone has access to the internet, and many will prefer to use it for entertainment rather than enlightenment
- (p) surfing is a superficial activity that can scarcely overcome profoundly socialised differences; ghettoisation of the internet (by language and culture) is just as likely as ghettoisation of towns and cities.

Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of how the internet might or might not be a force for community cohesion; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of ways in which the internet might actually make a contribution, or of why it might not, that support the argument and that lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of the strengths and limitations of its integrative possibilities, and of the 'values' of the internet, and facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (25-32)

- a good response showing awareness of the importance of the issue and of how the internet may have relevance to community cohesion; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples are given of the contribution it might make, or of its marginal utility, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the values that may be represented by the internet and of their relevance; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear, and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (17-24)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of whether the internet may bear on social integration; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there is no reference to material from beyond the texts, but there is some credible argument [AO2]
- there is reference to the value of integration and some understanding of a value-laden or value-neutral internet; there is little distinction of fact and opinion [AO3]
- there are errors in the language, but these do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

Level 4 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little awareness of the relevance of the internet to community integration; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- no concrete examples are given of how the internet might make a contribution; there is source-dependence and little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of the play of values in this context, or 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].

Level 5 (1-8)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue or of texts and task [AO1]
- assertions are given no support in examples; there is no clear line of argument and no conclusion [AO2]
- no understanding is shown of any principles underpinning the issue or of what facts and opinions may be in play [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) – No response, or no relevant information.

(40 arks)

03 Text D is about the ‘pick’n’mix’ nature of much modern religious belief; Text E is about what scientists believe, rather than know, to be true.

How sure can we be that science will ‘eventually find the answers’ to our fundamental questions?

(40 marks)

Science will find the answers:

- (a) The ‘track record’ of science suggests that all the bastions of ignorance will fall to enquiry eventually; there will be no room for myth and superstition
- (b) pooled knowledge and the techniques and tools of enquiry are such that much of what was mystery is now history
- (c) our ‘fundamental questions’ will change and be found to be inherently unknowable or merely naïve; answers arrived at to practical questions will lead to scepticism about anything deemed to be ‘fundamental’.

Science will not find the answers:

- (n) Scientific knowledge, reached by strictly scientific means, is limited by its very nature to the superficially knowable, measurable and replicable
- (o) scientists are people, subject to all the human weaknesses that beset the rest of us; none of us can be objective in any ‘ultimate’ way
- (p) the fundamental questions (‘why’ questions) are not open to final understanding by the forensic methods of science, and those non-trivial questions are the really interesting ones.

Level 1 (33-40)

- a very good response showing keen awareness of what scientists can and cannot do; texts and task are clearly understood [AO1]
- well-chosen examples are given from beyond the texts provided of actual scientific breakthroughs or shortcomings, that support the argument and lead to a convincing conclusion [AO2]
- there is critical analysis of why, in principle, there may be questions that are beyond science and a definition of ‘truth’; facts and opinions are weighed [AO3]
- communication is clear, accurate, and the argument is well structured [AO4].

Level 2 (25-32)

- a good response showing awareness of the probing nature of the question of what science is and does; texts and task are understood [AO1]
- one or more non-text examples of what science can do and cannot do are given, and there is argument that leads to a realistic conclusion [AO2]
- there is understanding of the ‘truths’ retailed by religion and by science respectively; facts and opinions are distinguished [AO3]
- communication is clear and mostly accurate, and the structure is reasonably logical [AO4].

Level 3 (17-24)

- a competent, generalising response showing some awareness of the nature of scientific truth; texts and task are broadly understood [AO1]
- there is no reference to material from beyond the texts; but there is some credible argument [AO2]

-
- there is reference to what counts as 'truth' in religion and science, but there may be little distinction of 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 (9-16)

- a limited response showing little awareness of what counts for knowledge in religion and science; there may be misunderstanding of texts and task [AO1]
- examples of what we know scientifically are ill-chosen or absent, and there is little sense of evidence being marshalled in an argument [AO2]
- limited understanding is shown of what 'truth' might consist of, in either domain, 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].

Level 5 (1-8)

- an inadequate response showing little understanding of the central issue and of 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 religious or scientific 'truth' and of what facts and opinions may be in play [AO3]
- language is inaccurately used, and communication is seriously impaired [AO4].

(0) – No response or no relevant information.