

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2007

GCE

## GCE General Studies (6453) Paper 01

## General Guidance on Marking

All candidates must receive the same treatment.

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does **not** mean giving credit for incorrect or inadequate answers.

Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even if it is not what is expected it may be worthy of credit.

Candidates must make their meaning clear to the examiner to gain the mark.

Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the Team Leader must be consulted.

### Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

- an idea of the types of response expected
- how individual marks are to be awarded
- the total mark for each question
- examples of responses that should NOT receive credit.

- 1 / means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.
- 2 ( ) means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.
- 3 Phrases/words in **bold** indicate that the meaning of the phrase or the actual word is **essential** to the answer.

## 6453: Social Perspectives

- 1 (a) Assume that 4 million women of working age have no qualifications. Calculate the number of these women who have jobs. (1)

Award one mark for correct answer.  
 $44\% \times 4 \text{ million} = 1.76 \text{ million} / 1,760,000$

- (b) Employment rates at each level of educational qualification are higher for men than for women. Suggest one reason why. (1)

Award one mark for a relevant response - eg:

The percentages shown are of the working age population

- some women may not choose to work
- they may take a career break when having children
- they may decide not to work while they looking after children especially if they are single parents.
- Some employers prefer men - discrimination takes place - men valued more than women.
- "Glass ceiling" effect - restricted access for women in some jobs.
- Some specific jobs require manual work/strength of men thus restricting some job options for women.

NOTE: This question is about employment rates so answers that give reasons relating to qualifications and time available for study only are NOT relevant.

- (c) Employment rates are lowest for those with no educational qualification. Suggest two reasons why. (2)

Award one mark for each relevant response (max 2) - eg:

1. Those with qualifications may be more able to do the job
2. The fact that they have a qualification shows they stick at things until they are complete
3. Those with qualifications may be keener to have a job
4. They may prepare more carefully for an interview/have better interview skills.
5. Most jobs now require qualifications
6. Some employers demand these qualifications.
7. Employers might conclude that those without qualifications have few skills and lack intelligence.
8. Those without qualifications lack confidence to seek work and so may choose not to work and claim benefits.
9. Suggests to employers a lack of motivation, not prepared to work hard and so less attractive.
10. Not equipped for jobs that require skills, particularly complex jobs.

- 2 Five people each make an offer for tickets to a concert. The mean of the offers is £50. The mode for the offers is 4, representing offers of £20. Calculate the highest amount offered. (2)

Award two marks for the correct answer

i.e.

£170 / 170 with or without working (2)

If answer is incorrect, one mark should be awarded where the candidate demonstrates a correct understanding of **either** mean **or** mode

e.g.

Mean

is the sum of the values divided by the number of values

OR in this case the candidate indicates that the sum of the values is 250

Mode

is the most frequent value.

OR  $20 + 20 + 20 + 20 = 80$

OR  $4 \times 20$

OR  $4 \times 20 = 80$

Note: so if the candidate makes use of the values of either 250 or 80 in their calculations then award one mark

- 3 (a) Assume that in 2003/4 there were 600,000 stepfamilies. Each step family had an average of 1.5 dependent children. Calculate the number of children in stepfamilies from the man's previous relationship only. (1)

Award one mark for correct response:  
 $10\% \times 600,000 = 60,000 \times 1.5 = 90,000$  (children)

- (b) Calculate the number of degrees of the pie chart in the segment representing children from the women's previous relationship only. (Show all your workings.) (2)

298.8 or 299 °/degrees with any working shown  
e.g.  $83\% \times 360 = 298.8$  °/degrees award two marks

Alternative calculations are acceptable if they support the correct answer.

Giving the correct answer with no working shown award one mark

If the answer given is not correct, but the candidate has used 360 anywhere in the calculation award one mark

- (c) There are now many more step families than in 1970. Suggest why. (2)

Candidates could either offer two simple reasons (1 mark each) - eg:

- Number of re-marriages has increased causing more re-constituted families/less nuclear families
- More partners now co-habit rather than marry, making formation of reconstituted step families easier to achieve if the relationship breaks up.
- In 1970 not so common for marriages to split up.
- Number of re-marriages has increased considerably.
- Easier to divorce now/divorce rate is higher.
- Divorce/remarriage is more socially acceptable.
- Different attitudes to sanctity of marriage and religion.

NB: if just one reason is given, 2<sup>nd</sup> mark should be awarded where there is a little development/explanation - eg if a candidate discuss the impact of divorce as a reason, and develops the reason with reference to say Divorce Reform Act 1969 or to changing values relating to acceptability of divorce.

- 4 A woman went to the UK courts claiming her human rights had been infringed. She lost her claim. To which one of the following should she take her case in order to pursue her claim further? (1)

C European Court of Human Rights

- 5 A guilty person can be made to suffer for the wrong they have done to society. Such a punishment is described as: (1)

E Retribution

- 6 At the 2005 general election, the MPs elected in Surrey were all Conservatives. In Durham they were all Labour and in Cornwall they were all Liberal Democrats. Suggest two reasons why people living in different areas of Britain may support different parties. (2)

The assumption in this question is of areas with multiple seats in the House of Commons so reasons given need to address the issue of areas dominated by particular political parties. Answers that suggest impact of individual MPs on an area should not be rewarded.

Award one mark for each positive reason offered.

Reasons do not need to be linked to Surrey, Durham or Cornwall.

- Social class may be important - eg Surrey is much more middle class than many other areas
- Traditional ties and loyalties may exist - eg coal miners in Durham and Labour
- Economic factors may be important - low wage area such as Cornwall may turn to a third party such as Lib Dems feeling others have failed it
- Strength of the organisation and membership of a party in a particular area may make a big difference
- Parties may target and focus their campaigns on particular areas.

**NB:** Reasons that refer to areas "voting for parties that support their views and concerns" must be specific e.g. parties that support "controls on housing in rural areas". No marks for general comments about parties promising to deal with local area problems.

- 7 Pressure and protest groups rarely put forward candidates at general elections. However they often try to influence the result of such elections. Suggest two ways in which pressure groups try to influence the results of elections. (2)

Award one mark for each positive reason offered. Reasons do not need to be linked to particular pressure groups or political parties.

- Providing campaign finance - many business organisations give money to support the Conservatives
- Providing full-time organisers or premises - many trade unions ask their full-time staff to campaign for Labour during an election period or provide a base for party workers
- Organising mailings or telephone calling/knocking on doors to persuade voters
- Getting candidates to complete questionnaires and endorsing those who support their point of view or urging people not to vote for those who oppose their views
- Paying for advertising or opinion polling to support parties whose values they share
- Organise demonstrations/rallies/debates before and during election campaigns to influence and persuade public of certain views/policies.
- Use media to focus on particular election issues/parties/candidates (national or local level).

**NB:** Reasons given must relate to elections/parties/candidates. Reasons such as petitions, banners, demonstrations and any pressure/protest group activity simply stated without the context of elections should not be awarded marks.

(Total Section A 17 marks)

Section B - AO2 (3 marks) and AO4 (10 marks)

AO2 - Students should be able to communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way

AO4 - Students should be able to demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge and of the relationship between them, appreciating their limitations.

- 8 (a) What type of argument is used in the first two paragraphs of the passage, (lines 1-10)? (1)

D inductive argument

- (b) What type of argument is used in the second paragraph of the passage (lines 11-12)? (1)

E deductive argument

- (c) Which of the following extracts from the passage are wholly factual? (1)

E (iii) and (v)

- (d) Which of the following statements about beliefs are correct? (1)

A all of them

- (e) Briefly explain what makes a fact different from an opinion. You do not need to quote from the passage. (2)

Award one mark for an accurate explanation of a fact - verifiable, evidence supported, observed, tested, checked, true etc.

Award one mark for an accurate explanation of an opinion - belief, value judgement, subjective, not proven not necessarily true etc.



- (f) Identify two pieces of evidence from the passage which support the conclusion that “the ‘system’ isn’t working” (line 9) and identify two pieces of evidence to support the conclusion that the government should “scrap the agency and start again” (lines 20-21). Explain which of these possible conclusions is justified by the stronger evidence and why you have reached such a judgement.

(4)

AO4 marks should be awarded as follows:

Evidence that ‘the system’ isn’t working is to be found in the 1st and 2nd paragraphs -

E.g.

- about 70% of ‘runaway dads’ are still believed to be refusing to pay child maintenance, leaving single mums in poverty.
- there is the case of single mum of two, Jackie La Marca, of Leicester - who is owed £17,000 by her former partner after eight years.
- the CSA’s failure to collect child maintenance from fathers means there are now payment arrears of more than £1,000,000,000 on its books.
- the situation is so serious that drastic ideas have been put forward....
- in one area last year, barely 1 in 3 of dads paid up.

Allow one mark if two acceptable pieces of evidence are identified.

Evidence to support the idea that the government should ‘scrap the system and start again’ is only located in the 4th and 5th paragraphs -

e.g.

- hanging on to most of £6.8 mil and passing on less than 10% of this to needy families
- one in three phone calls to the CSA goes unanswered, meaning more than a million desperate parents cannot get through to its hotline
- demands cash from the wrong men, such as Martin Garnett of Blackpool who was dumped by his fiancée after the CSA tried to make him support a child that was not his.
- statement by an expert (Professor Steve Webb, MP) that: "If the administration of the system is a shambles, just fiddling around the edges won't work".
- "you can only patch up a worn tyre so many times. You reach a point when it has to be thrown out and you start again".

Allow one mark if two acceptable pieces of evidence are identified

**NB:** There must be acceptable pieces of evidence to gain each “evidence mark” and they must come from the correct sections of the Insert.

The 2 explanation marks should be awarded according to the following levels:

Quality of evidence supporting the two conclusions is simply examined and a simple conclusion reached **award one mark**

Quality of evidence supporting the conclusions is simply evaluated and a clear judgment about which is the better justification is offered with acceptable reasons **award two marks**

To get 2 ‘explanation’ marks candidates do not need to produce lengthy and convoluted statements. It is sufficient to identify one piece of evidence as the stronger AND SAY WHY. It may be that one piece of evidence is more reliable and can easily be shown to be true in many cases whereas other evidence may be anecdotal and refer only to a minority of cases.

## AO2 Mark Scheme

There will be additional marks for Quality of Written Communication based on all parts of Q4(f) only.

The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.	<b>3 marks</b> <b>(above average)</b>
The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form, arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.	<b>2 marks</b> <b>(average)</b>
The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.	<b>1 mark</b> <b>(below average)</b>
The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question too seriously, there may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling <b>OR</b> there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably.	<b>0 marks</b> <b>(exceptionally poor)</b>

**AO2: 3 Marks**  
**Total Section B 13 marks**

## Section C (AO3 - 17 marks; AO2 - 3 marks)

**AO3** - Students should be able to marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.

**AO2** - Students should be able to communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

Marks for Section C questions should be awarded according to AO3 and AO2 level descriptors

### General Guidance on Marking

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for irrelevant or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing relevant, plausible explanations using evidence and for critical and imaginative thinking. Candidates should also be credited for considering more than one point of view. Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even if it is not what is expected it may be worthy of credit.

- 9 'Whenever something goes wrong such as flooding or a severe storm or holiday chaos, there is no reason why people should expect the government to bail them out or pay compensation.' (17)  
Critically assess the arguments for and against this view.

The specification refers to 'examination and appreciation of ideologies and values in society - the nature and development of social values; different social and cultural influences: religion; law; government; protest movements etc'. Answers which fail to address such issues will gain no marks.

A03 marks should be allocated using the following level criteria:

Level	A03 level criteria	Mark	Indicators of level for this question.
0	<b>Irrelevant or facetious answer</b>	0	
1	<b>Partial and inconclusive answer</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit	1	Candidates may write in general terms about the governments role without addressing the specific question set. Supporting evidence will be almost missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced.
2	<b>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence	2-6	The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. E.g. a focus on chaos at airports. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill-informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.
3	<b>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints.</b> Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.	7-11	Here there is an answer which does at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be heavily one sided; the conclusion reached will be consistent with the discussion. E.g. a candidate focuses almost exclusively on why the Government should/or should not support citizens in time of need.
4	<b>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question.</b> Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s)	12-16	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question, candidates may well make reference to such concepts as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation/compensation culture</li> <li>• Governmental responsibility for citizens and tax payers</li> <li>• Need for personal accountability insurance as opposed to a "nanny state" litigious society</li> </ul>
5	<b>A fully balanced perceptive answer</b>	17	Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion

10 'Issues of tax and spending are too prominent in UK elections; other issues such as foreign affairs or law and order should be given greater consideration.'  
 Examine the arguments for and against such a view. 17

The specification refers to political processes and goals 'government and politics: Britain and Europe - identity of major political parties in Britain; similarities and differences; protest groups and single-issue politics; economic factors influencing electoral performance (lower taxes or higher spending)'. **Answers which fail to address such issues will gain no marks.**

**A03 marks should be allocated using the following level criteria:**

Level	A03 level criteria	Mark	Indicators of level for this question.
0	<b>Irrelevant or facetious answer</b>	0	
1	<b>Partial and inconclusive answer</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with <b>NO CONCLUSION</b> either implied or explicit	1	Candidate may write in general terms about taxation and/or spending and/or foreign affairs and/or law and order without addressing the question set. Supporting evidence will be almost missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced.
2	<b>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence	2-6	The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. E.g. a focus on high levels of taxation and/or law and order. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill-informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.
3	<b>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints.</b> Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.	7-11	Here there is an answer which <b>does</b> at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and be very heavily one sided; the conclusion reached will be consistent with the discussion. E.g. a candidate focuses almost exclusively on supporting the view that tax spending is or not too prominent in UK elections or exclusively on supporting the view that foreign affairs or law and order are or are not more important in UK elections.
4	<b>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question.</b> Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s)	12-16	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balance and comprehensive treatment of the issues. In the stronger answers to this question candidates may well make reference to such concepts as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Factors affecting voting behaviour as perceived by voters and/or political parties e.g. the significance of economic issues (it's the economy stupid)</li> <li>• Political party priorities and party obsessions e.g. the current focus on green issues.</li> <li>• The significance of topical current concerns at General Election times e.g. the Iraq War and overcrowding in prisons.</li> </ul>
5	<b>A fully balanced perceptive answer</b>	17	Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion

11 'In the UK we send far too many people to prison.'  
Consider arguments for and against this opinion.

(17)

The specification refers to 'crime, deviance and the legal system, the role and purpose of law; the relationship of law to the concept of right and wrong; the arguments for and against universal human rights; law in different societies; the nature and purpose of punishment (retribution, deterrence, reformation)'. **Answers which fail to address such issues will gain no marks.**

A03 marks should be allocated using the following level criteria:

Level	A03 level criteria	Mark	Indicators of level for this question.
0	<b>Irrelevant or facetious answer</b>	0	
1	<b>Partial and inconclusive answer</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with <b>NO CONCLUSION</b> either implied or explicit	1	Candidates may write in general terms about overcrowding in prisons and/or crime levels and/or sentencing policy without addressing the question set. Supporting evidence will be almost missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced.
2	<b>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion</b> Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence	2-6	The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. E.g. overcrowding in prison and/or Capital punishment, and/or asylum seekers, refugees and immigrants. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill-informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.
3	<b>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints.</b> Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.	7-11	Here there is an answer which <b>does</b> at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and be very heavily one sided; the conclusion reached will be consistent with the discussion. E.g. The candidate focuses almost exclusively on opinion that prisons are overcrowded and costly because we send too many to prisons or focuses almost exclusively on arguments against this opinion, such as people need to be sent to prison to protect the law abiding public.
4	<b>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question.</b> Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s)	12-16	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of the issues. In the stronger answers to this question candidates may well make reference to such concepts as:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retribution and rehabilitation</li> <li>• Recidivism - is there any point in sending lots of people to prison</li> <li>• The effectiveness of prison as a deterrent to crime</li> <li>• The impact of media (moral panics)</li> </ul>
5	<b>A fully balanced perceptive answer</b>	17	Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion

Marks should be given for (AO2) the **Level of Written Communication** using these guidelines

The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.	<b>3 marks</b> <b>(above average)</b>
The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form, arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.	<b>2 marks</b> <b>(average)</b>
The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.	<b>1 mark</b> <b>(below average)</b>
The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question too seriously, there may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling <b>OR</b> there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably.	<b>0 marks</b> <b>(exceptionally poor)</b>

NB The Quality of Communication marks are not dependant upon the AO3 mark

**AO2: 3 Marks**  
**Total Section C 20 marks**